

Helsinki, 30 March 2023

**Addressees**

Registrants of JS\_C12C18unsatAKD as listed in Appendix 3 of this decision

**Date of submission of the dossier subject to this decision**

24/05/2022

**Registered substance subject to this decision ("the Substance")**Substance name: 2-Oxetanone, 3-C12-16-alkyl-4-C13-17-alkylidene derivs., (4E)-  
EC/List number: 939-401-9**Decision number:** Please refer to the REACH-IT message which delivered this communication (in format TPE-D-XXXXXXXXXX-XX-XX/F)**DECISION ON TESTING PROPOSAL(S)**Under Article 40 of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 (REACH), you must submit the information listed below by **7 July 2025**.

Requested information must be generated using the Substance unless otherwise specified.

**Information required from all the Registrants subject to Annex VIII of REACH**

1. Long-term toxicity testing on fish also requested below (triggered by Annex VIII, Section 9.1.3., column 2)

**Information required from all the Registrants subject to Annex IX of REACH**

2. Long-term toxicity testing on fish (Annex IX, Section 9.1.6.; test method: EU C.47./OECD TG 210)

The reasons for the decision(s) are explained in Appendix 1.

**Information required depends on your tonnage band**

You must provide the information listed above for all REACH Annexes applicable to you in accordance with Articles 10(a) and 12(1) of REACH. The addressee(s) of the decision and their corresponding information requirements based on registered tonnage band are listed in Appendix 3.

In the requests above, the same study has been requested under different Annexes. This is because some information requirements may be triggered at lower tonnage band(s). In such cases, only the reasons why the information requirement is triggered are provided for the lower tonnage band(s). For the highest tonnage band, the reasons why the standard information requirement is not met and the specification of the study design are provided. Only one study is to be conducted; all registrants concerned must make every effort to reach an agreement as to who is to carry out the study on behalf of the others under Article 53 of REACH.

You are only required to share the costs of information that you must submit to fulfil your information requirements.

### **How to comply with your information requirements**

To comply with your information requirements, you must submit the information requested by this decision in an updated registration dossier by the deadline indicated above. You must also **update the chemical safety report**, where relevant, including any changes to classification and labelling, based on the newly generated information.

You must follow the general requirements for testing and reporting new tests under REACH, see Appendix 4.

### **Appeal**

This decision, when adopted under Article 51 of REACH, may be appealed to the Board of Appeal of ECHA within three months of its notification to you. Please refer to <http://echa.europa.eu/regulations/appeals> for further information.

### **Failure to comply**

If you do not comply with the information required by this decision by the deadline indicated above, ECHA will notify the enforcement authorities of your Member State.

Authorised<sup>1</sup> under the authority of Mike Rasenberg, Director of Hazard Assessment

Appendix 1: Reasons for the decision

Appendix 2: Procedure

Appendix 3: Addressees of the decision and their individual information requirements

Appendix 4: Conducting and reporting new tests under REACH

---

<sup>1</sup> As this is an electronic document, it is not physically signed. This communication has been approved according to ECHA's internal decision-approval process.

## **Appendix 1: Reasons for the decision**

### **Contents**

<b>Reasons for the decision(s) related to the information under Annex VIII of REACH .....</b>	<b>4</b>
1. Long-term toxicity testing on fish .....	4
<b>Reasons for the decision(s) related to the information under Annex IX of REACH .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2. Long-term toxicity testing on fish .....	5
<b>References .....</b>	<b>9</b>

## **Reasons for the decision(s) related to the information under Annex VIII of REACH**

### **1. Long-term toxicity testing on fish**

- 1 Short-term toxicity testing on fish is an information requirement under Annex VIII, Column 1, Section 9.1.3. However, long-term toxicity testing on fish may be required by the Agency (Section 9.1.3., Column 2) if the substance is poorly water soluble, i.e. solubility below 1 mg/L.

#### *1.1. Triggering of the information requirement*

- 2 Poorly water soluble substances require longer time to reach steady-state conditions. As a result, the short-term tests do not give a true measure of toxicity for this type of substances and the long-term test is required.
- 3 You have provided information which indicates that the Substance includes constituents that are poorly water soluble. You indicate that QSAR based calculated water solubility by using the WSKOWwin v1.42 methodology was  $3.94 \times 10^{-10}$  mg/L for the main component. You consider this value being representative for the Substance.
- 4 Therefore, the Substance is poorly water soluble and information on long-term toxicity on fish must be provided.
- 5 The examination of the information provided, your considerations of alternative methods, of third party comments (if applicable), as well as the selection of the requested test and the test design are addressed under request 2.

**Reasons for the decision(s) related to the information under Annex IX of REACH****2. Long-term toxicity testing on fish**

6 Long-term toxicity testing on fish is an information requirement under Annex IX to REACH (Section 9.1.6.).

*2.1. Information provided to fulfil the information requirement*

7 You have submitted a testing proposal for a Fish, Early-Life Stage Toxicity Test (test method: OECD TG 210) on the analogue substance solid AKD (EC 284-932-5, CAS no 84989-41-3).

8 Your registration dossier does not include the standard information on long-term toxicity on fish.

9 ECHA therefore agrees that an appropriate study on long-term toxicity on fish is needed.

10 ECHA also requested your further considerations for alternative methods to fulfil the information requirement for long-term toxicity on fish. You provided your considerations and you apply a grouping and read-across approach according to Annex XI, Section 1.5. to fulfil the respective information requirement. No other alternative methods were available. ECHA has taken these considerations into account.

*2.1.1. Your proposal for a Grouping of substances and read-across approach*

11 You base your Grouping of substances and read-across approach on the following data from the source substances:

(i) read-across justification document in [IUCLID Section 13/CSR].

12 You provide the following reasoning for the prediction of this information requirement: [...]"The source (solid AKD, EC No. 284-932-5) and target substances (the Substance) have a very low water solubility, do not dissociate in biological fluids and in the aquatic environment and all have a log Kow above 13. The source substance was selected based on its structural and physico-chemical similarity to the target substance and alkyl chains in the range of C12-C22 are anticipated to have similar properties (liquid C14-C18 & solid C16-C18)"].

13 ECHA understands that you predict the properties of the Substance using a read-across hypothesis which assumes that different compounds have the same type of effects. The properties of your Substance are predicted to be quantitatively equal to those of the source substance.

*2.1.2. Assessment of the information provided*

14 We have assessed this information and identified the following issue(s):

*2.1.2.1. Read-across adaptation rejected*

15 Annex XI, Section 1.5. specifies two conditions which must be fulfilled whenever a read-across approach is used. Firstly, there needs to be structural similarity between substances which results in a likelihood that the substances have similar physicochemical, toxicological and ecotoxicological properties so that the substances may be considered as a group or

category. Secondly, it is required that the relevant properties of a substance within the group may be predicted from data for reference substance(s) within the group.

16 Additional information on what is necessary when justifying a read-across approach can be found in the Guidance on IRs and CSA, Chapter R.6. and related documents (RAAF, 2017; RAAF UVCB, 2017).

17 We have identified the following issue(s) with the prediction of ecotoxicological properties:

*Inadequate read-across hypothesis*

18 Annex XI, Section 1.5 requires that whenever read-across is used adequate and reliable documentation of the applied method must be provided. Such documentation must include an explanation why the properties of the Substance may be predicted from other substances in the group, i.e. a read-across hypothesis. This hypothesis should be based on recognition of the structural similarities and differences between the substances (Guidance on IRs and CSA, Section R.6.). It should explain why the differences in the chemical structures should not influence the ecotoxicological properties or should do so in a regular pattern, taking into account that variations in chemical structure can affect both toxicokinetics (uptake and bioavailability) and toxicodynamics (e.g. interactions with receptors and enzymes) of substances (Guidance on IRs and CSA, Section R.6.2.1.3).

19 Your read-across hypothesis is based on structural similarities and similarities in the physico-chemical properties of the source substance(s). In the Read-Across Justification Document you summarise that [..."*Alkyl ketene dimers (AKD) are structural similar due to the similar synthesis process (unsaturated lactones, frequently synthesised through the preparation of the acid chloride of a carboxylic acid, followed by intermolecular lactone ring condensation). The difference between liquid (target) and solid (source) forms of AKD is due to the alkyl chain. The alkyl chain of liquid AKD is usually branched or derived from unsaturated fatty acids. The alkyl chain of solid AKD is usually linear and derived from saturated fatty acids. The extra double bond in the alkyl chain is less reactive than the one attaching the alkyl chain to the lactone ring. The extra double bond, which has the cis-configuration, only liquidifies the substance and is not considered to significantly alter the behaviour in the body and environment and the (eco) toxicological properties compared to solid AKDs. Similarly, alkyl chains in the range of C12-C22 are anticipated to have similar properties. Therefore, suitable analogues are analogues that have the specific AKD structure, a double bond attaching the alkyl chain to the lactone ring, and alkyl chains in the range of C12-C22 with or without an extra double bond*"].

20 You consider that these elements are a sufficient basis for predicting the ecotoxicological properties of the Substance. Moreover, the data-matrix in the Environmental fate and ecotoxicological properties Section of the read-across Justification Document list only physico-chemical information and indicates that short-term aquatic toxic studies are available for the source substance.

21 However physico-chemical similarity alone does not necessarily lead to predictable or similar ecotoxicological properties. You have not provided a well-founded hypothesis to establish a reliable prediction for an ecotoxicological property, explaining why the structural differences (e.g. alkyl chain length and branching) do not influence toxicodynamics of the substances, and thus why the properties of the Substance may be predicted from information on the source substance.

22 However, you have not substantiated how structural and physico-chemical similarity alone would explain similarity in the predicted endpoint(s), more specifically effects on toxicodynamic, and thus be sufficient to justify the ecotoxicological predictions. Missing supporting information to compare the properties of the substances

- 23 Annex XI, Section 1.5 requires that whenever read-across is used adequate and reliable documentation of the applied method must be provided. Such documentation must provide supporting information to scientifically justify the read-across explanation for prediction of properties. The set of supporting information should strengthen the rationale for the read-across in allowing to verify the crucial aspects of the read-across hypothesis and establishing that the properties of the Substance can be predicted from the data on the source substance (Guidance on IRs and CSA R.6, Section R.6.2.2.1.f.).
- 24 Supporting information must include bridging studies to compare properties of the source substance and the Substance.
- 25 As indicated above, your read-across hypothesis is based on the assumption that the structurally similar source substance causes the same type of effect(s). In this context, relevant, reliable and adequate information allowing to compare the properties of the source substance is necessary to confirm that the substances cause the same type of effects. Such information can be obtained, for example, from bridging studies of comparable design and duration with the Substance and the source substance.
- 26 Apart from your read-across justification the registration dossier does not include any bridging data for the Substance that would confirm that both substances cause the same type of effects.
- 27 In the absence of such information, you have not established that the Substance and the source substance are likely to have similar properties. Therefore you have not provided sufficient supporting information to scientifically justify the read-across.
- 28 As explained above, you have not established that relevant properties of the Substance can be predicted from data on the source substance(s). Therefore, your read-across approach under Annex XI, Section 1.5. is rejected.
- 29 As the standard information requirement is not fulfilled, ECHA maintains that an appropriate study on long-term toxicity on fish is needed.

## *2.2. Test selection and study specifications*

- 30 The proposed Fish, Early-Life Stage Toxicity Test (test method: OECD TG 210) is appropriate to cover the information requirement for long-term toxicity on fish (Guidance on IRs and CSA, Section R.7.8.4.1.).
- 31 The Substance is difficult to test due to the low water solubility ( $3.94 \times 10^{-10}$  mg/L and adsorptive properties (log Kow for the ketone dimers 10.82-14.75). OECD TG 210 specifies that, for difficult to test substances, you must consider the approach described in OECD GD 23 or other approaches, if more appropriate for your substance. In all cases, the approach selected must be justified and documented. Due to the properties of Substance, it may be difficult to achieve and maintain the desired exposure concentrations. Therefore, you must monitor the test concentration(s) of the Substance throughout the exposure duration and report the results. If it is not possible to demonstrate the stability of exposure concentrations (i.e. measured concentration(s) not within 80-120% of the nominal concentration(s)), you must express the effect concentration based on measured values as described in OECD TG 210. In case a dose-response relationship cannot be established (no observed effects), you must demonstrate that the approach used to prepare test solutions was adequate to maximise the concentration of the Substance in the test solutions.
- 32 For multi-constituents/UVCBs, the analytical method must be adequate to monitor qualitative and quantitative changes in exposure to the dissolved fraction of the test material during the test (e.g. by comparing mass spectral full-scan GC or HPLC chromatogram peak areas or by using targeted measures of key components).

33 If you decide to use the Water Accommodated Fraction (WAF) approach, in addition to the above, you must:

- use loading rates that are sufficiently low to be in the solubility range of most constituents (or that are consistent with the PEC value). This condition is mandatory to provide relevant information for the hazard and risk assessment (Guidance on IRs and CSA, Appendix R.7.8.1-1, Table R.7.8-3);
- provide a full description of the method used to prepare the WAF (including, among others, loading rates, details on the mixing procedure, method to separate any remaining non-dissolved test material including a justification for the separation technique);
- prepare WAFs separately for each dose level (i.e. loading rate) and in a consistent manner.

### *2.3. Outcome*

34 Your read across testing proposal is rejected under Article 40(3)(d) of REACH. Under Article 40(3)(c) you are requested to carry out the additional test, as specified above.

## References

The following documents may have been cited in the decision.

### **Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment (Guidance on IRs & CSA)**

- Chapter R.4 Evaluation of available information; ECHA (2011).  
Chapter R.6 QSARs, read-across and grouping; ECHA (2008).  
Appendix to Chapter R.6 for nanoforms; ECHA (2019).  
Chapter R.7a Endpoint specific guidance, Sections R.7.1 – R.7.7; ECHA (2017).  
Appendix to Chapter R.7a for nanomaterials; ECHA (2017).  
Chapter R.7b Endpoint specific guidance, Sections R.7.8 – R.7.9; ECHA (2017).  
Appendix to Chapter R.7b for nanomaterials; ECHA (2017).  
Chapter R.7c Endpoint specific guidance, Sections R.7.10 – R.7.13; ECHA (2017).  
Appendix to Chapter R.7a for nanomaterials; ECHA (2017).  
Appendix R.7.13-2 Environmental risk assessment for metals and metal compounds; ECHA (2008).  
Chapter R.11 PBT/vPvB assessment; ECHA (2017).  
Chapter R.16 Environmental exposure assessment; ECHA (2016).

**Guidance on data-sharing**; ECHA (2017).

**Guidance for monomers and polymers**; ECHA (2012).

**Guidance on intermediates**; ECHA (2010).

All guidance documents are available online: <https://echa.europa.eu/guidance-documents/guidance-on-reach>

### **Read-across assessment framework (RAAF)**

- RAAF, 2017 Read-across assessment framework (RAAF); ECHA (2017)  
RAAF UVCB, 2017 Read-across assessment framework (RAAF) – considerations on multi- constituent substances and UVCBs); ECHA (2017).

The RAAF and related documents are available online:

<https://echa.europa.eu/support/registration/how-to-avoid-unnecessary-testing-on-animals/grouping-of-substances-and-read-across>

### **OECD Guidance documents (OECD GDs)**

- OECD GD 23 Guidance document on aquatic toxicity testing of difficult substances and mixtures; No. 23 in the OECD series on testing and assessment, OECD (2019).  
OECD GD 29 Guidance document on transformation/dissolution of metals and metal compounds in aqueous media; No. 29 in the OECD series on testing and assessment, OECD (2002).  
OECD GD 150 Revised guidance document 150 on standardised test guidelines for evaluating chemicals for endocrine disruption; No. 150 in the OECD series on testing and assessment, OECD (2018).  
OECD GD 151 Guidance document supporting OECD test guideline 443 on the extended one-generation reproductive toxicity test; No. 151 in the OECD series on testing and assessment, OECD (2013).

**Appendix 2: Procedure**

ECHA received your testing proposal(s) on 25 May 2022 and started the testing proposal evaluation in accordance with Article 40(1).

ECHA held a third-party consultation for the testing proposal(s) from 15 July 2022 until 29 August 2022. ECHA did not receive information from third parties.

ECHA followed the procedure detailed in Articles 50 and 51 of REACH.

ECHA notified you of the draft decision and invited you to provide comments.

ECHA did not receive any comments within the commenting period.

The deadline of the decision is set based on standard practice for carrying out OECD TG tests. It has been exceptionally extended by 12 months from the standard deadline granted by ECHA to take into account currently longer lead times in contract research organisations.

ECHA notified the draft decision to the competent authorities of the Member States for proposals for amendment.

As no amendments were proposed, ECHA adopted the decision under Article 51(3) of REACH.

**Appendix 3: Addressee(s) of this decision and their corresponding information requirements**

In accordance with Articles 10(a) and 12(1) of REACH, the information requirements for individual registrations are defined as follows:

- the information specified in Annexes VII and VIII to REACH, for registration at 10-100 tpa;
- the information specified in Annexes VII, VIII and IX to REACH, for registration at 100-1000 tpa;
- the information specified in Annexes VII to X to REACH, for registration at more than 1000 tpa.

<b>Registrant Name</b>	<b>Registration number</b>	<b>Highest REACH Annex applicable to you</b>
██████████	████████████████████	██████
████████████████████	████████████████████	██████████
████████████████████	████████████████████	██████

Where applicable, the name of a third-party representative (TPR) may be displayed in the list of recipients whereas ECHA will send the decision to the actual registrant.

## Appendix 4: Conducting and reporting new tests for REACH purposes

### 1. Requirements when conducting and reporting new tests for REACH purposes

#### 1.1. Test methods, GLP requirements and reporting

- (1) Under Article 13(3) of REACH, all new data generated as a result of this decision must be conducted according to the test methods laid down in a European Commission Regulation or to international test methods recognised by the Commission or ECHA as being appropriate.
- (2) Under Article 13(4) of REACH, ecotoxicological and toxicological tests and analyses must be carried out according to the GLP principles (Directive 2004/10/EC) or other international standards recognised by the Commission or ECHA.
- (3) Under Article 10(a)(vi) and (vii) of REACH, all new data generated as a result of this decision must be reported as study summaries, or as robust study summaries, if required under Annex I of REACH. See ECHA Practical Guide on How to report robust study summaries<sup>2</sup>.
- (4) Under the introductory part of Annexes VII/VIII/IX/X to REACH, where a test method offers flexibility in the study design, for example in relation to the choice of dose levels or concentrations, the chosen study design must ensure that the data generated are adequate for hazard identification and risk assessment.

Before generating new data, you must agree within the joint submission on the chemical composition of the material to be tested (Test Material) which must be relevant for all the registrants of the Substance.

#### 1.2. Test material

The Test Material used to generate the new data must be selected taking into account the following:

- the variation in compositions reported by all members of the joint submission,
- the boundary composition(s) of the Substance,
- the impact of each constituent/ impurity on the test results for the endpoint to be assessed. For example, if a constituent/ impurity of the Substance is known to have an impact on (eco)toxicity, the selected Test Material must contain that constituent/ impurity.

##### (1) Information on the Test Material needed in the updated dossier

- You must report the composition of the Test Material selected for each study, under the "Test material information" section, for each respective endpoint study record in IUCLID.
- The reported composition must include the careful identification and description of the characteristics of the Tests Materials in accordance with OECD GLP (ENV/MC/CHEM(98)16) and EU Test Methods Regulation (EU) 440/2008 (Note, Annex), namely all the constituents must be identified as far as possible as well as their concentration. Also any constituents that have harmonised classification and labelling according to the CLP Regulation must be identified and quantified using

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://echa.europa.eu/practical-guides>

- the appropriate analytical methods,
- The reported composition must also include other parameters relevant for the property to be tested

With that detailed information, ECHA can confirm whether the Test Material is relevant for the Substance and whether it is suitable for use by all members of the joint submission.

## **2. General recommendations for conducting and reporting new tests**

### **2.1. Environmental testing for substances containing multiple constituents**

Your Substance contains multiple constituents and, as indicated in Guidance on IRs & CSA, Section R.11.4.2.2, you are advised to consider the following approaches for persistency, bioaccumulation and aquatic toxicity testing:

- the "known constituents approach" (by assessing specific constituents), or
- the "fraction/block approach, (performed on the basis of fractions/blocks of constituents), or
- the "whole substance approach", or
- various combinations of the approaches described above

Selection of the appropriate approach must take into account the possibility to characterise the Substance (i.e. knowledge of its constituents and/or fractions and any differences in their properties) and the possibility to isolate or synthesize its relevant constituents and/or fractions.

References to Guidance on REACH and other supporting documents can be found in Appendix 1.