



30 September 2014

CONSIDERATIONS ON THE NEED TO SUBMIT A TESTING PROPOSAL
FOR THE IN VIVO MICRONUCLEUS ASSAY (OECD 474) ON
TETRACHLOROAUROIC ACID

1. Context

The *In Vitro* Micronucleus Assay (“MNvit”), OECD487, conducted on Tetrachloroauric Acid (CAS 16903-35-8), (“TCA”), returned an unexpected positive result, not in line with the known classification of the substance or with practical experience at the work place, where no genotoxicity suspicion has been raised so far.

As logic next step to this positive genotoxicity study result, and in order to confront the validity of this result (obtain the substantial risk information needed), the Precious Metals and Rhenium Consortium (“PMC”) relevant experts considered appropriate to conduct an *In Vivo* Micronucleus Assay (“MNviv”), OECD474.

2. The Question

TCA is manufactured/imported in the band 10-100 Tonnes/annum and is therefore submitted to information requirements laid down in Annexes VI, VII and VIII of the REACH regulation; the MNviv assay is mentioned in Annexes VIII and IX.

In Annex VIII, the study seems to be referred to in very general terms as an ‘Appropriate *in vivo* mutagenicity study’ which must be considered by the registrant, whilst in Annex IX it is referred to more precisely as an ‘Appropriate *in vivo* somatic cell genotoxicity study’ which must be proposed by the registrant.

The different wording used in Annexes VIII and IX of the Regulation leads to some confusion and to the following question: in complying with REACH for a substance manufactured/imported in the 10-100 Tonnes/annum, can PMC assume that the decision as to whether or not to conduct the MNviv will be motivated by the applicable information requirements laid down in the corresponding Annex VIII in the REACH regulation, and not Annex IX?

3. The Decision Process

The following table outlines the chronology of facts that conducted to PMC’s decision on the above question:

Table 1. Chronology of discussions held between PMC and external experts and authorities to answer the question under item 2 above.

Date	Event	Conclusion
Nov 2012	MLA study + FISH analysis at Covance results in positive clastogenic (chromosomal damage) properties of TCA	Need to discuss next steps of genotoxicity testing programme on TCA
Nov 2012	Review of above results by Dr David Kirkland	Confirms clastogenic properties of TCA



30 September 2014

Date	Event	Conclusion
Nov 2012	Conference call between WCA, dedicated toxicology consultant, PMC, and David Kirkland to understand results and discuss about next steps to address suspicion of genotoxicity of TCA	Need to conduct an <i>In vivo</i> micronucleus study to confirm genotoxic effect of TCA. <i>In vivo</i> micronucleus study can be performed in combination or separately from OECD 422, with various pros and cons to be further considered
Jan 2013	Conference call between WCA and PMC to identify ideal test material and further elaborate on next steps	Recommend combined OECD 422 and <i>in vivo</i> micronucleus study OECD 474
Jul 2013	Experts conference call to agree on way forward	Recommend separate MTD/DRF+OECD 422 and <i>in vivo</i> micronucleus study mainly due to the fact that administered doses would not be the same for the OECD 422 and the <i>in vivo</i> micronucleus study
Aug 2013	Sample for MTD/DRF and OECD 422 tests are requested	MTD/DRF and OECD 422 to run first and inform <i>in vivo</i> micronucleus study parameters, as applicable
Sep 2013	Start of MTD/DRF test (phases 1 and 2 of OECD 422)	
Mar 2014	Launch of OECD 422 and discussion around tiered testing approach to bring TCA genotoxicity assessment to a conclusion	
Mar 2014	Opinion from UK REACH Helpdesk obtained, in summary: Where <i>in vitro</i> genotoxicity studies of low tonnage substances (Annex VII and VIII) give a positive result, follow-up testing is not mandated, but "shall be considered". This allows duty holders the option of "considering" the data they have available, and conducting further testing, if they regard it as necessary. For higher tonnage substances (Annex IX and X), the possibility of duty holder to "consider" has been removed and duty holders are required to submit a testing proposal for an appropriate <i>in vivo</i> test (if such data are not already available) (Full UK REACH Helpdesk response in Annex I of this document.)	At a dedicated conference call, the Au WG decided as follows: Because TCA is registered in a low tonnage band, Annex VIII applies and decision on whether or not to conduct an <i>in vivo</i> micronucleus test is with the registrants. It is PMC members' opinion that responsible product stewards will follow the option of proactive testing in order to fully assess the potential genotoxic effect of TCA and implement the associated classification, labelling, and risk management measures, if any, accordingly.
Aug 2014	Preparation of this paper to report details behind opinion-forming	<i>In vivo</i> micronucleus test protocols at Covance can be signed and test can be launched



30 September 2014

4. Conclusion

Because TCA is registered in a low tonnage band, Annex VIII applies and decision on whether or not to conduct an *in vivo* micronucleus test is with the registrants. It is PMC members' opinion that responsible product stewards will follow the option of proactive testing, in order to fully assess the potential genotoxic effect of TCA without further delay, and implement any relevant classification, labelling, and risk management measures to protect the workers and users potentially exposed to TCA accordingly.

The In Vivo Micronucleus Assay on TCA is scheduled in August 2014.



30 September 2014

Annex I

1. UK REACH Response

From: Ian.Indans@hse.gsi.gov.uk [mailto:Ian.Indans@hse.gsi.gov.uk] **On Behalf Of** UKREACHCA@hse.gsi.gov.uk
Sent: mercredi 12 mars 2014 11:50
To: Owen Green
Subject: REACH - Annex VIII and Annex IX Genotoxicity Testing - Helpdesk reference - 1003IRI14-2408

Dear Owen

Generally, where *in vitro* genotoxicity tests give a positive result, regulatory schemes require appropriate follow up to determine whether the substance is an *in vivo* genotoxicant, and potentially subject to stringent regulatory control. The REACH Regulation information Annexes follow the same testing paradigm, but introduced some tonnage-related aspects too.

Where *in vitro* genotoxicity tests of low tonnage substances give a positive result, (Annex VII and VIII), follow-up testing is not mandated, but "shall be considered". In our opinion this allows duty holders the option of "considering" the data they have available, and conducting further testing, if they regard it as necessary. At Annex IX, this possibility has been removed and duty holders are required to submit a testing proposal for an appropriate *in vivo* test, if such data are not already available.

One of the features of REACH is that it has placed much more responsibility in the hands of the manufacturers/importers. The option to conduct *in vivo* follow up at Annex VII and VIII could be seen in this context, allowing duty holders the choice whether to pursue *in vivo* genotoxicity testing. It is likely that responsible product stewards will follow the option of earlier testing.

In our opinion, where *in vivo* follow-up studies are conducted at Annex VII or VIII they should be considered as Annex VII or VIII studies and a testing proposal does not appear to be required.

I hope this helps

Kind regards

Ian

Ian Indans
REACH and CLP Helpdesk
Chemicals Regulation Directorate
HSE, Redgrave Court, Bootle, Merseyside, L20 7HS

From: Owen Green [mailto:Owen.Green@wca-environment.com]
Sent: 10 March 2014 14:05
To: UKREACHCA
Subject: Re: REACH Annex VIII vs Annex IX Genetox tests Ian

In the case of a substance yielding a positive result in an Annex VIII *in vitro* micronucleus test should the ensuing *in vivo* mutagenicity tests considered to be an Annex VIII or an Annex IX test?

For ease of reference, the specific comments in the relevant regulations are as follows:



30 September 2014

Annex VIII, Col 2:

Appropriate in vivo mutagenicity studies shall be **considered** in case of a positive result in any of the genotoxicity studies in Annex VII or VIII.

Annex IX, Col 2:

If there is a positive result in any of the in vitro genotoxicity studies in Annex VII or VIII and there are no results available from an in vivo study already, an appropriate in vivo somatic cell genotoxicity study shall be proposed by the registrant.

If there is a positive result from an in vivo somatic cell study available, the potential for germ cell mutagenicity should be considered on the basis of all available data, including toxicokinetic evidence. If no clear conclusions about germ cell mutagenicity can be made, additional investigations shall be considered.

My personal view is that if there is a positive in vitro study under Annex VIII, the legislation can be interpreted so that there is a duty of care/moral position to define whether there is a risk to humans from exposure to the substance, ie by appropriate in vivo studies. Therefore such studies should be conducted without waiting years for the registration and test proposals to be considered by ECHA. Is this the way that these sections should be interpreted?

Very best regards,

Owen Green

Owen P Green PhD,
Principal Toxicologist
wca environment ltd
Brunel House
Volunteer Way
Faringdon
Oxfordshire
SN7 7YR

Mobile: +44 (0) 7880359029
Office: +44 (0) 1733239983
Email: owen.green@wca-environment.com
Website: www.wca-environment.com