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About HSI

• HSI represents the largest force for animal protection globally, active on the ground in >60 countries across Europe, the Americas, Asia & Africa

• Our science team brings together experts in human & environmental toxicology, risk assessment, biomedicine, law and public policy, etc.

• Working with regulatory authorities, industry, policy-makers, academia and public interest stakeholders

• Accredited stakeholder of ECHA, EFSA, CARACAL, EURL-ECVAM, OECD Test Guidelines & AOP development programmes & other governmental advisory bodies on chemical safety (e.g. US EPA)
The AFSA Collaboration works to accelerate global adoption of a modern, human-based approach to safety assessment that will better protect consumers and hasten the replacement of animal testing.
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Legal requirements to minimize and reduce animal testing


Article 4 Principle of replacement, reduction and refinement
1. Member States shall ensure that, wherever possible, a scientifically satisfactory method or testing strategy, not entailing the use of live animals, shall be used instead of a procedure.


Article 1 Aim and scope
1. The purpose of this Regulation is to ensure a high level of protection of human health and the environment, including the promotion of alternative methods for assessment of hazards of substances, as well as the free circulation of substances on the internal market while enhancing competitiveness and innovation.

Article 13 General requirements for generation of information on intrinsic properties of substances
1. Information on intrinsic properties of substances may be generated by means other than tests, provided that the conditions set out in Annex XI are met. In particular for human toxicity, information shall be generated whenever possible by means other than vertebrate animal tests, through the use of alternative methods, for example, in vitro methods or qualitative or quantitative structure-activity relationship models or from information from structurally related substances (grouping or read-across). Testing in accordance with Annex VIII, Sections 8.6 and 8.7, Annex IX and Annex X may be omitted where justified by information on exposure and implemented risk management measures as specified in Annex XI, section 3.

Article 25 Objectives and general rules
1. In order to avoid animal testing, testing on vertebrate animals for the purposes of this Regulation shall be undertaken only as a last resort. It is also necessary to take measures limiting duplication of other tests.
Adaptations to standard information requirements that reduce or avoid animal testing

Possible adaptations in REACH Annex XI(1) include:

• Use of existing data, including historical human data;
• Use of a weight-of-evidence approach;
• Information generated using quantitative structure activity relationships (QSARs);
• *In vitro* test methods; and
• Grouping of substances and read-across.
Adaptations to standard information requirements that reduce or avoid animal testing – Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option used</th>
<th>2019 average [%]</th>
<th>2016 average [%]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read-across/category</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSAR</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight of evidence</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data waiver</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing proposal</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency of the different options to fulfil the information requirements in 2019 (aggregated at IUCLID section level)

Options used to fulfil the information requirements on average, 2019 compared to 2016
Examples of guidance and projects

Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment
Chapter R.6: QSARs and grouping of chemicals

Integrated Approaches to Testing and Assessment (IATA)

The Co-operative Chemicals Assessment Programme (CoCAP) was revised in 2014 to enhance the activity of the development and the application of IATA. This programme provides a forum for scientific exchange of approaches on how novel methods are applied to assess the hazard of chemicals and establish common and best practices for the use of these methods for assessing different types of chemicals. The approaches described in the case studies are applicable in certain regulatory contexts outlined in the case studies. In other regulatory contexts, their fit for purpose would need to be determined.
Acceptability of adaptations

- Registrants are making use of adaptations under REACH ✓

- But are adaptations successfully meeting the requirements of REACH, i.e., effectively avoiding animal testing ?


“Between 2015 and 2017, the uses to satisfy legislative requirements for (...) industrial chemicals legislation uses (+17%) saw an increase”
Acceptability of adaptations (cont’d)

Weight of Evidence (WoE)

“experience from evaluation also indicates that such adaptations provided by registrants are often found to be incompliant”

Reported quality deficiencies:

- No reliable sources of information
- WoE not documented sufficiently
- Each element of the standard requirement is not sufficiently covered

QSARs

“For aquatic toxicity, the QSAR approach as applied by the registrants worked well in the majority of cases (68%) while for bioaccumulation, the majority (70%) had issues”

Reported quality deficiencies:

- Applicability domain of the model
- Reliability of the prediction is often not sufficiently scrutinised

Read-across

“experience from evaluation indicates that such adaptations provided by registrants often fail to comply with the legal requirements”

Reported quality deficiencies:

- Poor documentation
- Insufficient substance identification
- Significant deficiencies in the quality of the source studies
- Lack of or low quality of supporting data,
- Lack of qualitative and quantitative data to support predictions based on toxicokinetics
- Shortcomings in the hypothesis and justification of the toxicological prediction

Source: The use of alternatives to testing on animals for the REACH Regulation, Fourth report under Article 117(3) of the REACH Regulation, European Chemicals Agency, June 2020
Acceptability of adaptations (cont’d)

Despite the wealth of existing guidance, support tools & related work over many years, there are still many issues with the acceptability of alternatives → increase in animal testing

Example with Read-across

Registrants

- Need to update/improve adaptations
  but how to determine exactly what needs improving (and how)
  until feedback is received? [even with RAAF]

- Feedback is received
  i) short deadline (30 days) to clarify/improve \textit{impractical}
  ii) decide next steps to fill data gap

- Conduct animal testing (compliance)
- Improve adaptation/avoid animal testing
- Successful (compliance)
- Not successful (non-compliance)
Recommendations for future steps

What can be done to improve the situation, and uphold the principle of animal testing as a last resort?

• Commitment from ECHA’s leadership to fully replace animal testing in the long-term, and to decrease the upward trend in the short- to medium-term

• Implementation of a strategic plan that demonstrates a proactive commitment to the development and promotion of alternative methods

• Concrete steps to improve the issues identified by ECHA related to the acceptability of non-animal methods and adaptations, which could include the following actions:
  o Provide more positive examples of Read-across and other adaptations accepted to fulfil REACH requirements
  o Open a channel between ECHA and Registrants to discuss technical/scientific issues and suitability of testing strategies, to improve their chances of being accepted
  o Publish life-like examples on the application of RAAF
  o Flexibility on the application of RAAF
  o Define an acceptable, adequate level of uncertainty
  o Flexibility on timelines to improve adaptations
  o Work collaboratively with registrants, be open to feedback (ex. of users of the RAAF) to evolve and adjust the framework for assessment
  o Promote the use of NAMs to support Read-across, in particular for higher tier endpoints (rather than short-term animal studies to demonstrate similarity)
  o When a data gap is identified, consider first whether it would impact the risk management measures, as otherwise it might be omitted
What we would like to hear from the Forum

• Understand how the Forum enforces the principle of animal testing as a last resort

• What measures ECHA could take to promote the development and use of NAMs

• Forum’s views on what could increase regulatory acceptance/confidence in NAMs

• What steps can be taken to revert the trend of increasing animal testing
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