

SUB-COMMITTEE ON POLLUTION
PREVENTION AND RESPONSE
7th session
Agenda item 12

PPR 7/INF.23
13 December 2019
ENGLISH ONLY
Pre-session public release: ☒

**EVALUATION AND HARMONIZATION OF RULES AND GUIDANCE ON THE
DISCHARGE OF LIQUID EFFLUENTS FROM EGCS INTO WATERS,
INCLUDING CONDITIONS AND AREAS**

Report of the GESAMP Task Team on exhaust gas cleaning systems

Note by the Secretariat

SUMMARY

Executive summary: This document provides the report of the GESAMP Task Team on exhaust gas cleaning systems

*Strategic direction,
if applicable:* 1

Output: 1.23

Action to be taken: Paragraph 2

Related documents: MEPC 74/18 and PPR 7/12/5

Introduction

1 The final report of the GESAMP Task Team on exhaust gas cleaning systems, as approved by GESAMP, is set out in the annex.

Action requested of the Sub-Committee

2 The Sub-Committee is invited to note the annexed report.

ANNEX
REPORT OF THE GESAMP TASK TEAM ON EXHAUST GAS CLEANING SYSTEMS



EXHAUST GAS CLEANING SYSTEMS

A Roadmap to Risk Assessment

Advice to the Marine Environment Protection Committee and its

Sub-Committee on Pollution Prevention and Response

Report of the GESAMP Task Team on EGCS

Task Team:

Jan Linders (Chair, The Netherlands)

Eric Adams (USA)

Brigitte Behrends (Germany)

Annette Dock (Sweden)

Shinichi Hanayama (Japan)

Richard Luit (The Netherlands)

Claude Rouleau (Canada)

Jacek Tronczynski (France)

December 2019

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations	4
List of Figures	8
List of Tables	9
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	10
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	11
Short Summary	13
1. INTRODUCTION TO THE REPORT	15
2. PROBLEM DEFINITION	17
3. TERMS OF REFERENCE	17
4. DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE TO THE TASK TEAM ON EGCS	18
4.1 IMO Submissions	19
4.2 Relevant Documents	21
5. INVENTORY OF EXHAUST GAS CLEANING SYSTEMS	26
5.1. Introduction to EGCS	26
5.2. Wet EGC Systems	26
5.2.1. Open Loop Systems (OL)	26
5.2.2. Closed Loop Systems (CL)	29
5.2.3. Hybrid Systems	30
5.3 Environmental aspects of EGCS washwater	30
6. INVENTORY OF CHEMICALS	31
6.1. Introduction to Relevant Chemicals	31
6.2 General Concerns regarding Chemicals in EGCS washwater	31
6.3. Chemicals in EGCS Washwater: Background Considerations	32
6.4. Main Contaminants	32
6.5. General Concerns of Environmental Impacts of EGCS Washwater Discharges	33
6.6. Further Evaluation of Washwater Chemicals	34
6.7. Background Documents	35
6.8 Inorganic Chemicals	36
6.8.1. SO _x	36
6.8.2. NO _x	39
6.8.3 Trace Metals	42
6.9. Particulate Matter	47
6.10 Organic Contaminants	48
6.11 Conclusions and Recommendations on Chemicals	58
7. POSSIBILITIES FOR RISK ASSESSMENT, INCLUDING ERA AND HHRA	59
7.1. Exposure Assessment	59
7.1.1. Introduction	59
7.1.2. Initial Mixing Models	59
7.1.3 Near Field Models	60
7.1.4 Far Field Models	61
7.1.5 Available Models	62
7.1.5.1. MAMPEC-BW	62

	7.1.5.2. STEAM3	64
	7.1.5.3. DREAM	65
	7.1.6 Conclusions and Recommendations on Exposure Assessment	65
7.2.	Hazard Assessment, including PBT and CMR	66
	7.2.1 Human Health Hazard Assessment for CMR Properties	66
	7.2.1.1 Extrapolation and Derivation of Reference Values	67
	7.2.2 Environmental Hazard Assessment for PBT Properties	74
	7.2.2.1 Availability of Data	74
	7.2.3. Environmental hazard assessment for aquatic toxicity	76
	7.2.3.1 Availability of Data	76
	7.2.3.2 Extrapolation and Derivation of Reference Values	80
	7.2.4 Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Testing	83
	7.2.4.1 Conclusions and Recommendations for WET	86
	7.2.5 Conclusions and Recommendations on Hazard Assessment	87
7.3.	Potential for Risk Assessment	88
	7.3.1 Human Health Risk Assessment Approaches	88
	7.3.2 Exposure via Different Sources and Background Concentrations	89
	7.3.3 Possibilities for Environmental Risk Assessment	89
7.4	Recommendation on Risk Assessment	90
8.	UNCERTAINTY	91
9.	FURTHER RESEARCH	91
	9.1 Conclusions and Recommendations on Future Research	92
10.	ROLE OF GESAMP	93
11.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	94
	11.1 General	94
	11.2 With respect to Chapter 6	96
	11.3 With respect to Chapter 7	97
	11.3.1 Exposure Assessment	97
	11.3.2 Hazard Assessment	97
	11.3.3 Whole Effluent Toxicity	98
	11.3.4 Risk Assessment	99
	11.4 Recommendations for future Work	99
12.	REFERENCES	102
13.	APPENDIX	118
	Table A1	119
	Table A2	121

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronyms/ Abbreviation	Explanation
AA-EQS	Annual Averaged Environmental Quality Standard
ADI	Acceptable Daily Intake
AI	Adequate Intake
AIS	Automatic Identification System
AR	Average Requirement
BAT	Best Available Techniques
BATNEEC	Best Available Technology Not Entailing Excessive Costs
BMD	Benchmark Dose
BMDL	Lower confidence limit of the benchmark dose
BSH	Bundesamt für Seeschifffahrt und Hydrographie (Bundesamt für Seeschifffahrt und Hydrographie in Germany)
BWMS	Ballast Water Management Systems
BWWG	Ballast Water Working Group
BOTU	Bleed-Off Treatment Unit
BTEX	Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene, Xylene
CAPEX	Capital expenditure
CAS	Chemical Abstracts Service
CESA	Community of European Shipyards' Associations
CFD	Computational Fluid Dynamics modelling
CL	Closed Loop
CLIA	Cruise Lines International Association
CLP	Classification, Labelling and Packaging of Chemicals
CRM	Certified Reference Materials
CMR	Carcinogenicity, Mutagenicity and Reproductive toxicity
COD	Chemical Oxygen Demand
CONTAM	Panel on Contaminants in the Food Chain
CRM	Certified Reference Material
CSS	Current Status Scenario
DBP	Disinfection By-Products
DELWAQ	Delft Water Quality model
DMEL	Derived No Effect Level
DNEL	Derived Minimal Effect Level
DOC	Dissolved Organic Carbon
DREAM	Dose-related Risk and Effect Assessment Model
DU	Decanting Unit
DW	Drinking Water
ECA	Emission Controlled Areas
ECHA	European Chemicals Agency
EEA	European Environmental Agency
EF	Emission Factor
EFSA	European Food Safety Authority
EC50	Effect Concentration causing effects for 50% of the population
EG	Exhaust Gas
EGCS	Exhaust Gas Cleaning Systems
EGCSA	Exhaust Gas Cleaning Systems Association

EGSE	Exhaust Gas Scrubber Effluent
EGR	Exhaust Gas Recirculation
ELV	Emission Limit Values
EQS	Environmental Quality Standards
ERA	Environmental Risk Assessment
EU	European Union
FNB	Food and Nutrition Board
FNU	Formazine Nephelometric Unit
FW	Flow rate of wastewater
GC-MS(-MS)	Gas Chromatography Mass Spectrometry (could be double MS)
GC-TQ-MS	Gas Chromatography Triple Quad Mass Spectrometry
GESAMP	IMO/FAO/UNESCO-IOC/UNIDO/WMO/IAEA/UN/UN Environment/UNDP/ISA Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine environmental Protection
GHG	Green House Gas
GHS	Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals
HC	Hazardous Concentration
HFO	Heavy Fuel Oil
HHRA	Human Health Risk Assessment
HMW	High molecular weight
IARC	International Agency for Research on Cancer
IED	Industrial Emissions Directive
IKSR-CIPR-ICBR	Internationale Kommission zum Schutz des Rheins (same in French and Dutch)
IMO	International Maritime Organization
INF	Information document used in meetings at IMO
IPPC	Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control
IQ	Intelligence Quotient
IRIS	Integrated Risk Information System
ISO	International Standardization Organization
ITMS	Ion Trap Mass Spectrometry
JECFA	Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives
kWh	Kilowatt hour
LMW	Low Molecular Weight
LNG	Liquefied / Liquid Natural Gas
LOEC	Lowest Effect Concentration
LOQ	Level of Quantification
LSFO	Low Sulfur Fuel Oil
MAC-EQS	Maximum Allowable Concentration Environmental Quality Standard
MAMPEC(-BW)	Marine Anti-foulant Model for the Prediction of Environmental Concentrations (as amended for Ballast Water)
MARPOL	International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships
MCR	maximum Continuous Rating
MDO	Marine Diesel Oil
MEPC	Marine Environment Protection Committee
MGO	Marine Gas Oil
MIS	Maximum Installation Scenario
ML	Maximum Limits
MRL	Maximum Residue Limit
MPC	Maximum Permissible Concentrations
MSFD	Marine Strategy Framework Directive
MV	Motor Vessel
MWh	Megawatt hour

NA	Not Available or Not Applicable
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NOEC	No-effect concentration
NOx	Nitric Oxides, generally a combination of NO and NO ₂
NRC	National Research Council
NRWQC	National Recommended Water Quality Criteria
NTU	Nephelometric turbidity unit
NMVOC	Non-Methane Volatile Organic Compounds
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OL	Open Loop
OPEX	Operational expenditure
OSPAR	Oslo and Paris commissions
PAH	Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons
PBT	Persistence, Bioconcentration and Toxicity
PCB	polychlorinated biphenyls
PCDD	polychlorinated dibenzodioxins
PCDF	polychlorinated dibenzofurans
PEC	Predicted Environmental Concentration
PHS	priority hazardous substances
PM	Particulate Matter
PMTDI	Provisional Maximum Tolerable Daily Intake
PNEC	Predicted No-Effect Concentration
PNED	Predicted No-Effect Dilution
POC	Particulate Organic Carbon
PON	Particulate Organic Nitrogen
POP	Persistent Organic Pollutant or Particulate Organic Phosphorous
PPR	Sub-Committee on Pollution Prevention and Response
PRI	Population Reference Intake
PTWI	Provisional Tolerable Weekly Intake
REACH	Registration, Evaluation Authorization of Chemicals
RIVM	Rijksinstituut voor Volksgezondheid en Milieu (National Institute for Public Health and the Environment in The Netherlands)
RNA	Ribonucleic acid
RoRo	Roll-on-Roll-off
SCHER	Former Scientific Committee on Health and Environmental Risks of the EU
SCR	Selective Catalytic Reduction
SECA	SOx Emission Controlled Areas
SFOC	Specific Fuel Oil Consumption
SINTEF	Selskapet for INdustriell og TEknisk Forskning ved norges tekniske hogskole (The Foundation for Scientific and Industrial Research at the Norwegian Institute of Technology)
SOLAS	International Convention for the Safety Of Life At Sea
SOx	combination of SO ₂ and SO ₃
SPM	Suspended Particulate Matter
STEAM3	Ship Traffic Emission Assessment Model, version 3
TDI	Tolerable Daily Intake
TEF	Toxic Equivalence Factor
TG	Test Guideline
ToF-MS	Time of Flight Mass Spectrometry
ToR	Terms of Reference
TRS	Technical Report Series (WHO)
TWI	Tolerable Weekly Intake

UBA	Umwelt Bundesamt, German Environmental Department
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
USA	United States of America
USDT	United States Department of Transportation
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
UV	Ultra Violet light
vPvB	very Persistent and very Bioaccumulating
WET	Whole Effluent Toxicity
WFD	Water Framework Directive
WHO	World Health Organization

List of Figures

#	Description
Figure 1	MARPOL Annex VI fuel sulfur limits
Figure 2	Open loop exhaust gas cleaning system
Figure 3	Closed loop exhaust gas cleaning system
Figure 4	Ship smoke stack and EGCS washwater emissions
Figure 5	Calculated values of $EF_{m\ SO_2}$ ($g\ SO_2\ kg_{HFO}^{-1}$) and $EF_{p\ SO_2}$ ($g\ SO_2\ (kWh)^{-1}$) for SO_2 as a function of S concentration in HFO
Figure 6	Concentration of sulfate ion in washwater ($g\ L^{-1}$) as a function of S concentration in HFO and for $SFOC = 0.16\ kg\ (kWh)^{-1}$
Figure 7	Volume of buffer-depleted normal seawater ($m^3\ kg_{HFO}^{-1}$ and $m^3\ (kWh)^{-1}$) as a function of S concentration in HFO
Figure 8	Relative contribution of NO_x and SO_x emissions on water acidification
Figure 9	Minimum and maximum concentrations were used to calculate a range of EF values for each metal
Figure 10	Relative 16 EPA PAH based on all measurement campaigns
Figure 11	Temporal trend for global PAH shipping emissions in metric tons since 1960
Figure 12	Schematics of (left) the near-field and (right) the far-field model in top-view
Figure 13	Layout of the commercial harbour and the shipping lane in MAMPEC
Figure 14	Steps in the risk assessment approach (modified from GESAMP (2019))

List of Tables

#	Description
Table 1	MARPOL Annex VI fuel sulfur limits
Table 2	Overview of submissions to IMO bodies, MEPC and PPR, on EGCS
Table 3	Overview of otherwise relevant documentation considered by the Task Team
Table 4	H ⁺ and nitrate ion emission factors for EGCS
Table 5	Total Trace Metal Concentrations ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$) reported in different area
Table 6	Average concentrations and ratios of heavy metals in the dissolved versus the particulate phase in EGCS washwater on the basis of measured data from PPR 6/INF.20
Table 7	Mass-standardized emission factor (EF_m) values for V, Fe, Ni, Pb, Zn, Cd, Hg, As, Cr and Cu and power-standardized emission factors (EF_p) calculated for a SFOC of $0.19 \text{ kg HFO (kWh)}^{-1}$
Table 8	Dissolved PAHs environmental concentrations (ng L^{-1})
Table 9	Ranges of summed concentrations of parent Σ PAHEPA-16 and phenanthrene in EGCS washwater (in open loop operation); concentrations adjusted to $45 \text{ m}^3 (\text{MWh})^{-1}$ washwater flow rate only for EGCSA (2018)
Table 10	Concentrations of alkylated dibenzothiophenes, phenanthrenes and naphthalenes in closed loop EGCS in the BOTU feed water in comparison to total 16 EPA PAH ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$)
Table 11	Total PAH discharged per MW and year, based on the evaluated measurement campaigns
Table 12	CMR properties for trace metals
Table 13	CMR properties for 16 EPA PAHs
Table 14	Guideline values for selected CMR chemicals
Table 15	Guideline values for selected chemicals with threshold effects
Table 16	Legally established PBT properties of 16 EPA PAHs in the US and EU
Table 17	Overview of the derived risk limits for 16 EPA PAHs individually
Table 18	Overview of the derived PNECs or similar reference values for individual dissolved trace metals contained in EGCS washwater
Table 19	Summary results of WET testing using the actual discharge water from EGCS
Appendix	
Table A1	Log K_{ow} , freshwater solubility, and estimated acute and chronic toxicity of PAH frequently found in crude and refined petroleum
Table A2	Trace metal and PAH concentrations ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$) in open loop EGCS washwaters measured in the provided measurement campaigns

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Task Team on EGCS (Exhaust Gas Cleaning Systems) would like to express its appreciation to the Government of Australia for their generosity to sponsor the work of the Task Team. Without this grant the establishment of the Task Team would not have been possible. In the same way the Task Team would like to thank the Non-governmental Organizations (NGO) Cruise Lines International Association (CLIA) for its generous grant to make its work possible. Finally, the Task Team was thankful to the NGO Exhaust Gas Cleaning Systems Association (EGCSA) for their full support and willingness to share all the information and knowledge they have available in their organization.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Task Team on Exhaust Gas Cleaning Systems (EGCS) was convened on a request of the Marine Environmental Protection Committee (MEPC) to the Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection (GESAMP) to give an opinion on the potential environmental and public health effects of EGCS effluents. According to its Terms of Reference (ToR), the Task Team assessed the available evidence relating to the environmental impact of EGCS taking into account the information provided in several background documents and other information made available or accessed by the Task Team. It concerned in the first place, this information concerned the submissions on EGCS to the Sub-committee on Pollution Prevention and Response (PPR) and MEPC, and in the second place, other relevant scientific publications and other and publicly available reports that were accessible to the members of the Task Team based on the personal knowledge of the members. The Task Team attributed specific weight to the PPR and MEPC papers as this information could be considered as belonging to the knowledge of the stakeholders in International Maritime Organization (IMO) fora and were therefore specifically relevant in the scope of the ToR provided to the Task Team. The other data was considered as valuable additional information that may be confirmative or non-confirmative to the information presented in the PPR and MEPC papers. The Task Team applied a similar level of scientific scrutiny to all information available and where deemed appropriate this included a critical review focusing on applicability and uncertainties.

An important part of the assessment of the available information was the establishment of concentrations of chemicals involved in the application of EGCS. This related not only to the assessment of actually performed measurements of EGCS washwater content, but also to an analysis of specific processes that were involved in a more generalized way. This would be necessary if a risk assessment had been the aim. EGCS normally applied on ships were of the open or closed loop type and of a hybrid type of these two systems. Open Loop EGCS applied generally non-treated seawater as source for the washwater and closed loop EGCS were more prone to use freshwater made up on board. The hybrid type EGCS was able to operate in both modes. A major difference of the two types was the discharge of the washwater. In open systems, the washwater was generally directly discharged to the receiving waters with basically only a minimum of post-treatment. Closed loop EGCS used a separate tank to store and reuse the washwater and therefore it had the possibility of post-treatment of the washwater by chemicals, to recover the original pH of the washwater and to apply a sedimentation step to collect and separate the sediment in the washwater. The final volume of washwater discharge to the environment was, therefore, substantially lower although the concentrations of contaminants in this discharge volume may be higher than for open loop EGCS.

As there was (per definition) combustion involved in the propulsion of ships, the normal combustion chemicals were present, like different kinds and amounts of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, ash and soot. Also many trace metals were normally present in these exhaust gases in relation to the sources of the fuel. Fuels may have a wide variety in natural content of trace metals. Finally, a third group of products being present in the washwater of EGCS was the components in the lubricants of the ships. Also here, a wide variety of concentrations and amounts was present. However, the Task Team identified several flaws where the sampling, analysis and identification of the contaminants were concerned. Recognizing the possible variations in the composition of washwater the Task Team

was able to achieve a sufficiently clear view on the potential concentrations of chemicals in the wastewater. These also implied organic contaminants, like alkylated polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, for which no discharge limits exist, but which were normally present in the exhaust gas and partially end up in the EGCS wastewater.

The Task Team also assessed the results of available simulations for predicting the environmental concentrations of target substances. Several documents informed about the application of models to describe the fate and behavior of substances in aquatic systems taking also into account the specific circumstances of the aquatic environment for shipping. In this respect, power output of the engines may have an important influence on the functioning of EGCS as well as the alkalinity of the source water and the receiving waters. The Group assessed the modelling activities in the different documents available. Generally, the model MAMPEC was used by the authors, probably because it was applied already in several jurisdictions in a regulatory way, like the assessment of antifouling paints in the European Union (EU) and the United States of America (USA) as it was recommended by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). It was also applied in the risk assessment of disinfection by-products of ballast water management systems, where a specific emission scenario and geographic conditions of the receiving port was developed, MAMPEC-BW. However, the Task Team on EGCS became aware of two other models that with some effort could be made applicable for the situation of the evaluation of EGCS: STEAM3 and DREAM. Both models were developed for completely different applications, air emissions from ships and drilling wastes from oil platforms. Some features of both models are appealing, like the automatic identification system for ships (AIS) for STEAM3 and the multicomponent analysis for DREAM. The Task Team concluded after its assessment that the first model to be investigated further would be the MAMPEC(-BW) model as its development status would be more appropriate for the evaluation of EGCS. The use of a model would present a useful building block in the risk assessment process.

The Task Team identified many gaps in the IMO submissions and the scientific literature where toxicological and ecotoxicological data was concerned. For most trace metals, sufficient information was available to determine predicted no effect concentrations in environmental aquatic systems for an acute and chronic environmental risk assessment. However, for the sediment phase of the aquatic environment insufficient data were available and the use of equilibrium partitioning or quantitative structure activity relations maybe used. The Task Team did not have sufficient time to analyze this further.

With respect to polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH), the Task Team on EGCS identified the same kind of missing (eco-)toxicity data for the sediment. In addition, there was a lack of data on the acute and chronic ecotoxicity for aquatic organisms most generally used, like the relevant OECD Test Guidelines for three different aquatic organisms, algae, crustaceans and fish. For the human health risk assessment, the Task Team recommended that the most suitable indicators of PAH in food are PAH4 and PAH8. Also in this area, the Task Team did not have sufficient time to search for more data that could fill the (eco-)toxicity gaps identified. The Task Team was aware of the hesitations in the scientific arena, but also the public opinion in general, on the further testing of substances using test animals. A perspective may be available in the possibilities of *in vitro* or *in silico* developments. For *e.g.* the ecotoxicological and toxicological data this is already partly available.

To the Task Team on EGCS, it was quite clear from the beginning of its work that carrying out a preliminary risk assessment was not possible considering the available information and despite the

examples provided on risk assessments already carried out. In this regard, the Task Team noted that secondary poisoning (via consumption of seafood) had been mentioned as a likely exposure route for humans. The report, however, showed several shortcomings and insufficient scientific evidence to support the way forward in performing risk assessments according the methods presented. The Task Team was also clear in its recommendation to support a risk assessment to be carried out by GESAMP or some other entity. GESAMP would be available in this further process if the recommendation would be endorsed by the Committee. Contributory to a risk assessment, the Task Team considered it would be advisable in parallel to generate more information on the direct ecotoxicological effects of EGCS washwaters through well-established whole effluent toxicity (WET) testing. Such testing should be carried out in consultation with GESAMP to avoid inconsistent testing. An internationally accepted guideline for WET tests using seawater was not available but may be developed in this setting. Also, for this recommendation the Task Team was aware of the time constraints that may be accompanied with this development of a WET test guideline.

The Task Team recognized also that current available evidence on chemicals in EGCS washwater effluents and its importance for the environment, should call for an increased and broad focus on this topic from both the science community and from policymakers. This would provide a framework for future work allowing a more accurate estimation and prediction of current and future EGCS chemicals releases, and their spatial and temporal representation including further modeling efforts combining ship traffic data with ship emission factors and in-situ measurements of contaminants. The revision and improvement of existing guideline limits and development of a new guideline for certain chemicals and should take into account future updated chemical concentration levels, by using harmonized procedures in terms of washwaters sampling and analysis to ensure better comparability in different data sets.

Finally, this document presented the report of the findings of the Task Team on EGCS to PPR 7 and proposed actions as appropriate.

Short Summary

With respect to the ToR the following conclusions and recommendations were established:

- The Task Team on EGCS concluded that many useful documents were already available in the IMO submissions and the in the scientific literature but the Task Team on EGCS also identified data gaps in mainly basic (eco-)toxicological information of EGCS effluent contaminants, especially PAHs. The Task Team on EGCS recommended filling these data gaps that were essential for a future risk assessment.
- The Task Team also identified several useful tools for the simulation of predicted environmental concentrations of target substances. Several available documents presented their tools and their approach to an environmental risk assessment. In this respect the Task Team identified a missing harmonized approach that could be considered suitable for more areas around the globe than currently available. Therefore, the Task Team recommended the development of such a harmonized approach. In the view of the Task Team on EGCS this specifically means the development of a widely accepted mathematical calculation model, based on MAMPEC-BW, as a start. In addition, a database containing all physico-chemical characteristics, (eco-)toxicological effect data and fate and behavior data of all relevant

contaminants in exhaust gas effluents, using the GESAMP-BWWG database as a starting point.

- The Task Team on EGCS, in addition to the recommendation in the second bullet, recommended to gather and probably develop further knowledge on data with respect to the socio-economic data to be able to perform an environmental impact assessment in a global sense as the risk assessment approach recommended by the Task Team did not include risk management options, like cost-benefit analysis, risk mitigation measures and global policies. For the Task Team on EGCS, it was clear that an approach taking into account potential global effects with respect to acidification and eutrophication would put the risk assessment of exhaust gas effluent contaminants into the correct context.
- The Task Team was not able to perform a preliminary risk assessment due to the missing data as defined in the earlier bullet points.
- The Task Team recommended a clear way forward to the development of a risk assessment related to exhaust gas effluent contaminants using MAMPEC-BW as an environmental exposure assessment tool, developing a database with data on physico-chemical characteristics, (eco-) toxicological effects and fate and behavior of all relevant contaminants using the model of the database of GESAMP-BWWG.
- With respect to the entity to carry out the proposed future approach, the Task Team on EGCS recommended to position this work again under the supervision of GESAMP and was available to take on-board any successive work, whether or not in the same composition as additional expertise in the area of database development and adjusting the proposed model to comply with the identified needs were considered necessary.
- The Task Team on EGCS identified data gaps in the (eco-)toxicological effects area of the relevant exhaust gas effluents contaminants. The Task Team on EGCS was also aware of international resistance to effect testing using test animals, therefore, other approaches may have to be developed, such as in vitro and in silico methods, quantitative structure activity relations (QSAR) or read-across methods. In addition to these methods, the Task Team recommended the development of whole effluent toxicity (WET) testing methods that could be internationally accepted. The Task Team noted that these WET tests were applied successfully in the area of ballast water management systems, although these methods were not fully harmonized yet.
- The Task Team is of the opinion that the current report fulfils its ToR.

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE REPORT

At the International Maritime Organization (IMO), in its Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC) and its Sub-Committee, Pollution Prevention and Response (PPR), the 2015 Guidelines for Exhaust Gas Cleaning Systems (EGCS) (resolution MEPC 259(68) (MEPC, 2015)) are under review in relation to Regulation 14.4 of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL) Annex VI that sets out a sulfur limit for fuel oil in SOx emission controlled areas (SECA). The sulfur limit has been defined at 0.10% in SECAs and 3.50% m m⁻¹ (mass by mass) outside SECAs. A new Regulation coming into effect on 1 January 2020 limits the sulfur content of fuels outside SECAs at 0.50% m m⁻¹. Table 1 and Figure 1 show the development of the sulfur limits, regulated by MARPOL Annex VI since 2005.

Table 1. MARPOL Annex VI fuel sulfur limits

Date	Sulfur Limit in Fuel (% m m ⁻¹)	
	SOx ECA	Global
2005 May 19 th	1.5	4.5
2010 June 1 st	1.0	
2012 January 1 st		3.5
2015 January 1 st	0.1	
2020 January 1 st		0.5

The established ECAs are Baltic Sea area, North Sea area, North American area, and United States Caribbean Sea area.




Figure 1. MARPOL Annex VI fuel sulfur limits

As an equivalent method to the use of a compliant fuel, whose sulfur content was less than 0.50%, technologies that are at least as effective in term of reducing SOx emissions are allowed. Since 22 July 2005 when the first EGCS Guideline was adopted, the number of ships equipped with EGCS has grown from 300 to a projected 3,800 on 1 January 2020 (MEPC, 2016). This increased use of EGCSs has triggered a discussion on the costs and benefits of this equivalent technology and specifically on the direct environmental risks and impacts of increasing operational discharges of EGCS washwater by ships equipped with such systems. The PPR Sub-Committee agreed that the currently available information at MEPC and PPR, as contained in the documents PPR 6/INF.20 (PPR, 2018), PPR 6/20 (PPR, 2019), MEPC 74/INF.10 (MEPC, 2019b), MEPC 74/INF.24 (MEPC, 2019c) and MEPC 74/INF.27 (MEPC, 2019d) sufficiently warranted the undertaking of further scientific research and to subsequently submit the results to future sessions to facilitate the work on the revision of the 2015 EGCS Guidelines.

Based on the discussions during the meetings at IMO, it was suggested that an independent study would be helpful and the PPR Sub-Committee requested the Secretariat to explore the possibility of GESAMP carrying out a review of the relevant scientific literature and also overseeing a modelling study of the impacts of discharge washwater from exhaust gas cleaning systems and to inform the Sub-Committee at its next session. GESAMP, in its meeting from 9 to 12 September 2019, approved the terms of reference, that are outlined in Chapter 3 of this document, and including a timeline for the preparation of a report on this topic. Subsequently, GESAMP endorsed the establishment of a Task Team on EGCS.

The Task Team on EGCS consisted of 8 scientists with different expertise. The following persons were members of the Task Team on EGCS:

- Eric Adams (USA) with expertise in fluid dynamics, mathematical modelling;
- Brigitte Behrends (Germany) with expertise in marine and environmental chemistry;
- Annette Dock (Sweden) with expertise in human toxicology and human health risk assessment;
- Shinichi Hanayama (Japan) with expertise on ecotoxicology, ocean chemistry;
- Jan Linders (The Netherlands, Chair) with expertise in general risk assessment, mathematical modelling;
- Richard Luit (The Netherlands) with expertise in environmental risk assessment;
- Claude Rouleau (Canada) with expertise in chemistry;
- Jacek Tronczynski (France) with expertise in environmental marine biogeochemistry, oceanography.

The Task Team on EGCS was asked to report its findings, as an information document, to the seventh meeting of the Sub-Committee on Pollution Prevention and Response (PPR 7), that was scheduled at IMO in London from 17 to 21 February 2020. Factually, this meant that the Task Team had to finalize its report in the last week of November as two additional weeks were needed for the peer review of GESAMP.

When considering the scope of the work, the Task Team strongly pointed out that the time to produce a report was considered too short to address all requirements of the ToR in sufficient detail and sufficient scientific depth. The Task Team understood the time pressure of the work in relation

to the entry into effect of the 2020 standards. The Task Team was of the opinion that much more could have been achieved if more time had been available to reach a thorough scientific report. The approaches and methods used in the report by the Task Team were not the subject of in-depth scientific debate and therefore opinions expressed may not be necessarily fully shared. The Task Team would like to request some consideration of the readers in this respect. PPR and MEPC would now have the task to decide on a report that had several uncertainties that may limit the usefulness of the report. In fact, the Task Team recommended that the report would need further elaboration in future.

2. PROBLEM DEFINITION

As stated above, the new Regulation 14.4 of MARPOL Annex VI (MEPC, 2019h) limited the exhaustible SO_x gas to 0.50% m m⁻¹ in so-called outside SECAs by 1 January 2020, whereas it was already 0.10 % m m⁻¹ inside SECAs. Until 1 January 2020 still a limit of 3.50% was required outside SECAs. The use of EGCS, also called scrubbers, were applied as an alternative for the low sulfur limits to be achieved under the new Regulation, provided an equivalent level of SO_x emission reduction was achieved (Winnes, *et al.*, 2018a). It was recognized that to achieve the new limits a considerable amount of SO_x would have to be washed out of the exhaust gas to be able to meet the newly required limit. As the contaminants washed out of the exhaust gas, they would successively be introduced in the marine aquatic environment questions were raised at MEPC (MEPC, 2019b; MEPC, 2019c; and MEPC, 2019d) whether or not the chemicals in the washwater could present unintended consequences to the marine aquatic environment and could have environmental effects on aquatic ecosystems and toxicological effects on humans. The Task Team noted that, in this respect, it could even be argued that EGCS are potentially in conflict with Article 195 of UNCLOS “Duty not to transfer damage or hazards or transform one type of pollution into another”. Together with the nearby date of entering in effect of the Regulation 14.4, the need for quick scientific advice to MEPC through PPR was obvious.

3. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Terms of Reference (ToR) to the Task Team on EGCS agreed at the annual meeting of GESAMP held in New York from 9 to 12 September 2019 were as follows:

- To assess the available evidence relating to the environmental impact of exhaust gas cleaning system effluents taking into account the information provided in several background documents and other information made available or accessed by the Task Team;
- To assess the results of available simulations for predicting the environmental concentrations of target substances;
- To provide information on whether there was a need for more scientific research with respect to the environmental impacts of EGCS washwater discharges; and
- To report its findings, as an information document, to PPR 7.

It should be noted that the Task Team had not been requested to carry out a risk assessment following its review of the available evidence. With respect to the possibilities of a risk assessment the Task Team could decide to consider three options:

1. to carry out a preliminary risk assessment;
2. to recommend that a risk assessment should be carried out (by GESAMP or some other entity);
3. to request that further studies are undertaken to provide sufficient evidence to carry out a risk assessment.

Based on the ToR, the Task Team on EGCS set the scope of the work to be performed as follows:

- The Task Team is limiting its assessment to relevant effects of washwater releases. The potential effects of the still remaining emissions to air are not assessed in this report;
- The Task Team included environmental pollution (emissions), (eco-)toxicological, physico-chemical (pH, thermal), and biogeochemical (acidification and eutrophication) effects in its assessment;
- The Task Team recognized that the term “impact” in its ToR is ambiguous as it may be interpreted in a wider or a narrower meaning. For the purpose of this report taking into account the time limitations, the Task Team decided to restrict its work to the scope of the second bullet in the ToR, which is more in the context of the word “risk” than to make an economical and sociological assessment that is generally more related to the term “impact”.
- The Task Team also took into account different spatial (geographical) scales, open seas, harbours, special areas etc.;
- The Task Team assessed the possibilities of risk assessments for several environmental compartments normally considered in risk assessments (water, sediment dwelling organisms, secondary poisoning). The chemical and physical properties of the contaminants are considered;
- To identify the potential human health risks the Task Team examined the potential exposure pathways for humans via the environmental and coastal amenities.

4. DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE TO THE TASK TEAM ON EGCS

In recent years several Members States and Non-Governmental Organization (NGOs) have submitted documents to IMO on the topic of EGCS. Next to these documents, numerous scientific articles have been published in the literature. The Task Team was requested to assess the available information. The Task Team did not carry out an in depth literature search as most of the information was already available through several IMO submissions, especially MEPC 74/INF.10 (MEPC, 2019b), submitted by Panama with the particular purpose of such a search and the members of the Task Team brought in

their own knowledge and in addition, also because the time needed for an additional search activity was not available.

In this Chapter, the IMO submissions and relevant documents that reached the Task Team on EGCS during the course of its work were presented accompanied by a short evaluation.

4.1 IMO Submissions

In Table 2 an overview was given of the submissions to IMO on EGCS. It concerned submissions to MEPC and PPR.

Table 2. Overview of submissions to IMO bodies, MEPC and PPR, on EGCS

IMO-id	Member State /NGO	Title
MEPC 70/INF.6	Secretariat	Assessment of fuel oil availability – final report
MEPC 73/INF.5	CESA	Study report on analyses of water samples from exhaust gas cleaning systems
MEPC 74/14/1	Austria, <i>et al.</i>	Proposal for evaluation and developing harmonized rules and guidance on the discharge of liquid effluents from exhaust gas cleaning systems
MEPC 74/14/7	CLIA	Comments on the proposal for evaluation and developing harmonized rules and guidance on the discharge of liquid effluents from exhaust gas cleaning systems
MEPC 74/14/8	CESA	Environmental impact assessment of EGCS discharges for generic risk-based, requirements adequately addressing all available technologies
MEPC 74/14/9	China	Comments on document MEPC 74/14/1
MEPC 74/INF.10	Panama	Scrubber Environmental Impact Literature Review
MEPC 74/INF.24	Japan	Report on the environmental impact assessment of discharge water from exhaust gas cleaning systems
MEPC 74/INF.27	CLIA	Compilation and assessment of 281 cruise ship EGCS washwater samples
MEPC.170(57)	Secretariat	2008 Guidelines For Exhaust Gas Cleaning Systems
MEPC.184(59)	Secretariat	2009 Guidelines For Exhaust Gas Cleaning Systems
MEPC.259(68)	Secretariat	2015 Guidelines for Exhaust Gas Cleaning Systems
MEPC.307(73)	Secretariat	2018 Guidelines for the Discharge of Exhaust Gas Recirculation (EGR) Bleed-Off Water
PPR 6/20	Secretariat	Report to the Marine Environment Protection Committee
PPR 6/INF.20	Germany	Results from a German project on washwater from exhaust gas cleaning systems

Below a short description and evaluation was provided. Several of these documents will be dealt with in more detail in the relevant sections of the report of the Task Team.

- MEPC 70/INF.6: the submission by the Secretariat contained the final report of CE Delft (The Netherlands) on the availability of fuel oil. It gave an overview of the different types of fuel used in shipping, the origin of the fuels, the capacity and the refinery actions needed to produce the fuel. The study also defined three scenarios for future fuel developments.
- MEPC 73/INF.5: the submission by CESA to PPR contained the report on analyses of water samples from EGCS used on ships. The submission reported on the analysis of 238 samples of EGCS washwater discharges from 20 different vessels in the Baltic and North Sea ECAs. Substances analyzed were the USEPA 16 PAHs, several metals, BTEX (benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene and xylene) and nitrates/nitrites.
- MEPC 74/14/1: this submission of the EU dealt with a proposal for the evaluation and developing harmonized rules and guidance on the discharge of liquid effluents from EGCS. The authors foresaw a deterioration of the marine environment by the extensive use of EGCS and proposed to further develop guidance to industry with regard to new technological developments.
- MEPC 74/14/7: the submission of CLIA commented on submission MEPC 74/14/1 and dealt with its willingness to cooperate with the proposal by sharing details on a science-based modelling analysis that was currently performed. It was the understanding of the Task Team that a draft report of this study was presented in the paper of Faber, *et al.* (2019).
- MEPC 74/14/8: the submission by CESA was also a comment on document MEPC 74/14/1 and proposed carrying out an environmental impact assessment of EGCS discharges in which all available technologies were included. The potential of these technologies to avoid regulatory action to forbid certain technologies should be investigated as well. An independent body was advised to be installed to perform the study.
- MEPC 74/14/9: also this submission by China was a comment on MEPC 74/14/1 and supported in general that paper. In addition, China proposed a four-stage approach to develop a future marine environmental risk assessment methodology. The Task Team considered that the proposal by China was fully suitable to achieve this goal, however, the Task Team was of the opinion that pursuing the proposal would require several years of work (order probably >10y) and would cost several millions of dollars. The scientific challenge of such a project would be great.
- MEPC 74/INF.10: this document was submitted by Panama and gives an overview of the scientific literature on the environmental impacts of EGCS. The review was carried out by prof. John Heywood and Dr. Emmanuel Kasseris, both of Massachusetts's Institute for Technology (MIT) in the US, and they presented two areas of concern related to EGCS: 1) potential effects of EGCS discharge on marine life and biogeochemical processes and 2) doubts on the true equivalence between ships using EGCS and ships using low sulfur fuel with regards to air emissions. As air emissions were outside the ToR of the Task Team the last issue was not discussed in the report of the Task Team. Several of the identified reports in this submission were also discussed in the current report.
- MEPC 74/INF.24: Japan submitted this document and it dealt with an approach to the environmental impact of the discharge of EGCS. The analysis included a short- and a long-term assessment of the potential effects of using EGCS. In the short-term assessment a dilution model was applied to the EGCS discharge based on propeller influenced mixing and indicating no effects and sufficient dilution to meet national Japanese water quality criteria standards. In addition, the study applied the MAMPEC-model in three Japanese harbours and

in the study WET testing was also reported. As a general conclusion the report identified no unacceptable effects to the marine environment on short- and long-term perspectives. These results were further discussed in the report of the Task Team on EGCS.

- MEPC 74/INF.27: this CLIA submission dealt with the analytical results of 281 EGCS washwater samples collected from cruise ships and included 54 test parameters, PAHs and heavy metals. The submission concluded that internationally accepted guidelines, *e.g.* EU surface water standards and the World Health Organization (WHO) drinking water guidelines were not breached by the EGCS discharges.
- MEPC.170(57), MEPC.184(59), MEPC.259(68) and MEPC.307(73): these documents contained the MEPC resolutions on the guidelines for exhaust gas cleaning systems as they had developed during the years, 2008, 2009, 2015 and 2018, respectively.
- PPR 6/20: the document contained the report of PPR 6 to MEPC 74 and in section 11 dealt with the discussion on EGCS in relation to several submissions of member states and NGOs to PPR 6 and presented the wish of several delegations, as suggested by GESAMP, that a generalized marine environmental risk assessment was to be developed at least for some model harbours. The work of the Task Team on EGCS should be viewed in this respect.
- PPR 6/INF.20: the submission by Germany highlighted some preliminary results of a German project on washwater from EGCS. Samples taken from open loop (OL) and closed loop (CL) EGCS were compared and assessed in relation to the potential environmental impact of EGCS. Upon a request of the Task Team for the final version of this study, the Task Team was informed that the final report was not yet ready.

4.2 *Relevant Documents*

The Task Team on EGCS considered the scientific papers and some background documents as especially valuable for its task. An overview of these documents was given in Table 3. For further details the reader was referred to the list of references.

Table 3. Overview of otherwise relevant documentation considered by the Task Team

First author	Year of publication	Title
Reed, M.	2002	DREAM: a Dose-Related Exposure Assessment Model Technical Description of Physical-Chemical Fates Components
Hufnagl, M.	2005	Effects of Sea Water Scrubbing – Final Report, rev.
Rye, H.	2007	Development of a Numerical Model for Calculating Exposure to Toxic and Nontoxic Stressors in the Water Column and Sediment from Drilling Discharges
USDT	2011	Exhaust-Gas-Cleaning-Systems-Guide-Rev. A---Final-Report
USEPA	2011	Exhaust Gas Scrubber Washwater Effluent
Hansen, P.	2012	Exhaust Gas scrubber Installed Onboard MV Ficaria Seaways
Kjølholt, J.	2012	Assessment of possible impacts of EGCS water discharges on the marine environment
Hassellöv, I.-M.	2013	Shipping contributes to ocean acidification
Tripp, L.	2014	The effects of seawater-scrubber-masters-report
Boer, den	2015	Scrubbers – An Economic and Ecological Assessment
Lange, B.	2015	Impacts of EGCSs on the Environmental Situation in Ports and Coastal Waters
Stips, A.	2016	Scoping report on the potential impact of on-board desulphurization on water quality in SOx Emission Control Areas
Johansson	2017	Global assessment of shipping emissions in 2015 on a high spatial and temporal resolution
Karlberg, M.	2017	The future for micro-plankton in the Baltic Sea – Effects of SWS and climate change
Koski, M.	2017	Ecological effects of EGCS water discharge on coastal plankton: potential synergistic effects of contaminants reduce survival and feeding of the copepod <i>Acartia tonsa</i>
Turner, D.R.	2017	Shipping and the environment: Smokestack emissions, scrubbers and unregulated oceanic consequences
Endres, S.	2018	A New Perspective at the Ship-Air-Sea-Interface: The Environmental Impacts of Exhaust Gas EGCS Discharge
Winnes, H.	2018	Environmental analysis of marine exhaust gas EGCSs on two Stena Line ships, Summary Activity 3, EGCSs closing the loop
Magnusson, K.	2018	Risk Assessment of marine exhaust gas EGCS water, Task 2, Activity 3, EGCSs closing the loop
ABS	2018	ABS Advisory On Exhaust Gas EGCS Systems
Carnival	2019	Compilation and Assessment of Lab Samples from EGCS Washwater Discharge on Carnival ships
Ushakov, S.	2019	Meeting future emission regulation at sea by combining low-pressure EGR and seawater scrubbing
Ytreberg	2019	Effects of scrubber washwater discharge on microplankton in the Baltic Sea
Faber, J.	2019	The Impact of EGCS Washwater Discharges on Port Water and Sediment

As for the official submission to IMO, a short characterization was given of the most relevant articles in the scientific literature and grey literature that the Task Team on EGCS was aware of. It concerned in chronological order:

- Reed, M. & Hetland, B., 2002: The authors described the development of the DREAM, a Dose Related Exposure Assessment Model. The model was designed to support management decisions on the environmental risks of complex mixtures. The model had been further developed since, see also Rye, *et al.*, 2007 and Brønner, 2019, personal communication.
- Hufnagl, M., Liebezeit, G., Behrends, B., 2005: the report described the results of five sampling campaigns in the harbours of Calais and Dover and on board of a ferry that was equipped with an EGCS. PAHs, pH, nutrients, temperature, trace metals and nutrients were measured. No negative effects were detected on the port environment nor on eutrophication effects.
- Rye, H.; Reed, M.; Frost, T.K.; Smit, M.G.D.; Durgut, I.; Johansen, Ø.; Ditlevsen, M.K., 2008. A successive paper on DREAM that presented an application to model stressors in the water column and the sediment from drilling discharges.
- USDT, 2011: the document guided members of the US Ship Operations Cooperative Program in the selection of equipment including EGCS.
- USEPA, 2011: The document contained information on the use of EGCS onboard vessels. It reported on scavenging pollutants from the EGCS, like combustion products, fuel and lubricants, the source water used and the EGCS itself.
- Hansen, P., 2012: the report discussed the results of measurements at the EGCS on board the MV Ficaria Seaways. The EGCS was of a hybrid type and provided information on the advantages and disadvantages of both EGCS types. The system was analyzed in relation to the energy consumption of the vessel.
- Kjølholt, J.; Aakre, S.; Jürgensen, C. and Lauridsen, J., 2012: this study was initiated by the Danish Environmental Protection Agency and provided additional information on the potential environmental effects to the marine environment. As an overall result the study concluded that the pollutant concentrations were far below levels of concern and in some local conditions the levels determined could slightly exceed the environmental quality guidelines of the European Union.
- Hassellöv, I.-M., Turner, D.R., Lauer, A. and Corbett. J.J., 2013: discussed introduction of scrubbers in the context of modelling the shipping-derived pH decreases worldwide indicating that sea areas with heavy shipping traffic and seasonal stratification could be subject to larger pH decreases on a seasonal basis.
- Tripp, L., 2014: The report was mainly focusing on the Baltic Sea and discussed results from research based on laboratory measurements, experimental mesocosms and natural Baltic Sea microbial communities. It was shown that 10% effluent concentrations had effects on nutrient availability, primary production, photosynthetic activity and bacterial populations. Further research was recommended to the impact of shipping pollutants in the Baltic Sea.
- Boer, E. den and Hoen, M. 't, 2015: this was an often cited paper and dealt with an analysis of environmental and economic aspects of EGCS application in comparison to the use of Marine Gas Oil (MGO). It concluded also that EGCS may have a negative impact on the marine environment due to acidification, eutrophication and the accumulation of hazardous

hydrocarbons and heavy metals in case the dilution was limited. The authors of the study further advocated a cost benefit analysis between the potentially harmful impacts of EGCS and the benefits for the society as a whole and the ship owners in particular.

- Lange, B., Markus, T. and Helfst, L. P., 2015: the report analyzed several earlier reports published on EGCS, especially in the Baltic and North Sea. Due to the high pressure on the environment due to shipping, construction material extraction, energy, tourism and discharges of industry and agriculture, a further deterioration of the environment due the discharge of EGCS was considered unwanted and proposals were formulated to prohibit the use of EGCS unless a multilateral regulation would be established.
- Stips, A., Bolding, K., Macias, D., Bruggeman, J., and Coughlan, C., 2016: have used a spatially-resolved model to examine the potential impact of scrubber operation on acidification of the basin scale of the North Sea over a 1-year period. Authors conclude that the largest effects are confined to near-coastal areas, most particularly in the vicinity of major ports, where the acidifying effect due to SO_x can equal or exceed that due to CO₂.
- Johansson, L., Jalkanen, J.-P., Kukkonen, J., 2017: the authors developed a model for the global assessment of shipping emissions. The model STEAM made use of the Automated Identification System for ships to identify their route and emissions. The authors claimed that application to EGCS emissions and ballast water should be possible.
- Karlberg, M., 2017: the report dealt with a study on the micro-plankton population in the Baltic and potential threats in the future. The discharge of EGCS may have deteriorating effects on the aquatic organisms. The author applied different concentrations of diluted EGCS effluent to algal species and found no direct effects to the micro-plankton species composition but caution was recommended as long term effects were still unknown.
- Koski, M.; Stedmon, C. and Trapp, S., 2017: The paper reported on three items: 1) threshold concentrations of the copepod *Acartia tonsa* to exposure to EGCS discharge water, 2) whether the effects depended on the exposure route and 3) whether the exposure was detectable in organisms collected in the field. The authors were of the opinion that synergistic effects could play a role on the plankton productivity and bioaccumulation of metals.
- Turner, D.R., Hassellöv, I.-M., Ytreberg E. and Rutgersson A., 2017: Through modelling projections on the basin scale of the Baltic Sea, have shown that ships would become the major source of strong acid addition to surface marine waters if there was widespread use of wet EGCS.
- Endres, S.; Maes, F.; Hopkins, F.; Houghton, K.; Mårtensson, E.M.; Oeffner, J.; Quack, B.; Singh, P. and Turner, D., 2018: the paper presented the results of an international workshop on the impacts of ship emissions on biogeochemical processes at the air-sea interface and their socio-economic relevance. It was concluded that despite existing guidelines there was a risk for acidification, eutrophication and accumulation of pollutants in the marine environment due to EGCS.
- Winnes, H.; Granberg, M.; Magnusson, K.; Malmaeus, M.; Mellin, A.; Strippel, H.; Yaramenka; Zhang, Y., 2018: This report was a summary report of a much wider project of which the environmental part was dealt with in the next publication by Magnusson, *et al.* (2018). See below. There were projects on air emission measurements, risk assessment of marine exhaust gas scrubber water, cost benefit analysis and evaluation of exhaust gas scrubber systems for ship applications in a system perspective.

- Magnusson, K.; Thor, P.; and Granberg, M., 2018: the report was a part of a larger project on the effects of EGCS (see above) and this part dealt with the results of measurements on two ships where all the relevant parameters were analyzed. In addition, the discharge was tested for toxicity on field collected species, a zooplankton species and a sediment dwelling blue mussel. Effects were found with 0.04% of closed loop effluent and 1% of open loop effluent. Although there were found effects on organisms in some tests, the actual concentrations of individual compounds were always about 3 orders of magnitude lower than the concentrations that showed effects.
- ABS, 2019: the report was especially intended for ship designers, owners and operators to provide them with the latest information concerning EGCS. It gave information about regulatory requirements as well as the newest available technologies and was regularly updated.
- Carnival, 2019: the report summarized the results of 79 washwater samples on 23 ships using USEPA protocols and training taken in 2016. In the samples 54 parameters were identified and analyzed by certified laboratories. The results were compared to national and international point source discharge limits. Now an update was available with 281 samples on 53 ships. Although the report mentioned gaps in suitable standards, especially for PAHs, no exceedance of any set of limits was determined.
- Ushakov, S.; Stenersen, D.; Einang, P.M.; Ask, T.Ø., 2019: the paper reported on the environmental performance of full-scale combined low-pressure exhaust gas recirculation and seawater scrubbing system. The standard parameters were measured, pH, turbidity and nitrates, which values were below the IMO requirements, but the values for certain metals (vanadium, nickel and zinc) and the PAHs in the washwater indicated certainly of lesser quality and would need sufficient dilution. Considering the measurements of arsenic, copper and molybdenum, the substances should give cause to some concern.
- Ytreberg, E., Hassellöv, I.-M., Nylund, A.T., Hedblom, M., Al-Handal, A. Y. and Wulff, A., 2019: in the paper scrubber washwater was tested on a Baltic micro-plankton community. A significant increase in chlorophyll-a, particulate phosphorous, carbon and nitrogen was observed when the community was exposed to 10% scrubber washwater for 13 days. Also in the laboratory effects were determined: a 10% effect concentration (EC10) = 8.6% and EC10 = 5.5% for two different primary producers.
- Faber, J., Hattum, B. v., and Kleissen, F., 2019: the report was still a draft report and a follow-up of a presentation by the authors during MEPC 74. It was not clear to the Task Team in what detail it may be used as the information may be subject to changes. The report dealt with an approach to a risk assessment procedure by estimating the amount of chemical substances discharged based on energy related parameters and a set of scenarios, the application of the MAMPEC-model and regionally accepted water quality standards (the EU Maximum Allowable Concentration of the Environmental Quality Standard (MAC-EQS) and the Annual Average of the Environmental Quality Standard (AA-EQS) that will enter into force in the EU in 2021). Four different harbour scenarios had been defined as well as different background concentration assumptions. For sediments, the report identified several gaps in the available standards and also used national standards from the UK, The Netherlands and Canada. The authors did not find any significant breaching of the standards as far as available, although they noted that the results of the report were dependent on reference scenario (the number off ships in a port, and their fuel consumption and the port itself).

In the appropriate sections of this report of the Task Team on EGCS, these publications will be dealt with further.

5. INVENTORY OF EXHAUST GAS CLEANING SYSTEMS

5.1 Introduction to EGCS

This chapter gives an overview of current EGCS. EGCS could be subdivided into wet and dry EGCS. The category of the wet systems may be divided in three categories: the open loop (OL) systems, the closed loop (CL) systems and the hybrid systems. As a synonym or a short description often the name scrubbers was used. In this report consistently the abbreviation EGCS will be used. Generally, the OL systems were used with seawater whilst the CL systems worked with freshwater as washwater. Hybrid systems could use either system depending where they were sailing (Japan, 2019).

In wet EGCS, water was used to dissolve the SO₂ from the exhaust gas. The washwater was either discharged directly back into the sea or was re-circulated under the addition of neutralizing agents (see section 5.2). In a dry EGCS calcium hydroxide (Ca(OH)₂) granules or sodium bicarbonate powder formed with the SO₂ calcium sulfate (CaSO₄; gypsum) or sodium sulfate (Na₂SO₄). Both dry EGCS were generating solid waste streams. This assessment concentrated on the investigation of the environmental impact of EGCS washwater and possible chemicals used in the process. Dry EGCS do not produce a solid waste stream to the environment and were therefore not considered further in this report. For more technical details, please refer to the numerous publications in the area of EGCS.

5.2 Wet EGC Systems

Wet EGCS used seawater or freshwater, some in combination with chemical additives (*e.g.* NaOH). OL EGCS (section 5.2.1) used seawater like a flow-through system, whereas CL EGCS (section 5.2.2) could use fresh- or seawater, which was re-circulated, plus neutralization chemicals (NaOH, Na₂CO₃ or MgO) for the accumulating sulfuric acid. The hybrid type EGCS (section 5.2.3) could operate in OL or CL modes. Further, the inert gas cleaning EGCSs of oil tankers belonged into the category of wet EGCS.

5.2.1 Open Loop Systems (OL)

An open loop EGCS would take water from the marine or freshwater environment where the vessel was sailing. The system would bring this water in contact with the exhaust gas. After processing, the gaseous and particulate contaminants in the exhaust gas were partly washed-out and discharged to the marine or freshwater surroundings of the ship. This meant that the contaminants that were washed-out and removed from the exhaust gas were discharged into the water phase as dissolved or particulate chemical species. A typical layout of an OL EGCS with its basic components was given in Figure 2. It should be noted that the washwater treatment and dilution by using clean seawater as indicated in this example were optional.







Figure 2. Open loop exhaust gas cleaning system (Courtesy EGCSA)


In OL EGCS, seawater was pumped and sprayed in a counter current against exhaust gas flow in the scrubbing tower, where it dissolved the sulfurous gases SO_2 (equation 1) and SO_3 to form sulfurous acid (equation 2), which was oxidized to sulfuric acid (equation 3). In summary, the dissolved SO_2 was transformed by chemical reaction to sulfate ions and two hydrogen ions, which generated the acidity (equation 4). As follows:



Overall reaction:



Seawater was slightly alkaline (pH 8.2-8.4) due to carbonate and other ions present in seawater and therefore had a natural buffer capacity. This alkalinity of seawater was used to neutralize the acids, which are formed in the scrubbing process (equation 5, overall reaction).



Equation 5 further showed that the washwater releases two moles CO_2 per one mole SO_2 dissolved in the water. When the natural alkalinity was depleted, the washwater turned acidic. The actual washwater could have a pH of 3 or even lower depending on the ratio of water flow sprayed and exhaust gas flow. The lower the pH, the less SO_2 would be dissolved.

The water consumption depended on the sulfur content of the fuel, the engine load and the intended efficiency of the scrubbing process. As a rule of thumb, usually up to $90 \text{ m}^3 (\text{MWh})^{-1}$ was

required, based on Resolution MEPC.259(68) (MEPC, 2015). However, in a measurement campaign on OL EGCS by the German BSH, the water consumption was 75 – 140 (on average 100) m³ (MWh)⁻¹ (PPR, 2018). After reacting with the exhaust gas, the washwater was either discharged directly back to the sea or was treated in a washwater treatment plant and/or diluted before discharge.

Other substances occurring in the exhaust gas would also be taken up by the washwater. These were unburnt oil (both fuel and lubricant), polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH), trace metals, nitrate (from NO_x adsorption) and particles such as black carbon, soot and ash.

The 2015 Guidelines for Exhaust Gas Cleaning Systems (MEPC, 2015) had set limits for pH, phenanthrene equivalence for PAH (PAH_{phe}), turbidity measured as formazine nephelometric units (FNU) or nephelometric turbidity units (NTU) and nitrates. These parameters, except pH and nitrates, must be monitored continuously at the inlet of the EGCS and at the outlet of the EGCS, but before any kind of dilution. Washwater pH was allowed to be monitored only at the point of discharge, if it achieved the condition of 1) shown below. On the other hand, as no online and onboard monitoring methods for trace metals existed, these must be measured in the lab after discrete sampling. Relevant criteria were formulated in MEPC (2015) and may be summarized as follows (Magnusson, *et al.*, 2018):

- 1) Criteria for pH: The discharged EGSE should have a pH of no less than 6.5 at 4 m from the overboard discharge point with the ship stationary. Computed model may be used to simulate the pH at 4 m distances together with the reference of receiving seawater condition (*i.e.* alkalinity of 2,200 µmol L⁻¹ and pH 8.2).
- 2) Criteria for PAH concentration: The criterion for EGSE was that the maximum continuous PAH concentrations must not exceed 50 µg·PAH_{phe} L⁻¹ above the PAH concentration in the inlet water and was normalized for a washwater flow rate through the EGC unit of 45 t (MWh)⁻¹ where the MW refers to the maximum continuous rating (MCR) or 80% of the power rating of the fuel oil combustion unit.
- 3) Criteria for turbidity: The maximum continuous turbidity in Exhaust Gas Scrubber Effluent (EGSE) should not be greater than 25 FNU (formazine nephelometric units) or 25 NTU (nephelometric turbidity units) or equivalent units, above the inlet water turbidity.
- 4) Criteria for nitrates: The EGCS water treatment system should prevent the discharge of nitrates beyond that associated with a 12% removal of NO_x from the exhaust, or beyond 60 mg·L⁻¹ normalized for EGSE discharge rate of 45 tons (MWh)⁻¹, whichever was greater.

For nitrates/nitrites, an online method was available and was published by Azzarro (2013). Further impacts on the washwater included reduced pH, temperature rise, increased chemical oxygen demand (COD), reduced oxygen concentration and decreased alkalinity.









Figure 3. Closed loop exhaust gas cleaning system (Courtesy EGCSA)

5.2.2. Closed Loop Systems (CL)

In a closed loop exhaust gas cleaning system, the washwater was not discharged to the surrounding waters but was fed to a clean-up process tank to separate the sedimentable particles from the water phase and held stored on-board until it could be disposed of in a harbour. Only a small amount of water was directly discharged, so-called bleed-off, see below. A typical layout of a CL EGCS that could operate for some time without discharging any water was presented in Figure 3.

The effluent discharge of CL systems was substantially less than for the open loop system: $0.1 - 0.3 \text{ m}^3 (\text{MWh})^{-1}$ (EGCSA, 2019) and was generally called “bleed-off”.

In CL EGCS, the reaction equations are as follows:



In CL EGCS the fresh- or seawater was re-circulated and was therefore suitable for ship operation in areas with low alkalinity. The reactions of the gaseous sulfur compounds were similar to the OL systems, but to compensate the lack and the consumption of alkalinity, chemical additives must be added to the water to neutralize the generated sulfuric acid. The simplest chemical was sodium hydroxide (NaOH), which was used as 50% solution in water. The consumption varied, depending on the fuel oil sulfur content, from 1 to $11 \text{ L} (\text{MWh})^{-1}$ for 0.9% and 2.9% S in the fuel, respectively (Kjølholt, *et al.*, 2012). The higher the NaOH dosage, the better was the efficiency of SO_2 reduction.

The usage of NaOH as neutralizing chemical generated sodium salts like sulfate (Na_2SO_4), bisulfite (NaHSO_3) and sulfite (Na_2SO_3). The hydroxide ion reacted with the hydroxonium ions to form water. To prevent re-circulating water to be saturated with ions and above-mentioned pollutants the washwater was treated in a water treatment plant. The washwater treatment plant included chemical additives (*e.g.* aluminium(III)sulfate (Ochoa-González, *et al.*, 2012)) and/or mechanical treatment to remove particles and other pollutants (PPR, 2018). Following the water treatment, the water was returned to the EGCS. The water treatment plant generated sludge, which was stored in dedicated sludge tanks for later disposal in port reception facilities.

Further, some bleed-off water was discharged after treatment in the “bleed-off treatment unit” (BOTU). The discharge rate was typically in the range of $0.1 - 0.3 \text{ m}^3 (\text{MWh})^{-1}$ under a re-circulation rate of $20 \text{ m}^3 (\text{MWh})^{-1}$ (MEPC, 2008). Freshwater was added with the same flow rate to top up the process water. The bleed-off water could be stored in a holding tank for later discharge or disposal. The sludge of the BOTU was pumped into a decanter unit to allow settlement. The supernatant water was fed back into the BOTU and the sludge was stored for later disposal ashore.

5.2.3. Hybrid Systems

The hybrid EGCS could be operated in OL and CL modes using either seawater (OL) or freshwater (CL). An advantage of hybrid EGCS was that they could be operated in areas where the discharge of EGCS effluents was prohibited or in areas with low alkalinity (estuaries, harbours, rivers, the Baltic and other sensitive areas) (Aalborg, 2010). The system combined features of the OL and the CL system and was, therefore, more complicated. In the CL mode the effluent had to be stored on-board for the duration that the tank volume would permit.

5.3 Environmental aspects of EGCS washwater

In the preceding sections the existing EGCS were presented with their main features. MEPC (2019b) concluded that there was no doubt in the literature that the use of EGCS in marine applications was effective in removing SOx (SO_2 and SO_3). However, a closer examination revealed that there may be significant issues regarding exhaust particulate emissions.

The Task Team tried to explore the effects of EGCS use in the environmental and human health effects contexts, with the ToR as the guiding principle. Both types of systems discharged water containing several chemical substances in varying concentrations to the aquatic environment. The emission of these systems to the atmosphere was considered outside the ToR of the Task Team. The intention was to give an overview of the environmental and human health effects for the aquatic environment of the oceans and coastal areas caused by the lower emission standards to the atmosphere based on the use of EGCS on ships. The Task Team on EGCS, therefore, focused on the emission route of EGCS to marine surface water. Exposure routes were limited to the discharge of the direct effluent and the bleed-off water.

The environmental aspects of EGCS washwater also determined the effects to humans because of the secondary poisoning of aquatic species that may find their way to human food via bioconcentration and biomagnification. Bioconcentration was considered to be the first step in the

food chain while biomagnification was more related to the following levels in the food chain. In the way forward, these limitations had to be kept in mind in the risk assessment process proposal.

6. INVENTORY OF CHEMICALS

6.1. Introduction to Relevant Chemicals

The main aim of using EGCS on the sea-going ships was the reduction of SO_x emissions if heavy fuel oil (HSHFO, High Sulfur Heavy Fuel Oil) was used for the propulsion of the ship to a level that met the requirements of MARPOL Annex VI, Regulation 14.4.

Alternatively, distillate fuels were used for compliance with sulfur regulations. The distillate fuels such as marine gas oil (MGO) and marine diesel oil (MDO) were primarily used to comply also with the IMO regulation under MARPOL Annex VI. Exhaust gas cleaning systems operating in open loop mode, were low-cost and may be preferred alternatives to high-cost, low-sulfur fuel. Other technological solutions for sulfur abatements were also developed and implemented such as novel engine technologies, exhaust gas recirculation and fuel emulsifiers (Endres, *et al.*, 2018).

The evidence on how these different options enabled ships to operate within sulfur emission limits and how alternative solutions compared in the reduction of relevant chemical emissions and discharges had been yet poorly studied (Lehtoranta, *et al.*, 2019 and references there in, Zhou *et al.*, 2017, Endres *et al.*, 2018). This topic was seen as important by the Task Team on EGCS but it remained out of the scope of the present information report. It was recognized by the Task Team on EGCS that there was a need for scientific assessments comparing alternative emission reduction techniques in terms of their overall environmental performance.

6.2. General Concerns regarding Chemicals in EGCS washwater

The principle of the EGCS operation must result in the efficient transfer of sulfur oxides from the ships' exhaust gases to the washwaters of their EGCS. Through the operation of EGCS, other chemical contaminants present in the exhaust gas of the ships were also transferred, in different proportions, into the washwaters. The washwaters and chemical substances from open loop EGCS were discharged into the marine environments where the ships operate (offshore traffic lines, berth bays, estuaries, harbours and ports). The main concern was how the shipping sector could address sulfur regulations with EGCS and tackle the environmental impacts related to the transfer of polluting chemicals from air to marine water and their aquatic marine ecosystems.

The recognition of ships washwater as a new waste category from EGCS also triggered policy processes. This included introduction, enforcements and necessary revisions of emission limits, as for instance already adopted regulations in the scope of Annex VI to the MARPOL Convention and other national and international regulations (*e.g.* European Directives – EU 2019/883 of 17 April 2019 on port reception facilities for the delivery of waste from ships (EU, 2019)). Such policy efforts aimed at the environmental protection from chemical pollution and at the achievement and maintenance of clean, healthy and productive aquatic environments. The current regulations for on-going marine transport were, however, less strict than those applied to land-based transport within the European Union where in several Union Regulation the NO_x emission was reduced, for example (Turner, *et al.*, 2017 and references therein).

6.3. Chemicals in EGCS Washwater: Background Considerations

The washwater from OL EGCS may basically contain most of the chemical species present in the exhaust gas of the marine diesel engines. The comprehensive chemical characterization of heavy petroleum fuels and their combustion exhaust gases from diesel engines were largely characterized in scientific literature (examples of recent publications: Celo, *et al.*, 2015, Käfer, *et al.*, 2019, Jiang, *et al.*, 2019, Corbin, *et al.*, 2018 and references therein). The exhaust gases form complex chemical mixtures and their full characterization demanded highly elaborate analytical techniques and methods (Käfer *et al.*, 2019). These efforts were augmented because exhaust gases of diesel engines were classified as carcinogenic to humans – Group 1 (IARC/WHO, 2012, Benbrahim-Tallaa, *et al.*, 2012). In the routine emissions assessments, many chemicals, often present at low trace levels in the exhaust gases and in EGCS washwaters, were not surveyed, even if these compounds were recognized as toxic and contributing to genotoxic (mutagenic and carcinogenic) character of EG. The species of concern are suites of metals, PAHs, volatile organic hydrocarbons and chlorinated hydrocarbons (Attfield, *et al.*, 2012, IARC/WHO, 2012).

Furthermore, in the appreciation of chemicals of concern in the EGCS washwaters, it should be taken into account that the composition of chemical mixtures in the washwater effluent would vary and would mainly depend on the HSHFO specification, its composition, engine characteristics, combustion temperature, ship and EGCS operation conditions. The EGCS washwater dissolved gaseous and soluble contaminants, emulsified non-combusted fuels oil and lubricants, and partly removed suspended particulate matter with adsorbed contaminants. The chemical composition of the mixture would also depend on the efficiency of transfer processes from exhaust gas to washwater, directly influenced by compounds' properties like solubility in water and their sorption capacity to particulate matter.

The revision of the IMO 2015 EGCS Guidelines contained a new Appendix 3 to facilitate and improve washwater data collection. PPR 7 was expected to complete this revision of the IMO 2015 EGCS Guidelines. This revision focused on the structure, clarification of principles and terminology as well as on the improvement of the certification framework principles and requirements. Section 10 of the revised guidelines on EGCS discharge water criteria had not been changed, due to the lack of scientific evidence.

6.4. Main Contaminants

The main contaminants in the ship exhaust gases were largely characterized as nitrogen oxides (NO_x), sulfur dioxide (SO_x), particulate matter (PM) with a range of aerodynamic diameters between micrometers to nanometers (Mastral and Calleán, 2000, Moldanová, *et al.*, 2009, Celo, *et al.*, 2015, Käfer, *et al.*, 2019, Jiang, *et al.*, 2019). The emitted particles and gases contained also black carbon (BC), elemental and organic carbon (EC and OC) and other toxic contaminants such as trace metals (TMs) and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). Ships also emitted a large number and significant amounts of non-methane volatile organic compounds (NMVOC) and multiple other chemical species. In addition, roughly, for every ton of SO₂ input from EGCS washwaters, the ocean would not absorb about half a ton of CO₂ (Stips, *et al.*, 2016). It was, however, reported that the

introduction of EGCS on the ships would not strongly affect ship GHG emissions to the atmosphere, because CO₂ removal by washwater was generally low (< 5 %) (Køcks, *et al.*, 2013).

Contrary to the exhaust gases, the available evidence on the main contaminants identified and quantified in the EGCS washwaters from peer reviewed scientific literature was limited. Therefore, it could be appreciated indirectly via studies based on the measurements of the chemicals removal efficiency from the exhaust gases (Celo, *et al.*, 2015, Lehtoranta, *et al.*, 2019). However, more direct determinations of chemical concentrations in the washwaters were also needed for a better assessment of their potential environmental impacts.

In the following sections of the report in this chapter the Task Team on EGCS summarized estimated and measured concentrations of chemicals, grouped in inorganic SO_x, NO_x and trace metals (TM), particulate matter (PM) containing both inorganic and organic pools, and organic compounds, mainly PAH in the EGCS washwaters.

6.5. General Concerns of Environmental Impacts of EGCS Washwater Discharges

A number of studies concluded that the EGCS discharge water may impact biogeochemical processes (such as acidification, eutrophication) and marine life through accumulation of pollutants in the marine environment, especially in the coastal regions, with often already higher concentrations of contaminants and less dilution and dispersal potential compared to the open sea (Hufnagl, *et al.*, 2005, Køcks, *et al.*, 2013 Kjølholt, *et al.*, 2012, Boer and Hoen, 2015, BSH, 2019, Endres, *et al.*, 2018, Hassellöv, *et al.*, 2013, Koski, *et al.*, 2015, Turner, *et al.*, 2017, Turner, *et al.*, 2018, Ytreberg, *et al.*, 2019). This was considered a developing area of research and new European projects were now initiated. In the appreciation of environmental impacts the relevance of spatially non-uniform addition of acidifying, eutrophying and polluting chemicals should be carefully considered in the assessment efforts, with the main pressures occurring in the areas of intense shipping operations (Stips, *et al.*, 2016). There was no full understanding of the EGCS washwater discharges on ecological functioning of coastal marine ecosystems. In particular, the biological effects of increasing operation of EGCS in shipping transport had been addressed in only a few studies (Koski, *et al.*, 2017; Ytreberg, *et al.*, 2019). Additional accumulation of persistent, bioconcentrating and toxic (PBT) contaminants such as metals and PAH, especially in the coastal areas and semi-enclosed seas, may lead to exceedance of environmental quality standards (Endres, *et al.*, 2018, Kjølholt, *et al.*, 2012, Turner, *et al.*, 2017). Furthermore, there was a risk of cumulative and interactive effects of different pollutants, which should be considered (Paytana, *et al.*, 2009, Chouvelon, *et al.*, 2019, Lange, *et al.*, 2015). Metals and PAHs interacted and bioconcentrated in the first trophic levels of plankton and were transferred to higher trophic levels through food webs, especially to filter feeding marine molluscs (Valavanidis, *et al.*, 2008, Chouvelon, *et al.*, 2019, Echeveste, *et al.*, 2011, Echeveste, *et al.*, 2012).

Scientific evidence allowing careful appreciation of the short- and long-term potential environmental impacts of the large-scale uses of exhaust gas cleaning systems, was poor (Endres, *et al.*, 2018). This was further challenging because the nature of the environmental responses was wide and complex, ranging from effects on marine ecosystems biogeochemistry, threats to marine life, climate change and feedbacks, to human health hazards (Endres, *et al.*, 2018, Fuglestad, *et al.*, 2009, Corbett, *et al.*, 2007). Such potential, anticipated, modelled, and evidenced environmental impacts were recently summarized by Endres, *et al.* (2018) and are depicted in the Figure 4. This later publication was the most comprehensive available scientific summary of the environmental aspects of EGCS

discharge in the marine environment, given also in the wider perspective of the global shipping emissions, international and national global and local regulations and legal aspects of EGCS waste discharge, including alternative technologies for emission reduction (Endres, *et al.*, 2018).




Figure 4 Ship smoke stack and EGCS water emissions at the ship-air interface and their potential effects on atmospheric chemistry and marine ecosystems in the surface ocean (reproduced from Endres, *et al.*, 2018)

6.6. Further Evaluation of Washwater Chemicals

The Task Team on EGCS, in its further evaluation of relevant chemicals in the EGCS washwaters, will take into account several background documents. The additional bibliographic review was limited in the scope of the Task Team, and the main considerations were limited to the marine environment and open loop systems.

In the section below the selected contaminant groups were presented along the following general lines:

- major chemical species and their ambient environmental “background” concentrations of contaminants;
- measured and estimated contaminant concentrations in the washwater of the open loop systems;
- examples of estimation of chemical discharge by washwater effluents;
- further consideration of environmental risks of specific chemicals;
- explanation on the discharge limits in the current EGCS Guideline.

Several rationales and limitations for this presentation should be pointed out, namely:

- Well-documented and established ranges of ambient concentrations of contaminants in the open sea, coastal waters and specific areas of bays, harbours and ports were

- established in practice and recommended for their use in the risk assessment efforts in the areas where pollution from OL EGCS was added;
- ii) The data on the measured contaminant concentrations in the EGCS washwater, in the peer review studies available, was limited; therefore, based on the available emission factors, different transfer and dilution assumptions, estimated contaminant concentrations in the EGCS washwaters were proposed; this was reported as a useful exercise for instance for the discharge dilution modelling studies;
 - iii) On the basis of the measured and estimated contaminant concentrations in the outlet of EGCS washwater, several contaminant discharge loads were provided; their significance could not be fully discussed in the scope of the present information report, but the level of washwater contaminant inputs should be further assessed and taken into account in the risk assessment efforts;
 - iv) The present report also could not cover all aspects of possible environmental impacts related to EGCS contaminant discharges into the marine environment, however, more realistic approaches of environmental risk assessments in the field were highlighted.

6.7. *Background Documents*

A number of reports submitted by IMO/MEPC to GESAMP EGCS Task Team as “background documents” were listed above. More reports were submitted to the group during its meeting in London on October 29 to November 1 and a few additional documents were downloaded through the internet.

Nevertheless, the Task Team would like to draw attention to the need for more assured and scientifically valid and independently peer reviewed literature data, in contrast to the measurement and environmental impact assessment reports presented in selected background documents. In this section, concerns were raised especially on the quality of chemical analysis data. In a number of reports, no basic information was provided either on the sampling techniques, or on the quality assurance and control of the analytical methods used. Even if certain methods used were claimed to be according to certified analytical procedures, the information was needed on the analytical performance of the specific trials. Information was missing on the blank controls, the recovery levels of contaminants extraction, the precision, accuracy and reproducibility of the analytical methods, based on the certified reference materials (CRMs) analysis. The methods quantification limit (LOQs) were often not communicated. In a few reports, the detection limits were very high, resulting in no detection of contaminants. Lack of all this information put a great uncertainty on a number of presented results and the quality of the provided data could not be fully judged and trusted. The use of these data in the appreciation of environmental impacts and/or in the risk assessment models may result in inconsistent interpretations.

Another concern was that a number of these reports presented the data on the concentrations of contaminants in the seawater – qualified as “inlet seawater”. The concentrations in the samples of the “inlet seawater” were considered as “ambient – background concentration” and frequently were used for the assessments of an added pollution and related ecological risks. However, the inlet seawater was often collected after the passage through the onboard pump system and may be contaminated mostly by metals originating from the ship itself (copper containing antifouling paints in the sea chests, cathodic pipe protection systems, also releasing copper). This portion of

contaminants, even if not directly related to the exhaust gas wash-out process, would be discharged into seawater if EGCS would not be used (cf. in Kjølholt, *et al.*, 2012) and therefore should not be regarded as ambient background concentrations.

Furthermore, in most of the reported data on contaminant concentrations in the inlet and the outlet washwaters, there was no information on the separation of dissolved, particulate or total contaminants. The extraction efficiency of the “total”, in one extraction step, that was both dissolved and particulate contaminants, was uncertain. The quantification of the contaminants’ discharge and mass budgets was biased. The so-called ambient pollution existing in the areas where ships operate may indeed come from different sources, but also from current EGCS contaminant discharges in washwater. The subtraction of contaminant concentrations in inlet water from those of outlet washwaters was basically questionable for the exposure assessments.


6.8. Inorganic Chemicals

The inorganic contaminants, like metals and SO_x present in the exhaust gases were directly related to the fuel oil quality, whereas NO_x were formed in the combustion process itself. Internationally, shipping accounted for about 17.0 Mt y⁻¹ for nitrogen oxides (NO_x) emissions and 9.7 Mt y⁻¹ of sulfur oxides (SO_x) emissions in 2012. In contrast to this, Celo, *et al.* (2015) estimated that 15% of the world’s nitrogen oxides (NO_x) emissions and 5 – 8% of sulfur oxides (SO_x) emissions was shipping related. The question was which part of these contaminant loads would be transferred from air to the sea and what were the potential long-term environmental consequences.

For all inorganic chemicals, Emission Factors (EF) were calculated. In the case of SO_x and trace metals, EFs were calculated from the concentrations measured in fuel, as it was assumed they were transferred quantitatively to exhaust gas following combustion. It was also assumed that the removal efficiency of the EGCS was 100%, which represented a worst-case discharge scenario. In the case of NO_x, EF available from the literature were used and it was assumed that 12% of NO_x was transferred from the exhaust gas to the washwater (MEPC, 2015, Resolution MEPC.259(68)).

6.8.1. SO_x

The removal of sulphur oxides (SO₂, SO₃) to reduce acid-rain-causing emissions to the atmosphere resulting from shipping activities, in compliance with MARPOL Annex VI (MEPC, 2019h), while using HSHFO (S > 0.5 % m m⁻¹) was an important driver behind the installation of EGCS systems onboard ships. The chemistry of SO_x removal by EGCS was simple, but the process results in direct and localized emissions of large washwater volumes characterized by a low pH (≈ 3) and high sulfate concentrations. As chemical reactions governing the removal of both SO₂ and SO₃ from exhaust gas results in the same overall reaction, only the former was used in the calculation below:



HSHFO mass-efficiency factor (EF_m , units of $\text{g SO}_2 \text{ kg}_{\text{HFO}}^{-1}$) and power-normalized (EF_p , units of $\text{g SO}_2 \text{ kWh}^{-1}$) EFs for SO_2 were calculated as a function of S concentration in HFO (% S by mass in HSHFO, or $g_s g_{\text{HFO}}^{-1} \times 100$), assuming that 100 % of sulfur in fuel was converted to SO_2 . Molar masses of S (MM_S) and SO_2 (MM_{SO_2}) are 32.06 and 64.07 g mol^{-1} , respectively. As 1 mole S reacts with 1 mole O_2 to yield 1 mole SO_2 , it could be written that:

$$[1] \quad \left(\frac{\% S}{100}\right) \times \left(\frac{1000 g_{\text{HFO}}}{kg_{\text{HFO}}}\right) \times \left(\frac{1}{MM_S}\right) = \left(\frac{\text{mol S}}{kg_{\text{HFO}}}\right) = \left(\frac{\text{mol SO}_2}{kg_{\text{HFO}}}\right)$$

Since EF_m for SO_2 ($EF_{m \text{ SO}_2}$) could be calculated as:

$$[2] \quad EF_{m \text{ SO}_2} = \left(\frac{\text{mol SO}_2}{kg_{\text{HFO}}}\right) \times MM_{\text{SO}_2}$$

Combination of equations [1] and [2] yields:

$$[3] \quad EF_{m \text{ SO}_2} = \left(\frac{\% S}{100}\right) \times 1000 \times \left(\frac{MM_{\text{SO}_2}}{MM_S}\right)$$

or

$$[4] \quad EF_{m \text{ SO}_2} = \% S \times 19.98$$

As the power-normalized EF for SO_2 ($EF_{p \text{ SO}_2}$) was the product of $EF_{m \text{ SO}_2}$ and specific fuel oil consumption (SFOC, units of $\text{kg}_{\text{HFO}} (\text{kWh})^{-1}$), from equation [4] one could write:

$$[5] \quad EF_{p \text{ SO}_2} = EF_{m \text{ SO}_2} \times \text{SFOC} = \% S \times 19.98 \times \text{SFOC}$$




Figure 5. Calculated values of $EF_{m \text{ SO}_2}$ ($\text{g SO}_2 \text{ kg}_{\text{HFO}}^{-1}$) and $EF_{p \text{ SO}_2}$ ($\text{g SO}_2 (\text{kWh})^{-1}$) for SO_2 as a function of S concentration in HFO. Minimum (solid line) and maximum (dotted line) values of SFOC used to calculate $EF_{p \text{ SO}_2}$ were 180 and 225 $\text{g HFO} (\text{kWh})^{-1}$, respectively

Depending on S concentration in the fuel, $EF_{m \text{ SO}_2}$ could be expected to vary from 2 to 88 $\text{g SO}_2 \text{ kg}_{\text{HFO}}^{-1}$ and $EF_{p \text{ SO}_2}$ from 0.4 to 20 $\text{g SO}_2 \text{ kWh}^{-1}$. As sulfur oxides are ultimately converted to SO_4^{2-} ions ($MM_{\text{SO}_4^{2-}} = 96.06 \text{ g mol}^{-1}$), the concentration of the latter ($[\text{SO}_4^{2-}]$, in g L^{-1}) in washwater could be calculated as a function of the flow rate in EGCS (FW, in $\text{m}^3 (\text{MWh})^{-1}$) following:

$$[6] \quad [\text{SO}_4^{2-}] = \frac{\text{EF}_{\text{p SO}_2} \times 1000 \text{ (kWh MWh}^{-1}) \times \left(\frac{MM_{\text{SO}_4^{2-}}}{MM_{\text{SO}_2}} \right)}{\text{FW} \times 1000 \text{ (L m}^{-3})} = \frac{\text{EF}_{\text{p SO}_2} \times \left(\frac{MM_{\text{SO}_4^{2-}}}{MM_{\text{SO}_2}} \right)}{\text{FW}}.$$




Figure 6. Concentration of SO_4^{2-} ion in washwater (g L^{-1}) as a function of S concentration in HFO and for $\text{SFOC} = 180 \text{ g (kWh)}^{-1}$. Values calculated for $\text{SFOC} = 225 \text{ g (kWh)}^{-1}$ are 18.8 % higher

Again, as a worst-case scenario and for the sake of simplicity, a complete conversion of SO_2 to SO_4^{2-} within the EGCS was assumed. The concentration of SO_4^{2-} ions in EGCS effluent was calculated for FW values of 50, 100 and 150 $\text{m}^3 \text{ (kWh)}^{-1}$ (Figure 6). It could be seen that SO_4^{2-} concentrations in washwater were expected to remain below the average concentration found in seawater.

The worst effect of SO_x removal by EGCS was the production and disposal of large volumes of acidic washwater ($\text{pH} \approx 3$). Corrosion may result if non-corrosion resistant material for EGCS construction and associated piping were selected. Nevertheless, a discussion on corrosion was out of the scope of the present document. At sea, EGCS usually were run at a flow rate high enough, so that the limited buffer capacity of marine waters was enough to neutralize the H^+ ions produced and comply with requirement of pH of at least 6.5 at 4 meters from the point of discharge. However, disposal of acidic washwater may adversely affect the pH of water bodies of lower alkalinity that may have a lower buffering capacity, particularly if maritime traffic was congested. To evaluate the impact of EGCS acidic washwater on seawater buffering capacity, the volume of seawater completely depleted of its buffering capacity was calculated, considering that 2 moles of H^+ ions were produced for each mole of SO_2 removed by EGCS, the mass-normalized EF of H^+ ions ($\text{EF}_{\text{m H}^+}$) it could be written from equation [1]:

$$[7] \quad \left(\frac{\text{mol H}^+}{\text{kg}_{\text{HFO}}} \right) = 2 \left(\frac{\text{mol SO}_2}{\text{kg}_{\text{HFO}}} \right) = 2 \times \left(\frac{\% \text{ S} \times 10}{32.06} \right)$$

The mass-normalized EF of H^+ ions ($\text{EF}_{\text{m H}^+}$) was then calculated with:

$$[8] \quad \text{EF}_{\text{m H}^+} = \left(\frac{\text{mol H}^+}{\text{kg}_{\text{HFO}}} \right) \times MM_{\text{H}^+} = 2 \times \left(\frac{\% \text{ S} \times 10}{32.06} \right) \times MM_{\text{H}^+} = \% \text{ S} \times 0.629$$

where MM_{H^+} was the molar mass of H^+ ions (1.008 g mol^{-1}). Power-normalized EF for H^+ ions ($EF_{p H^+}$) was given by

$$[9] \quad EF_{p H^+} = EF_{m H^+} \times SFOC = \%S \times 0.629 \times SFOC.$$

The volume of buffer-depleted seawater (in $\text{m}^3 \text{ kg}_{\text{HFO}}^{-1}$ or $\text{m}^3 (\text{kWh})^{-1}$) as a function of Alkalinity (in $\text{mol } H^+ \text{ L}^{-1}$) and EFs was then:

$$[10] \quad V_{\text{buffer-deplete}} = \left(\frac{EF_{m H^+} \text{ or } EF_{p H^+}}{\text{Alkalinity} \times MM_{H^+}} \right) \times \left(\frac{\text{m}^3}{1000 \text{ L}} \right)$$

The volume of buffer-depleted normal seawater as a function of S concentration in fuel was calculated as an example (Figure 7). In the case of high-sulfur fuels, the volume of buffer-depleted seawater could reach up to a cubic meter for each kg of fuel burned. These figures were inversely proportional to alkalinity. This meant that the impact of EGCS washwater could be more important in water bodies with low salinity and low alkalinity. The Central Baltic Sea had an alkalinity of ca. 1.5 meq L^{-1} and it could be as low as $0.7 - 1.0 \text{ meq L}^{-1}$ in the Gulf of Bothnia and the Gulf of Finland (Muller, *et al.*, 2016). $V_{\text{buffer-depleted}}$ being inversely proportional to alkalinity, its value for a given S concentration in fuel oil would be 1.53, 2.30 and 3.28 times higher at 1.5 , 1.0 and 0.7 meq L^{-1} , compared to 2.3 meq L^{-1} .









Figure 7. Volume of buffer-depleted normal seawater ($\text{m}^3 \text{ kg}_{\text{HFO}}^{-1}$ and $\text{m}^3 (\text{kWh})^{-1}$) as a function of S concentration in HFO (left panel). Alkalinity was 2.3 meq L^{-1} . Minimum (solid line) and maximum (dotted line) values of SFOC (right panel) used to calculate $EF_{p H^+}$ were 180 and $225 \text{ g HFO (kWh)}^{-1}$, respectively

6.8.2 NOx

Production of nitrogen oxides resulted from the reaction of atmospheric N_2 with O_2 under high pressures and high temperatures typical of marine diesel engines. Briefly, nitrogen gas first formed NO with oxygen, which would further be oxidized to NO_2 . Water solubility of NO was negligible whereas NO_2 readily would produce nitrous and nitric acids with water. Ultimately, nitrous acid would be oxidized to nitric acid, which dissociated to H^+ and NO_3^- ions.





Emission factors for NO_x were not easily predictable as their value fluctuated with the type of fuel (e.g., residual fuel oil versus marine distillate), engines and actual load. Measured values of EF_{NO_x} from Tier 1 engines found in the literature (Agrawal, *et al.*, 2010, Cooper and Andreasson, 1999, Cooper and Gustaffson, 2004, Zetterdahl, *et al.*, 2016) were on average 12.5 ± 3.2 g NO_x (kWh)⁻¹ (range 7.5 – 18.7) and 64 ± 18 g NO_x kg_{HFO}⁻¹ (range 36 – 93) for ship engines of at least 4.5 MW and burning heavy fuel oil (or residual oil) or marine distillate. Considering that 12% of NO_x was assumed to be transferred from the exhaust gas to the EGCS washwater (MEPC, 2015, Resolution MEPC.259(68)), that NO_x values are usually reported as NO₂, that 1 mole NO₂ transferred to EGCS washwater will be ultimately converted to 1 mole HNO₃, EF values for NO₂, H⁺ and nitrate ion were calculated and are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. H⁺ and nitrate ion emission factors for EGCS

	EF _m (g kg _{HFO} ⁻¹)		EF _p (g (kWh) ⁻¹)	
	X ± SD	range	X ± SD	range
NO₂	7.7 ± 2.2	4.3 – 11.2	1.5 ± 0.4	0.9 – 2.2
H⁺	0.26 ± 0.07	0.14 – 0.37	0.051 ± 0.013	0.030 – 0.075
	V _{buffer-depleted} (m ³ kg _{HFO} ⁻¹) (alkalinity = 2.3 meq H ⁺ L ⁻¹) 0.014 ± 0.004 (range 0.008 – 0.021)			
	EF _m (g kg _{HFO} ⁻¹)		EF _p (g (kWh) ⁻¹)	
	X ± SD	range	X ± SD	range
NO₃⁻	15.9 ± 4.4	8.9 – 23.0	3.1 ± 0.8	1.9 – 4.6
	Load (kg kton _{HFO} ⁻¹) 15 900 ± 4400 (range 8900 – 23,000)			

Environmental impacts of SO_x and NO_x

The acidification process in the ocean was enhanced by the deposition of anthropogenic SO_x and NO_x (Doney, *et al.*, 2007). Through modelling projections on the basin scale of the Baltic Sea, it had been shown that ships would become the major source of strong acid addition to surface marine waters (Turner, *et al.*, 2017). This acid burden from shipping may also be significant in the open ocean. It had been estimated that emissions of SO_x and NO_x in the heavily trafficked waters of the open ocean could lead to significant regional pH reductions of the same order of magnitude as anthropogenic CO₂-driven acidification (Hassellöv, *et al.*, 2013; Stips, *et al.*, 2016). This later publication found critical regions with high ship traffic intensity, for example along shipping lanes and

in the Rotterdam port area (Stips, *et al.*, 2016). Here the contribution from SO₂ injection could be as much as 20 times larger than the North Sea mean (decrease of SO_x and NO_x = 0.0025 y⁻¹) and would therefore be about double the impact from increasing CO₂ concentrations.

The relative contribution of NO_x and SO_x to ocean acidification was dependent upon the concentration of S in fuel (Figure 8): with low sulfur fuels, NO_x emissions were responsible for most of the water acidification whereas their contribution would become negligible compared to SO_x in high-sulfur fuels.




Figure 8. Relative contribution of NO_x and SO_x emissions on water acidification

Eutrophication

Eutrophication was considered a relevant environmental problem for different areas of the world oceans (Gauss, *et al.*, 2013). Shipping contributed to nitrate emission and therefore, to the eutrophication processes especially in specific areas such as coastal semi-enclosed seas where nitrogen may be the limiting nutrient. (EEA, 2015, HELCOM, 2015; Jonson, *et al.*, 2015 and references therein). In more offshore and oligotrophic regions, away from direct terrestrial agricultural runoff, ship derived nitrogen, but also limiting iron, may have effects on the productivity of pelagic phytoplankton and its community structure (EEA, 2015, HELCOM, 2015, Endres, *et al.*, 2018).

IMO MARPOL guidelines limited the discharge of nitrates in washwater effluent stating that EGCS NO_x removal from the exhaust gases should not be more than 12% and / or below 60 mg L⁻¹ normalized concentration in washwater discharge rate at 45 m³ (MWh)⁻¹ (IMO, 2008b).

Most of the surveyed studies showed that the nitrogen amount washed out by EGCS was relatively limited and its concentrations in the washwaters were well below IMO guidelines (Hufnagl, *et al.* 2005, BSH, 2019, Boer den and Hoen, 2015). Hufnagl, *et al.* (2005), indicated that EGCS nitrogen from washwater appeared unlikely to cause a concern, because the quantities compared to other sources were very low and should be quickly assimilated in marine ecosystems. The BSH (2019) study showed that in the maximum EGCS installation scenario (in North Sea, English Channel, and Baltic Sea), EGCS

wastewater discharge of nitrates was significantly lower than river Rhine inputs in the North Sea. Therefore, the potential for significant increase of primary production and eutrophication appeared to be low.

Finally, it should be also noted that part of the exhaust NO_x emissions would end up in the sea, independent of the use of an EGCS. This was mainly because, as noted above, most of NO_x was not well soluble and was not removed in any significant quantities from exhaust gasses, whereas it was a major nitrogen chemical species in diesel engine exhausts.

6.8.3. Trace metals

Major and trace elements in HFO

The most abundant metal element in the heavy fuel oils was vanadium (V), which was also particularly toxic (Thompson and Orvig, 2003). It was followed by other metals such as Ni, Fe, Ca, Na present in significant amounts and other less-abundant species: Si, Al, Zn, Cr, Cu, K, Ba, Mo, Mn, Mg, Sn and trace elements As, Cd and Hg. Mainly V, Ni and Fe were known as the indigenous elements of crude oils, but their relative composition varied from oil to oil (Celo, *et al.*, 2015). It was recognized that almost all content of metals present in HFO may be transferred into exhaust gas and ultimately into washwaters (Celo, *et al.*, 2015). The EFs of these elements were correlated with their concentrations in the fuel (Agrawal, *et al.*, 2008a and b, Stippula, *et al.*, 2014, Moldanová, *et al.*, 2009). Therefore, the composition of metals in the washwaters would vary depending on the fuel oil used. Other parameters, such as type and technology of the engine, speed of operation and engine load would also affect the chemical composition of ship exhausts and washwaters. For instance, the prevalence of V and Ni in ship plumes was also reported in a number of studies and was used as an indicator of the contribution of shipping to the emissions in the regions of heavy maritime traffic (Celo, *et al.*, 2015 and references therein). The minor trace elements were also determined in the lanthanoid series, where the major elements were La and Ce (Celo, *et al.*, 2015). These elements together with V and Ni were considered as possible tracers of primary PM emissions by marine shipping (Viana, *et al.*, 2009, Celo, *et al.*, 2015, Viana, *et al.*, 2014; and references therein). The majority of studies on trace metals coming from EGCS focus on: As, Cd, Co, Cr, Cu, Fe, Mn, V, Ni, Pb and Zn as being of potential environmental concern.

Environmental Trace Metal Concentrations

The rationale for the presentation of contaminants' ambient environmental concentrations was given under the PAH paragraph (see below). The fundamentals of this discussion are also relevant for trace metals.

Total trace element concentrations in the open sea and seawaters (Atlantic, Pacific and Indian oceans), and available coastal regional waters were given in the Table 5. Metal data for harbour seawater was scarce and was expected to be highly variable. (Broeker and Peng, 1982, Bruland and Lohan, 2004, Mason, 2013, Chakraborty and Owens, 2014, Jahan and Strezov, 2017, Martínez-Soto, *et al.*, 2016). In harbours, most of the available data reported is on the sediment compartment. Therefore, the data presented in Table 5 should not be taken as representative values for harbour zones but was reported to show the variability of metal concentrations. This showed that EGCS

washwaters may impact the marine environment to various extents, mostly depending on local anthropogenic activities. That also meant that pristine marine environments like many “paradise islands” and other touristic spots may be significantly impacted by the presence of cruise ships.

As a rule of thumb, metal concentrations in coastal seas and harbours were 2 to 3 orders of magnitude higher than in open sea respectively.

**Table 5. Total Trace Metal Concentrations ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$) reported in different areas;
< indicates below detection limit**

[$\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$]	World Open Ocean			World Coastal waters		Australia Harbour 1		Australia Harbour 2		Mao Minorca Harbour	
Element	min	max	average	min	max	min	max	min	max	min	max
V	1.5	2.0	1.5	-	-			3	8		
Fe	0.001	0.1	0.03	-	-	180	350	8	530	0.07	1.9
Ni	0.1	0.7	0.5	0.9	2.1	0.3	1.9	BDL	9	0.16	0.35
Pb	<0.002	0.03	0.02	1.0	1.5	0.4	55	1	7	0.04	0.5
Zn	0.003	0.6	0.3	12	22	14	67	1	35	0.1	3.9
Cd	<0.001	0.1	0.06	-	-	0.1	0.8	1	7	0.01	0.04
Hg	<0.002	-	0.0004	-	-	-	-	BDL	BDL		
As	1.5	1.9	1.7	0.8	1.5	3.2	8.2	2	8		
Cr	0.2	0.3	0.2	-	-	0.4	1.3	1	2		
Cu	0.03	0.3	0.3	0.9	1.9	0.9	350	1	40	0.1	3.4
Mn	0.004	0.27	0.02	1.1	6.0	6.5	160	1	51		
Al	0.01	1.1	0.5	-	-	-	-	1	1200		
Co	<0.0006	0.001	0.001	-	-	2.2	5	1	2	0.01	0.04
Mo	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	6	13	9.1	14
Ag	<0.001	0.004	0.002	-	-	-	-	BDL	1		
Se	0.04	0.2	0.1	-	-	-	-	1	5		

At seawater pH conditions, metals were mostly adsorbed onto particulates (ca. 80 to 99%), the dissolved part represented a small fraction of the total metal concentration (ca. 20 to 1%). As described in Hatje, *et al.* (2003) metal desorption depends on pH, SPM loading and salinity. Desorption of particulate metals was correlated to pH change towards acidic conditions.

Washwater concentrations of metals

The desorption of metals increased sharply within narrow changes of pH (1 to 2 units) for Cu, Zn, Cd and Ni. Increasing release of metals to the dissolved phase was expected in the EGCS washwater effluents, because of their high acidity, thus enhancing metals bioavailability in the receiving ambient seawaters. This in turn would make these metals releases of greater concern for the health of coastal communities.

Although only limited data were currently available on monitoring of metals in EGCS washwaters, the reviewed surveyed studies on open-loop scrubber washwater indicates high to very high metal

concentrations. The summary table of the examined results was given in the Appendix, Table A2. The wide ranges of metals concentrations were determined in EGCS washwaters.

Vanadium had been found to be the dominating dissolved metal in several EGCS effluent studies with concentrations ranging from 10 – 300 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ in OL and 3 – 9 ng L^{-1} in CL EGCS study (PPR 6/INF.20). This compared well with a measurement campaign carried out by EGCSA and Carnival, where on average 210 and 140 $\mu\text{g V L}^{-1}$ in OL washwater were found, respectively. However, the average concentrations may be influenced by non-detected or below detection limit results. The overall range found for V was from 10 to 860 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$.

The solubility of V_2O_5 was 0.92 g L^{-1} at a temperature of 20 °C. The predicted no effect concentration (PNEC) of V_2O_5 for marine water was 2.5 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ and 240 mg kg^{-1} for sediments (ECHA, 2019b). All of the measured V_2O_5 concentrations are higher than this PNEC value for seawater. A recent study to determine levels for water quality guidelines in the case of bitumen extraction in Canada (Schiffer and Liber, *et al.*, 2017) had also shown the acute and chronic toxicity of V on marine zoo- and phytoplankton. V concentrations starting at 0.1 mg L^{-1} seemed to impact adversely the zooplankton. ISO 8217 specifies that maximum concentration of V should be limited to <150 mg kg^{-1} . The estimated concentration of V in washwater, using the ISO specification, SFOC (g-fuel (kWh)^{-1}) and average flow rate of EGCS ($\text{m}^3 (\text{MWh})^{-1}$), was about 3 times higher than the above mentioned concentration of 0.1 mg L^{-1} , therefore, further assessment will be needed for potential risk by V.

Table 6. Average concentrations and ratios of heavy metals in the dissolved versus the particulate phase in EGCS washwater on the basis of measured data from PPR 6/INF.20

[$\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$]	Average diss. conc. OL discharge	Average diss. conc. CL discharge	Average part. conc. OL discharge	Average part. conc. CL discharge	Ratio diss./part. OL discharges	Ratio diss./part. CL discharges
V	78	5700	11	620	7.4	9.3
Ni	16	1200	3.8	280	4.1	4.4
Cu	6.4	18	0.7	4.4	9.1	4.1
Zn	4.7	150	0.3	53	16	2.9
As	3.3	15	<LOD	1		15
Cd	0.03	0.14	<LOD	0.01		14
Pb	0.08	0.01	0.08	1.2	1.0	0.01

As stated above, due to the high acidity of the washwater, the solubility of metals was increased. This was supported by a measurement campaign of the BSH (PPR 6/INF.20), where both particulate and dissolved heavy metals were analyzed. The average dissolved vanadium concentration had been found to be ca. 7 times (OL) to 9 times (CL) higher than the average particulate vanadium analyzed in the suspended matter (Table 6). The same trend holds true for all the other metals.

The environmental potential impacts of copper and zinc discharged by EGCS were recently presented by Turner, *et al.*, 2017. The average concentrations of both copper and zinc in washwaters were 6 and 340 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$, respectively. The highest total copper and zinc concentrations reported in discharge

water were 260 and 537 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$, respectively (Appendix, Table A2). In total, 18 discharge waters have been analyzed for metal concentrations and the average concentrations of copper and zinc are 60 and 136 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$, respectively (Table 6). Thus, the average daily load of copper and zinc from a medium-sized RoRo vessel equipped with a 12 MW main engine would be 780 g Cu and 1770 g Zn.

Estimated concentrations and discharges of metals

Mass-standardized emission factor (EF_m) values for V, Fe, Ni, Pb, Zn, Cd, Hg, As, Cr and Cu were taken as their concentrations measured in HSHFO (Moldanova, *et al.*, 2009; Agrawal, *et al.*, 2010; Cooper and Gustafsson, 2004; Linak and Miller, 2000; Corbin, *et al.*, 2018; Huffman, *et al.*, 2000; Table 7). Power-standardized emission factors (EF_p) were calculated in turn for a SFOC of 0.19 $\text{kg}_{\text{HFO}} (\text{kWh})^{-1}$ with:

$$EF_p = EF_m \times SFOC = g (\text{kWh})^{-1}.$$

Table 7. Mass-standardized emission factor (EF_m) values for V, Fe, Ni, Pb, Zn, Cd, Hg, As, Cr and Cu and power-standardized emission factors (EF_p) calculated for a SFOC of 0.19 kg HFO (kWh)⁻¹

Element	Concentration in HFO (g kg^{-1}) = EF_m				EF_p (g (kWh)^{-1} , SFOC = 0.19 ($\text{kg}_{\text{HFO}} (\text{kWh})^{-1}$))			
	Mean	SD	min	max	Mean	SD	min	max
V	1.2E-01	6.9E-02	3.5E-02	2.2E-01	2.3E-02	1.3E-02	6.7E-03	4.2E-02
Fe	1.9E-02	4.4E-03	1.3E-02	2.5E-02	3.7E-03	8.4E-04	2.5E-03	4.8E-03
Ni	2.9E-02	6.1E-03	1.7E-02	3.5E-02	5.4E-03	1.2E-03	3.2E-03	6.7E-03
Pb	1.7E-03	2.0E-03	1.0E-04	4.5E-03	3.2E-04	3.7E-04	1.9E-05	8.6E-04
Zn	2.3E-02	3.5E-02	1.0E-03	7.4E-02	4.3E-03	6.6E-03	1.9E-04	1.4E-02
Cd	4.6E-04	2.6E-04	1.3E-05	6.0E-04	8.8E-05	4.8E-05	2.5E-06	1.1E-04
Hg	7.7E-05	4.7E-05	3.0E-06	1.2E-04	1.5E-05	8.8E-06	5.7E-07	2.3E-05
As	3.1E-04	3.0E-04	1.0E-04	8.5E-04	5.9E-05	5.8E-05	1.9E-05	1.6E-04
Cr	1.1E-03	9.3E-05	9.6E-04	1.2E-03	2.0E-04	1.8E-05	1.8E-04	2.3E-04
Cu	1.8E-03	1.4E-03	5.6E-04	3.5E-03	3.5E-04	2.6E-04	1.1E-04	6.7E-04

A range of trace metals concentration in discharge water was calculated using minimum and maximum values of EF_p and a flow rate FW of 100 $\text{m}^3 \text{MWh}^{-1}$. This figure was compared with concentration data for trace metals in OL EGCS at discharge published by Koski, *et al.* (2017), PPR (2018, PPR 6/INF.20 in the figure), MEPC (2019f, CESA, open loop in the figure) and BSH, (2019, Germany in the figure). It may be concluded from this figure that the concentration ranges predicted (white boxes in figure 9) from the calculated metals EFs correspond quite well to the concentrations actually measured. This may be used as a tool for environmental risk assessment and to detect anomalies, such as too high Cu, Zn and Cr concentrations that may be indicative of EGCS corrosion.

The BSH preliminary report (2019) provided an assessment of metals (and for other contaminants, see below for PAHs) discharge-loads from open loop systems (and also close loop) to the Baltic Sea, North Sea and English Channel. The estimations were performed for EGCS “current status” - CSS and “maximum installation” MIS scenarios, taking into account shipping activities, washwater water flow

rates, and actual contaminant concentrations in wastewater effluents. In the current scenario situation, the total (dissolved and particulate fractions) annual discharge of studied metals in the area of the North Sea, Baltic Sea and the English Channel were in the ranges: V (4 – 8 tons), Ni (2 – 26 t), Cu (0.6 – 7 t), Zn (0.8 – 46 t), As (0.4 – 2 t), Cd (0.003 – 0.02 t) and Pb (0.03 – 0.8 t). In the maximum installation scenario, these discharges for metals with washwaters effluents were: V (41 – 1010 t), Ni (18 – 240 t), Cu (5 – 63 t), Zn (7 – 430 t), As (3 – 22 t), Cd (0.02 – 0.25 t) and Pb (0.3 – 7 t). These ranges indicated significant inputs of metals accumulating in the environment. This situation presented a problem for some coastal areas with high shipping density and potential exceedance of environmental quality standards. The inputs of these elements coming from EGCS washwaters may, at local scales, in such areas, impair achieving good environmental status, failing the objectives of international agreements and regulations such as European Directives (MSFD, WFD and others).




Figure 9. Minimum and maximum concentrations were used to calculate a range of EF values for each metal

Metal environmental impacts

Certain trace metals had essential biological functions within a narrow range of optimal concentrations (essential elements), while others had no known biological role (non-essential elements) and were recognized for their toxic effects on aquatic organisms, even at low concentrations (Mason, 2013). The addition of both essential and non-essential elements into marine environment led to effects and impacts. Taxa- and species-specific metal regulation mechanisms (*i.e.* uptake, storage and/or elimination) had been described for both essential and non-essential elements (Wang and Rainbow, 2010). Their transfer between biogeochemical compartments, bioconcentration in organisms and biomagnification in food webs depended on their concentrations and speciation in both abiotic (habitat) and biotic (food sources) environments (Neff, 2002; Rainbow, 2002). Marine organisms were hence exposed to and accumulate contaminants via dissolved and

trophic pathways; the latter being the main route for trace metal intake by medium to high trophic level consumers such as fish (Mathews and Fisher, 2009; Pouil, *et al.*, 2016).

In a recent study, Koski, *et al.* (2017) investigated the threshold concentrations of metals in the EGCS discharge washwaters for survival, feeding and reproduction for the copepod, *Acartia tonsa*, and how the determined responses depended on the exposure routes. They also looked at whether the effects of discharge washwaters could be detected in field-collected organisms. Their findings indicated that a direct exposure to discharge EGCS washwaters increased adult copepod mortality and reduced feeding. The metals concentrations were orders of magnitude lower than the lethal concentrations suggesting synergistic effects on plankton productivity and bioaccumulation of metals. Ytreberg, *et al.* (2019) investigated how microplankton species and communities may be affected by EGCS washwater discharges in the Baltic Sea. The main result showed scrubber washwater to stimulate the microplankton community; shown in increased chlorophyll *a* concentrations as well as POP, POC and PON concentrations in the 10% scrubber washwater treatment. Cd and Pb toxicity thresholds had also been studied for marine phytoplankton (Echeveste, *et al.*, 2012). Values of $0.2 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ g L}^{-1}$ and $20 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ g L}^{-1}$ of Cd and Pb respectively were found to be lethal (LC50). Considering that HFO Cd and Pb concentrations are 2000 and 85 times higher than these thresholds respectively, acute toxic effects arising from the discharge by EGCS of these elements might also be considered.

Trace metals discharge limits

Up to this date, there were no regulations or guidelines for specific trace metals discharge concentrations in EGCS washwaters. However, the MEPC 2015 Guidelines stated that the environmental criteria for EGCS residues needed updating and that ship owners and scrubber manufacturers were requested to additionally monitor heavy metals such as cadmium, copper, nickel, lead, zinc, arsenic, chromium, and vanadium in the washwater. The Task Team on EGCS recommended the development of harmonized guideline procedures for selected trace metal concentrations in EGCS washwater effluents.

6.9 Particulate Matter

Particulate matter (PM), along with the gas-phase, was one of most studied fractions emitted in exhaust gases from the marine diesel engines. The emitted particulate matter (PM) properties, mass, size distribution, chemical composition and structures were extensively investigated (Moldanovà, *et al.*, 2009 and references therein). A number of recent studies linked PM of ship emissions to both negative health effects for exposed populations, and to significant changes in climate patterns (Corbett, *et al.*, 2007, Tronstad, *et al.*, 2012, Fuglestad, *et al.*, 2009). With the actual growth trend in utilization of EGCS, new studies were carried out in order to clarify the effects of EGCS introduction on particle mass, number and size, and related chemicals emissions, in the wide context of health hazards and global environmental impacts (Lehtoranta, *et al.*, 2019 and references therein).

In the present report, the Task Team did not review the large number of scientific publications on emissions and impacts of PM, which would be out of the scope of the ToR. The surveyed studies in the background documents did not provide much information on how EGCS affect particulate matter. However, considering the large spectrum of PM environmental impacts and its crucial role as

the main carrier of different chemicals this topic should be further examined in the context of EGCS washwater effluents discharge.

6.10 Organic Contaminants

A great number of organic contaminants were emitted by ships diesel engines through either incomplete combustion of the fuel or via formation during the combustion processes. All of these chemicals may be found in EGCS washwater. The amounts and chemical composition of emitted compounds was related to the type of fuel used and the engine operations. The numerous organic compounds determined in the exhaust gas of marine engines were mainly hydrocarbons like linear and cyclic hydrocarbons (*e.g.* alkanes, alkenes, terpenes, etc.), mono-aromatics (benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, xylene, together often named BTEX) and a great number of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). A large group of organic compounds was also more operationally defined as non-methane volatile organic compounds (NMVOC), covering a variety of volatile hydrocarbons, aldehydes, ketones and others.

The emission factors for many of the individual chemicals and their groups for marine engines were reported by Agrawal, *et al.*, 2010, Cooper and Peterson, 1996, Cooper and Andreasson, 1999, Cooper, 2001, Cooper and Gustaffson, 2004, and Zetterdahl, *et al.*, 2016. Methane, together with black carbon and N₂O were quantified as shipping non-CO₂ climate pollutants, whereas NMVOC and other contaminants belonged to air pollutants because of their volatility (Smith, *et al.*, 2015, Olmer, *et al.*, 2017). The amounts of NMVOC emitted by international ships were estimated to be globally 609 kt (kilotons) in 2012, whilst Olmer, *et al.* (2017) estimated an amount of 795 kt in 2015. Toxic halogenated organic compounds were also identified in the marine combustion exhaust gases and particles. The groups of compounds such as polychlorinated dibenzodioxins (PCDDs) and dibenzofurans (PCDFs), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB) were found at low trace levels and should also be accounted for in their environmental budgets.

Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs)

IMO had already regulated the maximum PAH concentration in the discharged EGCS washwaters from the viewpoint of environmental protection. Furthermore, PAHs were the largest known group of carcinogenic substances recognized as global contaminants and being on the lists of priority pollutants in regional frameworks (EPA, 2014; EU, 2013). They were persistent compounds and accumulate in the marine environment. As potential mutagens and/or carcinogens (Allen, *et al.*, 1998; Durant, *et al.*, 1998) PAHs represented a significant public health concern and threats to ecosystems. The total PAH emissions from shipping operations were seen as a significant contributor to their global budgets (Shen, *et al.*, 2013). Environmental quality standards (OSPAR, 2004, EU, 2013 and US EPA, 2014) existed for certain PAH compounds in these regional frameworks.

PAH environmental concentration

The concentrations of PAHs in marine waters were relatively well documented in scientific literature (González-Gaya *et al.*, 2016, Lohmann, *et al.*, 2013 and references there in). An in-depth and critical review of bibliographic data was not attempted in this report. The intention was to assess the ranges

for environmental concentrations of PAHs to be regarded as their reference levels for environmental assessments of EGCS discharge. The concentrations of PAHs in marine waters are generally in the wide range from parts per quadrillion (ppq – pg L⁻¹) to parts per billion (ppb - µg L⁻¹). Such wide ranges and low levels of concentrations required suitable analytical techniques and often large volumes of water samples to perform the analysis. Gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS) has become the leading reference technique for the analysis of PAHs. The highest environmental concentrations of PAHs were reported in specific areas: ports, harbours, after operational and accidental oil spills and in certain environments such as for instance in macro-tidal estuaries with maximum turbidity zones (Zhou, *et al.*, 2000, Reddy and Quinn, 2001, Tronczynski, *et al.*, 2004, González, *et al.*, 2006). The developments of complementary analytical techniques (Time of Flight Mass Spectrometry (ToF-MS), Gas Chromatography Mass Spectrometry (could be double MS) (GC-MS-MS), Ion Trap Mass Spectrometry (ITMS) and Gas Chromatography Triple Quad Mass Spectrometry (GC-TQ-MS)) had also allowed the detection of PAHs at very low levels including those in open ocean waters. Whereas the relevance of being able to detect very low concentrations of PAHs should be now taken into account and linked to risk assessment which in turn should result in a sensible policy as far as monitoring was concerned.

As an example, the Task Team had assembled data on PAH concentrations in open oceanic waters, coastal waters and for oil spills in Table 8. PAH was a loosely defined analyte, because it was a mixture of many compounds. Therefore, their summarized concentrations varied and depended on which and how many individual compounds were quantified and summarized. For example, Guigue, *et al.* (2011, 2014) reported that when taking into account alkylated derivatives (*i.e.*, mono-, di-, tri- or tetra-methyl PAHs) the concentration of dissolved total PAHs may increase by a factor 1.5 – 3 in coastal and harbour waters.

Table 8. Dissolved PAHs environmental concentrations (ng L⁻¹)

Ocean area	Mean	Range	Σ PAH Sum range	References
Open ocean		0.1 – 10	Σ13 – 19	Witt and Matthäus, 2001; Stortini, <i>et al.</i> , 2009; Berrojalbiz, <i>et al.</i> , 2011
Coastal areas		1.6 – 500	Σ13 – 19	Guitart, <i>et al.</i> , 2007; Valavanidis, <i>et al.</i> , 2008; Qiu, <i>et al.</i> , 2009 Tronczynski, <i>et al.</i> , 2004
North Atlantic	1.8		Σ16	González-Gaya, <i>et al.</i> , 2016
South Atlantic	2.0		Σ16	González-Gaya, <i>et al.</i> , 2016
North Pacific	1.4		Σ16	González-Gaya, <i>et al.</i> , 2016
South Pacific	1.5		Σ16	González-Gaya, <i>et al.</i> , 2016
Indian	1.1		Σ16	González-Gaya, <i>et al.</i> , 2016
West Atlantic		0.8 – 2.8	Σ16	Tronczynski, <i>et al.</i> , 2004
East Atlantic	0.4	0.2 – 0.7	phenanthrene	Nizzetto, <i>et al.</i> , 2008
Atlantic	0.2	0.03 – 1.4	phenanthrene	Lohmann, <i>et al.</i> , 2013
Oil spills		3.9 – 100 000	Different ranges	Reddy and Quinn, 2001; Tronczynski, <i>et al.</i> , 2004; González, <i>et al.</i> , 2006; Reddy, <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Wade, <i>et al.</i> , 2016

The concentrations of particulate PAHs (associated with suspended matter in the water column and sediments) were not reported here. The ranges of concentrations varied widely – from open sea to coastal and estuarine environments. In the water column particulate PAH concentrations often depended on the levels of suspended particulate matter (SPM). In shallow waters, estuaries and ports particulate PAH concentrations may vary with natural (tides, currents) and mechanical (e.g. dragging, ship propellers) bottom sediment resuspension.

PAH concentrations in EGCS washwaters

The Task Team took firstly into consideration available data on the PAH analysis carried out using gas chromatography coupled to mass spectrometry (GC-MS). The optical method with UV/fluorescence sensor continuous determination of phenanthrene will be discussed later.

The sources of PAH in scrubber washwater were three-fold: PAH could constitute a large fraction of the fuel oils (petrogenic PAH), which by incomplete combustion could end up in the exhaust gas (Czech, *et al.*, 2018) and finally in the EGCS washwater. The same would hold true for the lubrication oil. The third source was the formation of PAH during combustion (pyrogenic PAH). Marine fuels like heavy fuel oils (HFO) were composed of tens of thousands of compounds with c. 75% hydrocarbons, including PAHs (OSPAR, 2004).

Pyrogenic PAH either occurred in the gas phase (2-3 ring PAH) or attached to particles like soot (4-6 ring PAH) (Neff, 2002). There were many studies specifying the 16 EPA PAH, but there was little information on their derivatives like alkylated PAH, although they were more abundant in the environmental compartments, persistent, and sometimes more toxic (Casala, *et al.*, 2014). The results on PAH concentrations in EGCS washwaters published as surveyed reports of EGCS trials had not been peer reviewed. A number of these reports were submitted to the Task Team on EGCS in the series of background documents, whereas available evidence on PAH concentrations and their thorough chemical characterization in EGCS washwaters, published in peer reviewed scientific literature was very limited or not found.

The concentrations of PAHs in washwater for open loop EGCS were at the range of ppb levels ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$) as summarized from selected number of surveyed studies (Table 9). The summary table of all examined results was given in Appendix, Table A2. These reported concentrations were not normalized on washwater flow rate (except for EGCSA, 2018), but were only for non-substituted parent PAHs and might be 2 to 3 times higher if alkylated homologues would be added (Guigue, *et al.*, 2014, BSH, 2019).

Based on all evaluated background documents, an average relative distribution of the (dissolved) parent 16 PAH in the EGCS washwater was calculated. The data were presented in the Appendix, Table A2, references were in the footnote of the table. Figure 10 showed the averaged PAH concentrations of all measurement campaigns. The dominant PAH were naphthalene (42%), phenanthrene (18%) and pyrene (8%) in EGCS effluents. Their average (maximum) concentrations were 1.8 (14), 1.2 (6.1) and 0.17 (2.6) $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$, respectively.

Table 9. Ranges of summed concentrations of parent Σ PAH_{EPA-16} and phenanthrene in EGCS washwater (in open loop operation); concentrations adjusted to 45 m³ (MWh)⁻¹ washwater flow rate only for EGCSA (2018). BSH data was only from a preliminary report, the full report was expected in 2019

Source	PPR 6/INF.20, BSH, 2019	MEPC 73/INF5, EGCSA, 2018	Magnusson, <i>et al.</i> , 2018	Hufnagl, <i>et al.</i> , 2005
Σ PAH _{EPA-16} ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$)	1.6 – 19	0.5 – 24	22	12. – 20
Phenanthrene ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$)	0.7 – 2.9	0.08 – 6.1	10	5.1 – 8.2




Figure 10. Relative 16 EPA PAH based on all measurement campaigns

Almost none of the PAH determinations in washwaters was done on separate particulate and dissolved fractions, whereas a great portion of the total PAHs emitted by diesel engines were bound to soot particles (Hufnagl, *et al.*, 2005; Buhaug, *et al.*, 2006). A significant fraction of particulate PAHs in washwaters was thus not determined by many of the surveyed studies. This was a gap to be taken into account in the further appreciation of EGCS PAH risks. Most of the results systematically showed prevalence of lower molecular weight PAHs (2-3 rings) in the EGCS washwaters, indicating predominance of dissolved PAH compounds. These results suggested again that the particulate PAH fraction (with higher molecular weight) may be underestimated.

The low molecular weight (LMW) PAHs with 2 to 3 rings ($\text{Log } K_{ow} < 4$) were usually dispersed in the water column and were less persistent in the environment because of their high volatility. High molecular weight (HMW) PAHs (*e.g.*, 3 rings and more) were more hydrophobic ($\text{Log } K_{ow} > 4$) and therefore, less water soluble and more persistent (Rice, *et al.*, 2001). HMW PAH tended to adsorb to particles and soot that were dispersed in the scrubber washwater and would be discharged, unless filtered.

PAH solubility in freshwater decreased with increasing PAH molecular weight (Appendix, Table A1). The solubility of some alkyl-PAHs was greater than that of the parent compounds and decreased with an increase of alkylation. With increasing seawater salinity, the solubility of PAH tended to decrease with decreasing water temperature (Neff, 2002). At all salinities and temperatures, anthracene was less soluble than its isomer, phenanthrene. These physical properties of PAH affected their bioavailability and toxicity to freshwater and marine organisms (Neff, *et al.*, 2004).

As already stated above, the review of the Task Team revealed significant issues with methodological protocols and on how the measurements were actually organized and performed. This was important with analysis of PAH concentrations in EGCS washwaters and especially when their potential environmental impacts should be assessed (and not merely examination of EGCS compliance performance). Not normalized conditions of test studies, for instance, engine power and operating loads, washwater flows, resulted in different PAH emissions in exhaust gases and consequently in discharged EGCS effluent washwaters.

Other PAH

The 16 EPA PAH compounds encompassed only parent PAHs. However, there were many other potentially toxic polyaromatic compounds (PACs). In environmental toxicity studies where fossil material was involved, adherence to the EPA list underestimated the toxic potential of the analyzed material (Andersson and Achten, 2015). Three groups of polycyclic aromatic compounds (PAC) were missing: larger PAHs, alkylated PACs, and compounds containing heteroatoms (mainly N, O, S). All of the parent PAH occur in single- or multi-alkylated forms. The NOS-heterocyclic compounds contained a heteroatom in their internal structure, *e.g.*, like dibenzofurans including a central oxygen atom.

Table A1 in the Appendix clearly showed the increasing toxicity with increasing number of alkylation. For naphthalene the acute and chronic toxicities increased by a factor of 116 and 237 times, respectively from the parent naphthalene to the 4-fold methylated naphthalene (C4-naphthalene). The same trend could be found for phenanthrene, where the toxicity of C4-phenanthrene was even higher than that of benzo[a]pyrene. The high aromatic content of HFO also caused a high concentration of PAH derivatives. For almost all PAHs, the highest concentrations of alkylated PAH were present, *e.g.* the C3-alkylated naphthalene derivatives.

In the BSH measurement campaign (PPR 6 INF.20) also two methylated naphthalenes were analyzed and found in significant concentrations ($2 - 19 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$) for 1-methyl and 2-methyl naphthalene, respectively, in OL scrubber discharge water. The total dissolved 16 EPA PAH were $4.7 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ on average (min. 1.2 ; max $13 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$). This result showed that the detection of only two methylated PAH already exceeded the concentration of the parent PAH by a factor of 4.5. Magnussen, *et al.* (2018) measured a variety of alkylated PACs in scrubber washwater, but only in closed loop systems. These included alkylated naphthalenes, alkylated phenanthrenes and alkylated dibenzothiophenes. The

concentrations of alkylated dibenzothiophenes (3,000 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$), phenanthrenes and naphthalenes (9,200 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$) in CL EGCS in sum exceeded the measured total 16 EPA PAH (780 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$) by a factor of more than 15 (Table 10) and these PACs were only a small selection of alkylated PAH. It was not possible to extrapolate these results to OL EGCS, but due to the solubilities and occurrence of these compounds in the exhaust gas, one could only assume a similar ratio.

Table 10 Concentrations of alkylated dibenzothiophenes, phenanthrenes and naphthalenes in closed loop EGCS in the BOTU feed water in comparison to total 16 EPA PAH ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$). (Magnussen, *et al.*, 2018)

Compounds	Concentration in BOTU feed water ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$) CL
Total 16 EPA PAH	780
Dibenzothiophene	150
Methyldibenzothiophene	700
2,3-Methyldibenzothiophene	330
Trimethyldibenzothiophene	790
4-Methyldibenzothiophene	280
Total dibenzothiophenes	3000
Methylphenanthrene	3300
Dimethylphenanthrene	4000
Trimethylphenanthrene	1500
Dimethylnaphthalene	320
Trimethylnaphthalene	120

In many of the measurement campaigns, there was a lack of information regarding the EGCS operating conditions during washwater sampling, especially those concerning removal of particulate matter (open or closed loop, use of decantation tank and multi-cyclone treatment, etc.), which would have a direct influence on particulate PAH levels in washwaters. In addition, the extraction recovery for the analysis of particulate PAH from the bulk seawater, that was not a filtered water sample (often used in the trials), would be lower or minimal – *i.e.* significantly less efficient than extraction of lower molecular weight dissolved compounds. All these factors may lead to the apparently higher level of lower molecular weight PAH in EGCS washwaters. The question was also what was the fate of higher molecular weight PAH produced in large quantities (mainly adsorbed on soot particles) by heavy fuel oil combustion? Indeed, a high concentration of PAH in the hundreds of mg kg^{-1} in EGCS sludge wastes was determined (Kjølholt, *et al.*, 2012). These findings are in contrast to $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ level concentrations of PAH determined by surveyed studies in washwater effluents from open loop EGCS. It was also possible that a significant fraction of particulate PAH was not removed by EGCS and remained emitted to the atmosphere. Data on a better mass balance budget of PAH emissions from ships with EGCS were needed. Such data was also required for the careful assessment of environmental threats and health hazards related with discharge of contaminants by EGCS.

In the present discussion the Task Team on EGCS would draw attention to the factual difficulties related to the determination of PAH concentrations in the EGCS washwater effluents. Determining chemicals in marine matrices posed quite a challenge and an entire chain of processes, from sampling at sea through the conservation, transport and preparation steps that led to the final analysis, was considerably demanding and required trained personnel. Such standardized controlled protocols for sampling and PAH analysis could not be routinely performed in real-world ship activities.

In short, the Task Team on EGCS concluded that given the PAH determination in EGCS washwaters, together with the lack of compulsory information (test conditions, design of EGCS, sampling protocols etc.) and the quality of obtained data, limit the comparability of the results and the representativeness of the surveyed studies. These factors accounted for uncertain results in this area.

PAH discharge-loads with EGCS washwaters

The appraisals of contaminant loads from the discharge of EGCS washwater effluents were probably even more relevant than their concentrations for their environmental risk assessments. This was raised in several surveyed studies (Endres, *et al.*, 2018, BSH, 2018), especially for persistent and long-term accumulating substances. The accumulation in certain areas with high shipping activities may potentially lead to the exceedance of contaminant environmental quality standards. The significance of the contaminant loads may be also appreciated through comparison with other contributing contaminant sources.

Table 11. Total PAH discharged per MW and year, based on the evaluated measurement campaigns

PAH g (MWy) ⁻¹	Min	Max	Average
Acenaphthene	0.0	630	61
Acenaphthylene	0.0	230	24
Anthracene	0.0	470	24
Benzo(a)anthracene	2.4	470	27
Benzo(a)pyrene	3.9	220	21
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	3.9	150	18
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	3.9	140	14
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	0.0	36	7.3
Chrysene	0.0	630	35
Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	2.4	32	6.7
Fluoranthene	0.0	300	35
Fluorene	0.0	710	130
Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene	0.0	55	8.3
Naphthalene	2.4	5500	720
Phenanthrene	2.4	2400	450
Pyrene	2.8	1000	66

The BSH preliminary report (2019) provided an assessment of PAH (and other contaminants) discharge-loads from open loop systems (and closed loop) to the Baltic Sea, North Sea and English Channel. The estimations were performed for EGCS “current status” (CSS) and “maximum installation” (MIS) scenarios, taking into account shipping activities, washwater water flow rates, and actual contaminant concentrations in washwater effluents. The range of total annual loads of $\Sigma\text{PAH}_{\text{EPA16}}$ to these regional Seas was estimated to be between 0.5 and 6.0 tons for current state situation and between 5.0 to 60 tons for the maximum installation scenario. These inputs were compared to the whole river Rhine basin PAH annual loads to the North Sea, that were estimated to be between 6.5 – 7 tons. Therefore, the current and potential loads of PAH from EGCS were recognized to be a significant cause of concern regarding chemical pollution of these regional Seas (Baltic, North Sea and English Channel).

To calculate the mass load per installed MW of the ship’s engine, the minimum, maximum and average concentrations of the PAH had been calculated as loads in g MW^{-1} per year, based on a washwater flowrate of $45 \text{ m}^3 (\text{MWh})^{-1}$. It should be noted that some installations used a higher flowrate of up to $140 \text{ m}^3 (\text{MWh})^{-1}$ (PPR 6/INF.20). Therefore, the total masses discharged per year could be a factor of 2-3 times higher. These values had to be multiplied with installed power (MW) of an individual ship to calculate the total emissions per ship. For some PAH the total mass load emitted by one ship per year will then easily be in the kg range as shown in Table 11.

The impact of EGCS installation on shipping emissions of PAHs should also be recognized in the global perspective. The global annual PAH shipping emissions were estimated to be at 10700 tons in 2014 (Shen, *et al.*, 2013 and personal communication with prof. S. Tao). These global emissions had increased by a factor of over 2.5 times since 1960 (Figure 11). Comparable PAH emissions were here estimated to be in the range of 6500 – 15,500 t y^{-1} on the basis of PAH emission factors and global shipping fuel consumption in 2015. These values indicated also that in 2014 – 2015 shipping would thus account for 1.3 to 3.1% of the global (all sources) of PAH emissions (Shen, *et al.*, 2013. González-Gaya, *et al.*, 2016). The consistent estimates by different methods and models suggested that PAH emission factors could be used for the determination of different scenarios for PAH loads discharged with EGCS washwaters, providing useful data for their environmental risk assessments.

On the other hand, it should also be noted that the absolute amounts of emitted PAH by the shipping sector would not change with the introduction of EGCS, unless other factors would change, such as use of modern engines, different fuels (distillates, LNG), lower speed, etc. The large-scale introduction of EGCS on ships would change the spatial distribution of contaminant loads as well as the routes of their entry to the environment. Higher amounts of PAH (and other contaminants) would be directly introduced by discharge of EGCS washwater effluents into shallow coastal waters, regional semi-enclosed seas and in bays and ports. There was a rather wide consensus in the literature that discharge of contaminants by ship EGCS was a main cause of concern with respect to possible short and long term impacts on the environment, especially in the areas of high shipping activities, with low degree of flushing and under high existing pollution levels and anthropic pressures (Endres, *et al.*, 2018). This was the justification for further scientific investigations and it warranted also careful revisions of policy regulations and decisions.




Figure 11. Temporal trend for global PAH shipping emissions in metric tons since 1960 (Shen *et al.*, 2013 and personal communication with prof. S. Tao)

The Task Team concluded that in different papers different values were reported on the trend of future PAH emissions from ships. The Task Team would prefer to have information available from established sources based on sound data. This was a clear case that the Task Team would have a preference for the data presented in PPR 6/INF.20, but these values may also be prone to uncertainties.

PAH guideline limit discharge concentration

IMO Resolution MEPC.259(68) provided a guideline limit defined as phenanthrene equivalence (PAH_{phe}) for PAHs concentrations in EGCS wastewater effluents. The limit concentration determined before any dilution for open loop operation, at the outlet of the EGCS, was related to EGCS wastewater flow rates. The method for PAH_{phe} determination was defined as an optical measurement with UV or fluorescence detection by means of an online-sensor installed onboard, allowing continuous monitoring of the dissolved PAH discharge. This PAH_{phe} limit should be revised because it was not well defined and its level of protection was questionable. The optical measurement of PAH was introduced to have a permanent control of PAH and indirectly oil discharges during operation of an EGCS. similar to an oil in water monitoring device for bilge water alarms. However, its operational application was frequently failing whereas GC-MS analysis of PAH was demanding and required trained technicians and could only be done in a laboratory after discrete samplings. Generally, the examined results determined by GC-MS met the IMO criteria for PAH discharge in OL-EGCS wastewater, whereas the rarely presented optically determined data showed frequent detection failures or not comparable results with the GC-MS determination (BSH, 2019).

The historical development of phenanthrene equivalence (PAH_{phe}) criterion for PAH might have been well intended, but the rationale for this was not well established. There was no clear definition stated and in practice, its application could introduce many flaws and misunderstandings. Historically, the PAH limit was derived relative to several oil discharge limits and its concentration of

PAH in oil. To relate this limit to PAH toxicity, the toxic equivalence factors (Nisbet and LaGoy, 1992, Fisher, *et al.*, 2011) of individual compounds should be used to express the results. Such a concept was mainly proposed for PAH health hazard quantification. This required also the use of analytical techniques allowing individual PAH compounds determination. On the other hand, if one would like to express the concentration of a “total” PAH (*i.e.* for a defined number of individual compounds, like 16 EPA-PAHs) as an equivalent of one compound determination, like phenanthrene, a conversion factor should be established and used. Such a concept was barely proposed and developed in the scientific literature – mainly because of impracticalities, such as, for instance, changing relative composition of PAH deriving from different PAH sources. For the IMO guideline, such conversion would be even further complicated because phenanthrene concentrations measured by an optical technique should be eventually converted to equivalent 16 EPA PAHs concentrations determined by GC-MS or other analytical techniques. This would be very unreliable.

In practice, almost all surveyed studies compared PAH_{phe}-equivalency value limit to summed concentrations of PAH determined by GC-MS analysis. This was not correct. Thus, the terminology should be revised – until any PAH “equivalency” was defined and appropriate conversion factor was determined.

The onboard installation of EGCS systems was accompanied now by optical sensors installations for PAH continuous monitoring. Certain PAH fluorescence sensor manufacturers claimed that a conversion factor of 6 should be applied (multiplication, causing underestimation) to convert from optical phenanthrene determination to 16 EPA-PAHs. This was somewhat confusing with scientific literature data concerning the development and application of optical sensors, like MiniFluo-UV, installed on the ocean on-going underwater gliders for continuous detection of selected PAH (Cyr, *et al.*, 2019). The authors showed that the MiniFluo sensor used in this study agrees within one order of magnitude with the concentration determined by GC-MS (overestimation by a factor 7 on average (Cyr, *et al.*, 2019). These apparently contradictory results for the conversion of optical phenanthrene concentrations to 16 EPA PAH would require further investigation, because the online measurement of PAH_{phe}-equivalents could lead to imminent exceedances or underestimations of PAH discharges from EGCS.

Furthermore, the optical measurement was subject to the strong interferences (quenching, scattering of emitted light, etc.), which may be related, for instance, to changing suspended particulate matter and organic matter concentrations. This was particularly important in industrial applications, such as in EGCS. Additionally, one of the important disadvantages was also the fact that optical measurement would totally overlook particulate PAH present in washwaters, as this was technically not feasible. This could only be done by frequent sampling followed by laboratory GC-MS analysis.

A simple calculation showed that in a maximized scenario of all ships equipped with OL-EGCS, taking in account the 2015 HFO world fuel consumption by the shipping sector (Smith, *et al.*, 2015) and known emission factors for PAH (Cooper and Peterson, 1996, Cooper and Gustaffson, 2004) and the 50 µg L⁻¹ PAH limit and assuming a washwater discharge flow rate of 45m³ (MWh)⁻¹, the global emission of PAH would be 5.9 Mt. This amount would be about 10 times higher than the world-wide PAHs emissions from all sources (all biomass, all fossil fuel combustion (Shen, *et al.*, 2013, González-Gaya, *et al.*, 2016). That was considered unrealistic, but clearly indicating that, in fact, the actual IMO PAH guideline limit did not provide any restriction for PAH discharges.

6.11. *Conclusions and Recommendations on Chemicals*

The Task Team on EGCS formulated the following conclusions and recommendations with respect to the Chapter on chemicals:

1. Well-documented and established ranges of contaminant ambient concentrations in the open sea, coastal waters and specific areas of bays, estuaries, harbours and ports were recommended for their use in the risk assessment efforts in areas where effluents of OL EGCS was discharged into the ambient environment;
2. Extensive chemical characterization of substances in EGCS washwater effluents, including toxic and genotoxic species (such as heterocycle and alkyl-PAH) was recommended and needed for better appraisal of contaminants emissions through EGCS and their environmental threats for marine life. In this context, EGCS washwater measurements should also include monitoring of particulate and dissolved contaminant concentrations, especially for PAHs, trace metals and all other relevant chemicals. The Task Team recognized also the necessary improvements and need for harmonized procedures in terms of washwaters sampling and analysis to ensure better comparability in different data sets. With respect to these points the Task Team recognized also that the current available data and practice was insufficient;
3. Besides improving chemical emissions characterization, the development of spatial and temporal in situ measurements of contaminants along shipping lanes and in all areas of high volume of ship activities was considered important to gain a more comprehensive understanding of EGCS related pollution distribution and the environmental consequences of large-scale uses of EGCS. In respect to this, the ship emissions monitoring network may be further developed. Such developments were recommended by the Task Team, considering also an enhancement of cooperation with independent academic institutions;
4. In terms of total amounts of contaminant discharges through EGCS, it appeared that large scale uses of these systems may lead the deterioration of environmental status, especially in the ecologically vulnerable and sensitive areas such as coastal waters, semi-enclosed seas and also in ports and harbours. In respect of this, the Task Team recommended further assessment and appraisal of contaminant loads discharged with EGCS washwater effluents. The development of alternative effective methods and protocols based on combining ship traffic data with contaminants emission factors were fundamental for the improvement of EGCS contaminants loads monitoring and assessments. The spatial representation of related discharges of pollutants would require further modeling efforts combining ship traffic data with ship emission factors and in-situ measurements of contaminants. The amounts of EGCS contaminants should also be further taken into account in the appreciation of their environmental risk assessment approaches and methods;
5. The Task Team recommended the revision of the existing PAH_{phe} guideline limit, including revision of its definition, methodology of determination and its limit level. The development of a new limit guideline for selected trace metal concentrations in EGCS washwater effluents was also recommended;
6. Considering the complexity of the topic and its importance for the marine environment, the Task Team recognized a great need for more interdisciplinary research development to

better predict ship emission and the use of EGCS and their chemicals impacts on acidification, eutrophication and related climate feed backs.

7. POSSIBILITIES FOR RISK ASSESSMENT, INCLUDING ERA AND HHRA

7.1. Exposure Assessment

7.1.1 Introduction

The exposure assessment was considered an essential part of a risk assessment (see section 7.3). It identified the Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC) of the relevant chemical contaminants for which the risk assessment was carried out. The PEC could be identified with different methods, varying from rather simple, and easy to perform calculation based on worst case assumptions and conservative fate to complicated 3-D simulation models with more realistic assumptions and natural behavior of substances with respect to degradation and sorption. Some features of the different types of modelling will be dealt with in the next sections. Finally, a short overview was presented of the available models with similar possibilities as the Task Team considered relevant for the evaluation of the potential risk assessment for EGCS.

Contaminants in the washwater discharge from EGCS were of potential environmental concern in open waterbodies with heavy ship traffic such as straits, shipping channels and canals, and/or enclosed or semi-enclosed waterbodies with weak flushing such as bays and harbours. Different types of models were appropriate for each. These two domains were typically analyzed using near field and far field models respectively. There was also interest in predicting concentrations at very short distances from the ship for which initial mixing models could be used. In each case the goal was to predict concentrations that could be compared against threshold concentrations determined from (marine) ecotoxicological studies. The models could be used to predict the concentrations of specific contaminants (*e.g.*, pH, a particular trace metal or a PAH). Models had also been used to predict the dilution of the discharge which could be used in connection with whole effluent toxicity testing.

7.1.2 Initial Mixing Models

Washwater was discharged through the ship's hull, below the waterline, a few meters from the propeller. The region within a few meters of the discharge received rapid mixing because of the washwater discharge momentum, the ship's wake and propeller wash. These same factors contributed to making the flow complex and 3-dimensional, such that analysis required use of either direct measurements of a tracer, or computational fluid dynamics modeling (CFD). An example of CFD modeling, applied to EGCS, was provided by MEPC 74/INF.24 (MEPC, 2019c) where, in addition to near source concentrations, the distributions of turbulent viscosity and diffusivity were generated. Because initial mixing was a function mainly of ship and discharge properties, such mixing was independent of the site (waterbody) so a single CFD analysis could be applied to all ships and discharge scenarios of a given type.

The Task Team noted that such initial mixing models had been used to predict near source pH and in particular to confirm compliance with the regulation of pH exceeding 6.5 at a distance of 4 m from the source. Over this distance, mixing alone did not generate sufficient dilution to achieve a pH of 6.5; hence washwater treatment (buffering) must be employed.

7.1.3 Near Field Models

The Task Team considered the near field to extend from the initial mixing region described above to a distance of several kilometers behind the ship. MEPC III/7 (MEPC, 1975) used results of earlier field campaigns in the US, Netherlands and Norway and a large scale lab study to derive an empirical formula for the dilution of conservative contaminants in the wake of a moving ship. Such contaminants were found to be directly proportional to the contaminant mass loading, and proportional to the ship length and velocity and the distance behind the ship, to powers of -1.6, -1.0, and -0.4. Thus, the most influential independent variable was the ship length. Mixing was also shown to depend on the location, orientation and the number of orifices employed (*e.g.*, orifices on either side of the stern). Later experimental studies and analyses conducted during the 1980s (Lewis, 1985; Byrne, *et al.*, 1988; Lewis and Riddle, 1989, and Delvigne, 1987) found that the MEPC III.7 formula underestimated observed dilutions (overestimated peak concentrations) by a factor of three or more, rendering its use quite conservative.

Rather than relying directly on field measurements, a near field mathematical model, calibrated to field observations could also be used. Applied to an open waterbody, such a model would start with a description of the steady-state 3-D concentration distribution $c(x,y,z)$ resulting from a continuous effluent discharge from a single ship. Important variables here were the lateral and vertical turbulent diffusivities which should be calibrated to observed concentrations in the field and would reflect characteristics such as ship length, speed and position x . For relatively short distances from the discharge, the results of an initial mixing analysis could be used to generate “starting” conditions, though the influence of initial mixing would die off at longer distances (order of a kilometer or more) from the ship. In the frame of reference of a moving ship, $c(x,y,z)$ could be determined by solving an advection-diffusion equation. In congested waterways, there were usually multiple vessels, often of different type (tanker, cargo, etc.), each contributing overlapping contaminant plumes. See Figure 12.

In general, near field concentrations in the x , y , and z directions would depend on the frequency of vessel arrivals (often obtainable by AIS), their spacing, type, and washwater volumetric flow rate, initial mixing (as described above), ambient current speed and lateral and vertical diffusivities, and waterway dimensions (width, depth and length). Contaminants may also be lost due to processes such as biodegradation, evaporation or sorption / settling, but the associated time constants for these processes may be larger than the time scales in the near field (hours), in which case the contaminants could be treated as conservative.

An example of a near field model application was presented in MEPC 74/INF.24 (MEPC, 2019c) which analyzed concentrations aft of a line of vessels traveling in a shipping lane entering Tokyo Bay. The study concluded that a minimum dilution of at least 5000 in 60 s would be achievable, and independently noted that the dilution ratio of > 5000 would exceed the predicted no-effects dilution (PNED) of 5000 calculated from their results of whole effluent toxicity tests. The study included several conservative (worst case) assumptions including peak rates of vessel daily peak congestion, and the assumption that vessel orientation was precisely “line astern”. The latter assumption would produce maximum concentrations when the vessel wakes are superimposed (see Figure 12); a slight off-set in lateral vessel orientation, or a mild lateral current, would cause the individual wakes to separate, leading to smaller peak concentrations (higher dilutions), albeit over larger areas. Also, the

predicted no-effects dilution of 5000 was quite uncertain and possibly conservative, as it included an assessment factor of 1000 relating the minimum dilution of 5 (20% of discharge concentration) in which acute effects were observed in the laboratory, extrapolated down to a predicted no-effects dilution (see 7.2.4). On the non-conservative side, the model used spatially uniform, isotropic turbulent diffusivities derived from the initial mixing model described above. The initial mixing zone was quite turbulent and, more likely, the diffusivity would decrease with distance as predicted for the wake behind a moving ship (Lewis, 1985; Byrne, *et al.*, 1988; Lewis and Riddle, 1989; Delvigne, 1987 and Tennekes and Lumley, 1972). Overall, however, the analysis was conservative and through judicious choice of input parameters, the methodology could be applied to other waterbodies.

An important consideration would be the exposure time experienced by an organism subject to the computed near field concentration distribution, versus the duration under which ecotoxicological studies were conducted (*e.g.*, exposure duration of 72 or 96 hours). To evaluate the impact based on 24 or 96 hour toxicological data may be conservative for motile organisms (*e.g.*, pelagic fish) which may pass quickly through the wastewater plume; conversely, such an assessment may be non-conservative for sessile organisms (*e.g.*, demersal fish or benthic infauna).




Figure 12. Schematics of (left) the near-field and (right) the far-field model in top-view. Vessels in different colors denote different ship types (thus engine load capacities). (Left) vessels cross a line AA' normal to a shipping lane of width W and follow a Gaussian distribution with a mean crossing location in the middle of the lane and a lateral spread with a standard deviation of σ . (Right) vessels move and berth inside an enclosed waterbody (of volume V) that receives on average number of vessels per time N' and has a flushing rate of Q .

7.1.4 Far Field Models

Far field models could range in complexity, but the simplest would be a well-mixed box model in which steady-state and spatially averaged concentrations were computed as a function of the frequency of vessel arrivals, their type, the times they would spend in transit and at berth, the waterbody volume and hydraulic residence time, and the appropriate loss rate(s). Unlike the near field, the time scales in the far field (*e.g.*, given by residence times) could be days to weeks, during which time loss mechanisms such as biodegradation, sorption/deposition could be very important in reducing concentrations. The time that organisms were exposed to far field concentrations was also

important. Under the assumption that far field concentrations were both steady and spatially well-mixed, the exposure time of an organism that would reside permanently in the waterbody would exceed typical exposure times in laboratory ecotoxicological tests (e.g., 96 hours or 28 days) rendering the calculations non-conservative. However, a more realistic calculation should consider organism movement into and out of the waterbody.

7.1.5 Available models

Ports and harbours differed in their geometry, and thus a model study conducted at one site may not be suitable for other sites. Thus, different and more generalized analyses were required. Quite recently, two papers had been published where the GESAMP-BWWG Standard Harbour, as used in the ballast water management systems (BWMS) evaluation had been adapted to 2 commercial harbours of Hamburg in Germany and Koper in Slovenia (David, *et al.*, 2018 and Dock, *et al.*, 2019). The results showed that a model with success could be adapted to other situations. In these papers, the model MAMPEC had been used to perform the calculations. The first paper dealt with the environmental risk assessment and the second the risks for the general public. Below the Task Team discussed several models that had been, or could be, used to analyze EGCS effluent concentrations in ports and harbours.

7.1.5.1. MAMPEC-BW

MAMPEC (Marine Antifoulant Model to Predict Environmental Concentrations) was a steady-state, 2D-integrated hydrodynamic and chemical fate model (Hattum, *et al.*, 2016). The original model was developed for the evaluation of anti-foulant paints in the framework of the biocides regulation in the EU. The MAMPEC-BW model was adapted for exposure assessment of chemicals discharged from ballast water management systems and had the same features as MAMPEC. Before 2011, MAMPEC was used on a voluntary basis by a number of applicants (summarized in Zipperle, *et al.*, 2011). On the request of the GESAMP-BWWG and IMO, a special standardized version of MAMPEC-BW for ballast water was created (MAMPEC-BW v3.0) in 2011, with a dedicated environment, a compound and an emission scenario. Currently the model was part of the evaluation methodology for Basic and Final Approval by the MEPC of IMO, based on the recommendations of the GESAMP-BWWG (MEPC, 2017).

Perhaps the most significant factor affecting predicted concentrations was the exchange rate between harbour and the surrounding environment (about 30% in the GESAMP-BWWG Standard Harbour scenario, MEPC, 2017). This was expressed as an exchange flow defined as the volume of water released over a tidal period. Six exchange mechanisms were considered—tidal exchange, horizontal circulation, vertical density exchange, other non-tidal exchange, flushing due to external flows, and wind-driven exchange—with the first three generally being the most important. Different approaches were used to estimate these six exchange flows ranging from simple analytical expressions (tidal exchange) to synthesis of model 3-D hydrodynamic runs (wind driven exchange). Each of the flows was then used to compute a longitudinal dispersion coefficient that produced the same exchange flow as given by the exchange flows themselves. The sum of the 6 dispersion coefficients was used to drive the 2-D transport model based on a given pollutant loading (magnitude and distribution) and the fate process contained in the model DELWAQ.

The MAMPEC model used an entry screen to define the compound. It had incorporated a database of about 40 chemicals that were defined as the most relevant disinfection by-products (DBP) in ballast water management systems (BWMS). The standard model harbour, GESAMP-BWWG Standard Harbour, was defined as a worst-case scenario with specified dimensions with a fixed exchange rate between the harbour and the surrounding area. Finally, there was the emission scenario, where the highest concentration in ballast water of the DBP under consideration was discharged in the harbour on a daily basis and with a pre-determined default value for the amount of water discharged. The output of the model was the yearly averaged concentration in the water and sediment phases. Sediment concentrations could also be computed for up to 10 years. In this way, also potential accumulation of the DBPs may be analyzed. The GESAMP-BWWG used in all cases a worst-case scenario, *e.g.* for the different DBPs no degradation was assumed. In relevant cases, if concentrations were determined in excess of the ecotoxicological reference values (Predicted No Effect Concentration, PNEC), degradation was taken into account as a second Tier. The Task Team on EGCS was of the opinion that the MAMPEC model may be used for the risk assessment of components of the effluent of EGCS, using various emission scenarios (*e.g.* ratio of the ships that used either open loop or closed loop mode). Also, the discharge of the BOTU may be analyzed with the model after thorough evaluation of the adjustments needed. One of the main differences with ballast water, was that EGCS emissions from ships would take place during the whole journey of the ship, much of the time being in open waters. For this, MAMPEC had the possibility to calculate the concentration also in a shipping lane. It had to be seen how this feature could be incorporated in a potential risk assessment approach for EGCS effluents. Schematics of the MAMPEC model applied to both a harbour and a shipping lane were shown in Figure 13.

MAMPEC was recently applied to four generic harbours visited by cruise ships (Faber, *et al.*, 2019). Concentrations of 11 trace metals and 16 PAHs in the water column and sediment were predicted. The predictions all fell well below applicable water quality and sediment quality standards. The authors claim that their results were conservative, but there are several aspects of their study which may not be conservative. The hydrodynamics varied significantly among the four sites with exchange rates (net volume of water exchanged at the mouth divided by the tidal period) ranging from $\sim 1000 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ for the “Standard OECD-EU Commercial Harbour” down to $\sim 30 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ for the “Baltic Commercial Port”, having the same horizontal area and depth. This was a huge difference, suggesting the need for additional validation. Dividing the exchange flow rate by the wastewater flow rate of $\sim 0.1 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ (45 T (MWh)⁻¹ from Ulpre and Eames (2014) times a cumulative loading from all ships in the harbour of 8 MW) would give an average dilution varying from $\sim 10,000$ to ~ 300 . The higher value was comparable to the predicted no-effects dilution of 5000 based on the WET tests used by MEPC 74/INF24 (MEPC, 2019c), while the lower value was ~ 30 times lower implying a potentially large impact. Yet, as mentioned above, the analysis of Faber, *et al.* (2019) based on individual pollutants showed all PECs were well below the relevant PNECs. This highlighted the substantial difference between analyses based on WET with a large assessment factor, and studies based on individual constituents.

MEPC 74/INF.24 (MEPC, 2019c) described another application of MAMPEC: to predict concentrations of nitrate, phosphate and pH in three bays in Japan rather than compare predicted concentrations against a national environmental standard depending on the category of sea area (*e.g.* some part of the bay was classified as industrial area, so that the severe standard for conserving fishery resources was not applicable). Also, the authors compared the predicted increase in concentrations to existing

background concentrations. The predicted increases after 10 years were all less than 1% of the existing background concentration suggesting that the impact would be acceptable. However, details of the study were scant. And as there was no national environmental standard for PAH in Japan, the model was applied for the phenanthrene equivalents of PAHs.

In summary, MAMPEC had an elegant structure that allowed application to a range of different waterbodies, with different pollution loadings. The Task Team was of the opinion it could be a promising model for future EGCS applications, but that it should be further validated, perhaps through a carefully designed field study focusing on EGCS loading.



Figure 13. Layout of the commercial harbour and the shipping lane in MAMPEC (Boon, *et al.*, 2008)

7.1.5.2. STEAM3

In Finland, the model STEAM was developed. STEAM stands for Ship Traffic Emission Assessment Model. The first model, STEAM, used historic information of the automatic identification system (AIS), in which ships track their position to avoid collisions with other ships in the same area together with a technical database with emission factors from ships. The model STEAM2 was developed to analyze emission to the North Sea and the Baltic Sea and successively the model STEAM3 was developed to enable global emissions. (Endres, *et al.*, 2018 and references therein).

The authors were of the opinion that their simulation results for SO_x and NO_x were quite comparable with measured emission factors, but for PM the calculations were a factor of 2 to 3 higher than the measurements. They concluded that more real measurement data should be used as input (Johansson, *et al.*, 2017). Some of the assumptions in the model were the use of the cheapest fuel that met the requirements of the regulations, and an additional power consumption of 2 to 3% to run the EGCS (Johansson, *et al.*, 2017).

The STEAM3 model had primarily been developed for use in atmospheric pollution problems. With appropriate assumptions, alternative emission scenarios could be used for policy management in air pollution caused by international shipping. Whether or not the model would also be applicable for water pollution scenarios by EGCS may be further investigated (Johansson, *et al.*, 2017). The extension of the model with a module on EGCS occurred already in 2018. The STEAM model was constantly upgraded to include further areas of research, like, noise, OL/CL EGCS, antifouling paints residues, black/grey water discharges, food waste nutrients, ballast water discharges and stern tube oil leakages. (Jalkanen, personal communication, 2019)

7.1.5.3. DREAM

DREAM (Dose-related risk and effects assessment model; Reed and Hetland, 2002, Rye, *et al.*, 2008)) was developed by the Norwegian independent research organization SINTEF and was originally designed to describe the behavior of drilling discharges in the sea/ocean. Drilling discharges consisted of complex mixtures of chemical components and particles which might lead to toxic and nontoxic stress in the environment. In order to be able to evaluate the potential environmental consequences of such discharges in the water column and in sediments, a numerical model was developed. The model included water column stratification, ocean currents and turbulence, natural burial, bioturbation, and biodegradation of organic matter in the sediment.

Accounting for these processes, the fate of the discharge was modeled for the water column, including near-field mixing and plume motion, far-field mixing, and transport. The fate of the discharge was also modeled for the sediment, including sea floor deposition, and mixing due to bioturbation. Formulas were provided for the calculation of suspended matter and chemical concentrations in the water column, and burial, change in grain size, oxygen depletion, and chemical concentrations in the sediment. The model was fully 3-dimensional and time dependent. It relied on an external hydrodynamics model and a provided wind field to produce circulation. A Lagrangian approach was successively used to transport particles released to the water column, and an Eulerian approach with a fixed grid was used to calculate the fate of pollutants in the sediment. The model had been used to calculate the environmental risk, both in the water column and in sediments, from drilling discharges. It could serve as a tool to define risk mitigating measures, and as such it could provide guidance towards the “zero harm” goal. (Rye, *et al.*, 2008)

The authors were of the opinion that the DREAM model could be applied to evaluate the discharge of EGCS as the DREAM model was already used to model different chemical and particulate discharges and to simulate their transport and fate. Example applications of the model included the discharge of produced water and drilling wastes from oil and gas operations, mine tailings and dredge spoils, cooling and wastewater, and run-off from aquaculture (excess feed, feces, medical treatments). Current developments in DREAM included a toxicokinetic model that allowed tracking of body burdens in stationary 'numerical cages' which could be numerically deployed in the model area. (Brønner, 2019, personal communication).

7.1.6 Conclusions and Recommendations on Exposure Assessment

Concerning the exposure assessment of aquatic organisms and humans indirectly via the environment, the Task Team determined the following conclusions and corresponding recommendations:

1. In relatively open waterbodies with heavy ship traffic, dilution of EGCS washwater occurred mainly through turbulent mixing. Near the ship this mixing was generated mainly by the ship, its propeller, and the EGCS discharge, while farther away it was mainly from turbulent diffusion caused by wind, waves and currents. In order to better characterize the lateral and vertical mixing, the Task Team on EGCS recommended conducting a field tracer study in which a tracer was injected into the EGCS from one or more ships, and tracer concentrations were measured in cross sections at various distances aft of a ship employing EGCS.

2. One of the most significant factors affecting predicted concentrations in an enclosed waterbody was the exchange rate between the water body and the surrounding environment. MAMPEC had an elegant structure to account for such flows based on various physical processes. The models for each process had been developed by different researchers using different techniques and therefore, the Task Team on EGCS recommended having a more comprehensive model validation, perhaps involving a carefully conducted field study in one or more harbours, focusing on EGCS loading.
3. Whether or not EGCS washwater was harmful to aquatic health depends on the magnitude of predicted concentrations (or dilutions) compared with a reference standard. At least three approaches had been used in the literature: 1) comparison of predicted dilutions against predicted no effects dilution based on whole effluent toxicity testing, usually with a large assessment factor, 2) comparison of predicted concentrations for individual pollutants with corresponding predicted no effects concentrations, and 3) comparison of predicted concentrations with relevant “background” concentrations. The three approaches could lead to significant differences in risk assessment, and therefore, the Task Team on EGCS recommended having a rigorous comparison of the three approaches.
4. In situations where exposure could be long term, physical/chemical/biological fate processes such as volatilization, photo-degradation, sedimentation, etc. could be important. Some studies had omitted these processes, while others had included them but with little description. As a recommendation the Task Team considered that a comprehensive analysis could be made to characterize the importance of the various processes, and the conditions under which they were expected to be important.
5. MAMPEC (or MAMPEC-BW) had been used in several studies of EGCS in enclosed waterbodies, but there were several other models that could also be used, including STEAM3 and DREAM. The Task Team on EGCS recommended seeing a side by side comparison of these, and possibly other, models, not yet known to the Task Team.
6. The Task Team recommended the performance of a set of four to five well-established, good quality WET tests, including short term and long-term endpoints on species of three trophic levels. The Task Team recommended such testing to be performed using a range of representative EGCS washwater samples from open loop systems taken in representative areas.

7.2. Hazard Assessment, including CMR and PBT

7.2.1 Human Health Hazard Assessment for CMR Properties

The Task Team recognized that carcinogenicity, mutagenicity and reproductive toxicity (CMR) properties for the chemicals presented in chapter 6 may be categorized according to their classification in accordance with the Globally Harmonized System for Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS) (United Nations, 2019). The harmonized classifications according to the European version of the GHS, the CLP Regulation where CLP stands for Classification, Labelling and Packaging of Chemicals (European Commission, 2008a) had been used for all selected trace metals except for arsenic and nickel. For arsenic the classification in the Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) was used. USEPA classified arsenic as a human carcinogen (class A) (IRIS, 1991). For nickel the classification of the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) had been taken into account. IARC classified nickel and nickel compounds as human carcinogens (IARC, 2012c). The CMR

properties of the selected trace metals were listed in Table 12 and of the PAHs in Table 13. Chemicals with harmonized classifications as Carcinogenic Category 1A and 1B, Mutagenic Category 1A and 1B and Reproductive toxicity Category 1A and 1B were regarded as CMR substances within the scope of the current report. In addition, IARC classification in Group 1 and 2B had been included in the categorization of a substance as carcinogenic (C). In several jurisdictions across the world, CMR substances were identified and risk management measures were directed towards minimization of use of such chemicals.

Table 12. CMR properties for trace metals

Chemical	C	M	R	CMR
Arsenic	1	0	0	1
Cadmium	1	0	1	1
Chromium (vi)	1	0	0	1
Copper	0	0	0	0
Nickel	1	0	0	1
Lead	0	0	1	1
Selenium	0	0	0	0
Vanadium	0	0	0	0
Zinc	0	0	0	0

The harmonized classification according to CLP had been used for benzo(a)pyrene (European Commission, 2008). IARC had classified a number of the PAHs, and a classification in Group 1 and Group 2B was taken into account within the scope of this report. Regarding the mutagenic properties of the PAHs, the work of several expert groups had been taken into account (refer to section on PAHs in 7.2.1.1).

7.2.1.1 Extrapolation and Derivation of Reference Values

The next step after the hazard assessment was the hazard characterization which would include establishing guidance levels for the chemicals. These were levels below which no adverse health effects to humans were expected for chemicals with a threshold effect. However, in the case of substances that could cause cancer, the guidance levels were associated with a low, possibly hypothetical, acceptable risk since no lower safe limit existed. For chemicals with a threshold effect, on the other hand, it was sometimes possible to establish a value for tolerable daily intake (TDI) or for provisional tolerable weekly intake (PTWI) for the general public (WHO, 2010). For chemicals that may cause cancer to humans it was more appropriate to assign a slope factor. This was an estimate of the life-time cancer risk associated with a unit dose of a chemical through ingestion (or inhalation). The slope factor was defined as increased cancer risk from lifetime exposure to a substance by ingestion (or inhalation). It was expressed as an estimate of cancer risk associated with a unit concentration ($\text{mg kg}^{-1} \text{bw d}^{-1}$) or risk per $\text{mg kg}^{-1} \text{bw d}^{-1}$ (USEPA, 2005). The slope factor may be used to derive the dose ($\text{mg kg}^{-1} \text{bw d}^{-1}$) associated with cancer at a specified risk level, for instance 10^{-5} . It was also possible to use a Benchmark Dose (BMD) which was defined as the dose for a

predetermined level of response, such as 1% or 10% cancer incidence (WHO, 2010). For food contaminants JECFA established lower confidence limits (BMDL).

Table 13. CMR properties for 16 EPA PAHs

Chemical	C	M	R	CMR
Naphthalene	1	0	0	1
Acenaphthylene	NA	NA	NA	NA
Acenaphthene	0	0	0	0
Fluorene	0	0	0	0
Anthracene	0	0	0	0
Phenanthrene	0	0	0	0
Fluoranthene	0	0	0	0
Pyrene	0	0	0	0
Benzo[a]anthracene	1	1	0	1
Chrysene	1	1	0	1
Benzo[b]fluoranthene	1	1	0	1
Benzo[k]fluoranthene	1	1	0	1
Benzo(a)pyrene (PAH)	1	1	1	1
Indeno[1,2,3-cd]pyrene	1	1	0	1
Dibenzo[a,h]anthracene	1	1	0	1
Benzo[ghi]perylene	0	1	0	1

NA = not available (no IARC classification)

As EGCS washwater may contain many constituents the focus of this report and any future hazard and risk assessment should be on those chemicals that were of highest concern and for which information was available on their appearance and concentrations in EGCS washwater. The analyses focused, therefore, on the 16 EPA PAHs, and trace metals (As, Cd, Cr, Cu, Ni, Pb, Se, V, Zn).

Trace metals

Metals found in EGCS washwater may be in dissolved or particulate form. Many trace metals may be found but for practical reasons the Task Team considers that the assessment should be limited to the metals that were in the analysis scheme of the 2015 EGCS Guidelines which were arsenic (As), cadmium (Cd), copper (Cu), chromium (Cr), nickel (Ni), lead (Pb), selenium (Se), vanadium (V) and zinc (Zn). As regards the hazards for humans, most metals were very data rich and hence the hazard evaluation had been focused on work done by internationally recognized bodies (WHO, IARC, US EPA, EFSA). Furthermore, it should be noted that some of the trace metals were essential to humans (copper, zinc and selenium) which would make the hazard evaluation more complicated, since the difference between the amount needed for proper physiological functioning (nutritional requirement) and the amount above which adverse effects may start to appear (maximum tolerable intake) was small (a factor of about 5 for copper).

Arsenic (As)

WHO classified arsenic as carcinogenic (IARC, 2012b). Long-term exposure to arsenic in drinking-water was causally related to increased risks of cancer in the skin, lungs, bladder and kidneys. The excess lifetime risk of lung or bladder cancer at the current drinking water guideline value ($10 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$) was more than 3 cases per 1000 individuals (NRC, 2001). Note that this level was higher than the 10^{-5} excess lifetime risk cancer for genotoxic carcinogens used in the Guidelines for drinking-water quality (WHO, 2017b).

Arsenic was found widely in the earth's crust in oxidation states of -3, 0, +3 and +5, often as sulfides or metal arsenides or arsenates. In water, it was mostly present as arsenate (+5), but in anaerobic conditions, it was likely to be present as arsenite (+3). It was usually present in natural waters at concentrations of less than $1 - 2 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$. However, in waters, particularly in groundwater, where there were sulfide mineral deposits and sedimentary deposits deriving from volcanic rocks, the concentrations could be significantly elevated (WHO, 2017b).

Human and animal data indicated that over 90% of the ingested dose of dissolved inorganic trivalent (+3) or pentavalent (+5) arsenic was absorbed from the gastrointestinal tract. Organic arsenic compounds in seafood were also readily absorbed (75 – 85%). Absorption of less soluble forms, *e.g.* arsenic trioxide, was much lower (Ishinichi, *et al.*, 1986).

Arsenic had been found in the diet, particularly in fish and shellfish and cereal and cereal products, with particularly high concentrations in rice grains and rice-based products, and bran and germ. A range of benchmark dose lower confidence limit (BMDL₀₁) values between 0.3 and $8 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1} \text{bw d}^{-1}$ was identified for cancers of the lung, skin and bladder, as well as skin lesions. BMDL₀₁ represented the benchmark dose of 1% extra risk. The estimated dietary exposures to inorganic arsenic for average and high level consumers in Europe were within the range of the BMDL₀₁ values identified, and therefore there was little or no margin of exposure and the possibility of a risk to some consumers could not be excluded (EFSA, 2009a).

Cadmium (Cd)

The WHO stated that there was evidence that cadmium was carcinogenic by the inhalation route (WHO, 2017b), and IARC had classified cadmium and cadmium compounds in Group 2A (probably carcinogenic to humans) (IARC, 2012a). However, there was no evidence of carcinogenicity by the oral route and no clear evidence for the genotoxicity of cadmium. The kidney was the main target organ for cadmium toxicity. The WHO drinking water guidance value of $3 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ was based on the provisional tolerable monthly intake (PTMI) of $25 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1} \text{bw}$ (WHO, 2011a), where 10% was allocated to drinking water due to the high intake of cadmium via food (WHO, 2017b). Data on human exposure to cadmium in the general population had been statistically associated with increased risk of cancer such as in the lung, endometrium, bladder, and breast (EFSA, 2009b).

Cadmium was released to the environment in wastewater, and diffuse pollution was caused by contamination from fertilizers and local air pollution. Contamination in drinking-water may also be caused by impurities in the zinc of galvanized pipes and solders and some metal fittings. Food was the main source of daily exposure to cadmium. Cadmium absorption after dietary exposure in humans was relatively low (3 – 5%) but cadmium was efficiently retained in the kidney and liver in the human body, with a very long biological half-life ranging from 10 to 30 years (EFSA, 2009). The

EFSA Panel on Contaminants in the Food Chain (CONTAM Panel) had established a tolerable weekly intake (TWI) for cadmium of $2.5 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1} \text{bw}$ (EFSA, 2009). The mean exposure for adults across Europe was close to, or slightly exceeding, the TWI of $2.5 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1} \text{bw}$. Subgroups such as vegetarians, children, smokers and people living in highly contaminated areas may exceed the TWI by about 2-fold.

Chromium III and VI (Cr)

IARC (IARC, 1996) had classified chromium(VI) in Group 1 (human carcinogen) and chromium(III) in Group 3 (not classifiable as to its carcinogenicity to humans). Chromium(VI) compounds were active in a wide range of *in vitro* and *in vivo* genotoxicity tests, whereas chromium(III) compounds were not. The WHO drinking water guidance value of $50 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ for total chromium was first proposed in 1958 for hexavalent chromium, based on health concerns, but was later changed to a guideline for total chromium because of difficulties in analyzing for the hexavalent form only (WHO, 2017b). The EFSA Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies (NDA) had evaluated whether Cr(III) could be considered to be an essential trace element for humans (EFSA, 2014a), but however noted that the attempts to create chromium deficiency in animal models had not produced consistent results. The NDA Panel considered that there was a possibility that Cr(III) was an essential trace element for humans, but that there was, as yet, no convincing evidence. The CONTAM Panel had derived a Tolerable Daily Intake (TDI) of $300 \mu\text{g Cr(III) kg}^{-1} \text{bw}$ from the lowest No Observed Adverse Effect Level (NOAEL) identified in a chronic oral toxicity study in rats (EFSA, 2014d). The bioavailability of Cr(VI), that had been ingested, was minimized by the reduction to Cr(III). This reduction by saliva, gastric juices and intestinal bacteria, took place outside the cells (extracellular), and had been described as significant (De Flora, *et al.*, 1997 in Draft USEPA, 2010). A unit lifetime excess small intestine cancer risk of 8×10^{-4} at an average oral daily dose of $1 \mu\text{g Cr(VI) kg}^{-1} \text{bw d}^{-1}$ was estimated by USEPA (Draft USEPA, 2010). This value had been adopted by ECHA (2013).

Copper (Cu)

Copper was an essential trace element for humans, and it was required for electron transfer processes (EFSA, 2015a). Copper was a central component of many enzymes, such as those involved in neurotransmitter synthesis, in energy metabolism and in collagen and elastin cross-linking. Copper was not classified as carcinogenic to humans and animals (JECFA, 1982), and furthermore, copper salts were not embryotoxic in rodents. Except for individuals with Wilson's disease, copper did appear to be a cumulative toxic hazard for man. Adequate Intakes (AIs) had been established by EFSA based on mean observed intakes in several European Union (EU) countries, while taking into account that there was no evidence of overt copper deficiency in the European population. Data from balance studies were used as supportive evidence. AIs of 1.6 mg d^{-1} for men and 1.3 mg d^{-1} for women were proposed (EFSA, 2015a).

Lead (Pb)

The WHO guidance value for drinking water of $10 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ (WHO, 2017b) was no longer a health-based guideline value but was designated as provisional on the basis of treatment performance and

analytical achievability. Concentrations in drinking water were generally below $5 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$, although much higher concentrations (above $100 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$) had been measured where lead service connections or fittings were present. The primary source of lead was from service connections and plumbing in buildings. Lead occurred primarily in the inorganic form in the environment. Human exposure was mainly via food and water, with some via air, dust and soil. Cereal products contributed most to dietary lead exposure, while dust and soil could be important non-dietary sources in children. The Panel on Contaminants in the Food Chain (CONTAM Panel) identified developmental neurotoxicity in young children and cardiovascular effects and nephrotoxicity in adults as the critical effects for the risk assessment (EFSA, 2010). A BMDL₁₀ value had been derived by EFSA from a blood level of $15 \mu\text{g Pb L}^{-1}$ (corresponding to a dietary intake value of $0.63 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1} \text{ bw d}^{-1}$) and based on effects on prevalence of chronic kidney disease JECFA had established the following values as a point of departure $0.6 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1} \text{ bw d}^{-1}$ loss of 1 IQ point in children; $1.2 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1} \text{ bw d}^{-1}$ for 1 mmHg increase in blood pressure (adults) (WHO, 2011b).

Nickel (Ni)

Ni and Ni compounds had been classified by IARC (2012a) as human carcinogens causing cancers of the lung, nasal cavity and paranasal sinuses after inhalation (IARC Group 1 for nickel compounds, and IARC Group 2B for metallic nickel). The WHO drinking water guidance value of $70 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ was based on the tolerable daily intake (TDI) of $12 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1} \text{ bw}$ (JECFA, 2011), where 20% was allocated to drinking water (WHO, 2017b). Food was the dominant source of nickel exposure in the non-smoking, non-occupationally exposed population; water was generally a minor contributor to the total daily oral intake. There were no maximum levels (MLs) for Ni in food. For drinking water, a parametric (maximum acceptable concentration) (WHO, 2017a) value of $20 \mu\text{g Ni L}^{-1}$ in water intended for human consumption, and a ML of $20 \mu\text{g Ni L}^{-1}$ in natural mineral waters were laid down in Council Directive 98/83/EC ('Drinking Water Directive', European Commission, 1998) and in Commission Directive 2003/40/EC ('Mineral Water Directive', EU, 2003), respectively. These maximum limits were well within the guideline value of $70 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ set by the WHO (EFSA, 2015b). A tolerable daily intake of $2.8 \mu\text{g Ni kg}^{-1} \text{ bw d}^{-1}$ had been derived by EFSA while taking into account the lower 95 % confidence limit for a benchmark dose of $0.28 \text{ mg kg}^{-1} \text{ bw}$ at 10 % extra risk (BMDL₁₀) for post-implantation fetal loss in rats (EFSA, 2015b).

Selenium (Se)

Selenium was an essential trace element for humans (EFSA, 2014b), and an Adequate Intake (AI) of $70 \mu\text{g d}^{-1}$ for adults had been set. Selenium was part of a number of selenoproteins that displayed a variety of functions that had been identified in humans, including antioxidant effects, T-cell immunity, thyroid hormone metabolism, selenium homeostasis and transport, and skeletal and cardiac muscle metabolism.

Vanadium

Vanadium had not been shown to be essential for humans (EFSA, 2006). Vanadium compounds administered orally produced adverse effects on kidneys, spleen, lungs and blood pressure in rats.

Reproductive and developmental toxicity had been shown in rats and mice. Gastrointestinal disturbances had been reported in humans. EFSA found the available data to be inadequate to derive a tolerable upper intake level. The daily intake from food of vanadium was estimated to be of the order of 10-20 $\mu\text{g d}^{-1}$. This intake was below the lowest doses reported to cause adverse effects by at least three orders of magnitude (EFSA, 2004). The Food and Nutrition Board (FNB) recommended a maximum intake level of 1.8 mg V d^{-1} for adults (FNB, 2001). Vanadium pentoxide had been evaluated by IARC as “possibly carcinogenic to humans” (Group 2B based on inhalation studies in animals (IARC, 2003). The conclusion was based on “sufficient evidence” in experimental animals, as there was no human data.

Zinc (Zn)

Zinc was an essential trace element for humans (EFSA, 2014c), and the Average Requirement (AR) range was 6.2-10.2 mg d^{-1} for women (reference weight: 58.5 kg), and 7.5-12.7 mg d^{-1} for men (reference weight: 68.1 kg). Zinc had a catalytic role in many enzymes. The human transcriptome had 2500 zinc finger proteins, with a broad intracellular distribution, and activities that included binding of RNA molecules, but also involvement in protein–protein interactions. The biological role of these proteins included transcriptional and translational control/modulation and signal transduction (EFSA, 2014c). A daily dietary requirement/maximum tolerable daily intake of 0.3-1 mg kg^{-1} bw was established by JECFA (1982).

PAHs

EGCS washwater contained a range of PAHs as has already been described in chapter 6. Some PAHs were known carcinogens such as B(a)P, see Table 13 above. PAHs had been evaluated by the International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS) (WHO/IPCS, 1998), the Scientific Committee on Food (SCF) (SCF, 2002) and by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA) (JECFA, 2005). SCF concluded that the other 15 PAHs (benzo[a]anthracene, benzo[b]fluoranthene, benzo[j]fluoranthene, benzo[k]fluoranthene, benzo[ghi]perylene, benzo[a]pyrene, chrysene, cyclopenta[cd]pyrene, dibenzo[a,h]anthracene, dibenzo[a,e]pyrene, dibenzo[a,h]pyrene, dibenzo[a,i]pyrene, dibenzo[a,l]pyrene, indeno[1,2,3-cd]pyrene and 5-methylchrysene) showed clear evidence of mutagenicity / genotoxicity in somatic cells in experimental animals *in vivo*. Furthermore, all PAHs, with the exception of benzo[ghi]perylene, showed clear carcinogenic effects in various types of bioassays in experimental animals. SCF reasoned that these compounds may be regarded as potentially genotoxic and carcinogenic to humans and represented a priority group in the assessment of the risk of long-term adverse health effects following dietary intake of PAHs. SCF also suggested using benzo[a]pyrene as a marker of the carcinogenic PAHs in food. This decision was based on examinations of PAH profiles in food, and on evaluation of two coal tar mixtures in a carcinogenicity study in mice. JECFA re-evaluated PAHs in 2005 (JECFA, 2005) while using the assessments of IPCS and SCF for 13 PAHs, but also took into account more recent studies. Overall, the JECFA concluded that 13 PAHs were clearly genotoxic and carcinogenic. The conclusion made by the CONTAM Panel regarding a suitable indicator for PAH in food was that benzo[a]pyrene was not a suitable indicator (JECFA, 2005). The CONTAM Panel concluded, based on currently available data, relating to occurrence and toxicity, that PAH4 (the sum of benzo[a]pyrene, chrysene, benzo[a]anthracene and benzo[b]fluoranthene) and PAH8 (Sum of benzo[a]anthracene, benzo[a]pyrene,

benzo[b]fluoranthene, benzo[k]fluoranthene, benzo[ghi]perylene, chrysene, dibenzo[a,h]anthracene and indeno[1,2,3-cd]pyrene) were the most suitable indicators of PAHs in food.

Benzo(a)pyrene

IARC classified benzo(a)pyrene as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1) (IARC, 2010). The World Health Organization drinking water limit value of $0.7 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ was a maximum concentration allowed in drinking water relating to an excess lifetime cancer risk of 10^{-5} for the general population. A BMDL_{10} value for an extra 10% risk compared to the background was estimated by EFSA (2008). The established BMDL_{10} of $0.07 \text{ mg kg}^{-1} \text{ bw d}^{-1}$ (Culp, *et al.*, 1998) was chosen for benzo[a]pyrene as a marker for the carcinogenic PAHs in food.

Table 14. Guideline values for selected CMR chemicals

Chemical	CAS No	Guideline value DW WHO, 2017	$\text{BMDL}_{10} / \text{BMDL}_{01}^*$	IRIS Slope factor	Cancer risk at 10^{-5} ($\text{mg kg}^{-1} \text{ d}^{-1}$)
Benzo(a)pyrene (PAH)	50-32-8	$0.7 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$	$0.07 \text{ mg kg}^{-1} \text{ bw d}^{-1}$	1 per $\text{mg kg}^{-1} \text{ bw d}^{-1}$	$1\text{E}-5$
Arsenic	7440-38-2	$10 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$	$0.3 - 8 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1} \text{ bw d}^{-1}$	1.5 per $\text{mg kg}^{-1} \text{ bw d}^{-1}$	NA^1
Cadmium	7440-43-9	$3 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$	$2.5 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1} \text{ bw w}^{-1}$ (TWI)	1.8×10^{-3} per $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$	$1.6\text{E}+0$
Chromium (vi)	18540-29-9	NA^2	carcinogen	8×10^{-4} per $\mu\text{g kg}^{-1} \text{ bw d}^{-1}$	$1.2\text{E}+1$

* This value represent a BMDL of 01 for arsenic

¹ NA = not applicable, the cancer risk for arsenic was 3 cases per 1000 individuals and exceeds the cancer risk level of 1 case in 100 000 individuals

² NA = not applicable

Table 15. Guideline values for selected chemicals with threshold effects

Chemical	CAS No	Guideline value DW WHO, 2017	Guideline value food, PMTDI	BMDL_{10}
Chromium total	7440-47-3	$50 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$	NA	
Chromium (iii)	7440-47-3		$0.3 \text{ mg kg}^{-1} \text{ bw d}^{-1}$	
Copper	7440-50-8	$2000 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ (2 mg L^{-1})	1.6 mg d^{-1} for men and 1.3 mg d^{-1} for women	
Lead	7439-92-1	$10 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$	0.6 $\mu\text{g kg}^{-1} \text{ bw d}^{-1}$ loss of 1 IQ point in children; 1.2 $\mu\text{g kg}^{-1} \text{ bw d}^{-1}$ for 1 mmHg increase in blood pressure (adults)	$0.63 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1} \text{ bw d}^{-1}$
Nickel	7440-02-0	$70 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ $20 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ (EFSA, 2018)	$2.8 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1} \text{ bw d}^{-1}$	$0.28 \text{ mg kg}^{-1} \text{ bw d}^{-1}$
Selenium	7782-49-2	$40 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$	$70 \mu\text{g d}^{-1}$ (AI)	
Vanadium	7440-62-2	NA	1.8 mg d^{-1}	
Zinc	7440-66-6	$>3000 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ (3 mg L^{-1})	$0.3 - 1 \text{ mg kg}^{-1} \text{ bw d}^{-1}$	

NA = not available

USEPA had established a slope factor for benzo(a)pyrene (2017) of 1 per $\text{mg kg}^{-1} \text{ d}^{-1}$ based on the tumor response in the alimentary tract (forestomach, esophagus, tongue, and larynx) of female

B6C3F1 mice (Beland and Culp, 1998). This slope factor was selected as the factor with the highest value (most sensitive) among a range of slope factors derived (USEPA, 2017), see Table 14 and 15.

In addition to the sources for guidance values stated above, it should be mentioned that the European Commission had established maximum limits (MLs) for a number of food contaminants including heavy metals (lead, cadmium, mercury, tin (inorganic) and arsenic (inorganic)) and PAHs (EFSA, 2019).

7.2.2 Environmental Hazard Assessment for PBT Properties

Substances may be Persistent (*i.e.* poorly degradable in the environment), Bioaccumulating (accumulate in organisms and foodchains) and Toxic for humans and the environment (PBT). If certain criteria were met, substances may be classified as PBT. In Europe, criteria for PBT identification were laid down in Annex XIII of the REACH Regulation (EC No. 1907/2006) (European Commission, 2006). In several jurisdictions across the world, PBT substances were identified and risk management measures were directed towards minimization of environmental releases of such chemicals. The minimization need was due to the persistence of PBT substances in the environment, the unpredictability of long-term environmental risks and impacts and ability to be distributed over long ranges and across food chains. Assessment of persistence, bioaccumulation and toxic effects of chemicals was performed in several jurisdictions such as under the Stockholm Convention of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to protect the environment from persistent organic pollutants (POP's), the UNECE POP protocol and the Oslo-Paris Convention (OSPAR). Criteria applied were largely comparable but there were some differences. In the EU under REACH in addition to PBT also very Persistent and very Bioaccumulating (vPvB) substances were identified. Within the context of assessment of active substances in ballast water management systems, an assessment of PBT properties was performed. The criteria were also laid down in BMW.2/Circ.13/Rev.4 (MEPC, 2017).

7.2.2.1 Availability of Data

EGCS washwater may contain chemical constituents that were of concern regarding possible PBT properties. Metals, metal compounds and other inorganic compounds, NO_x, SO_x were not of concern as these constituents did not meet the PBT criteria. Hydrocarbon fuel oil constituents and combustion products may be of concern depending on their chemical characteristics such as carbon chain length and molecular structure. Linear, branched and cyclic hydrocarbons would normally not meet the PBT criteria as the rate of (bio-)degradation would be sufficient for breakdown in environmental compartments after release. Main constituents in EGCS washwater that were of concern regarding possible PBT properties were Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs). PAHs were a class of hundreds of organic compounds that consisted of two or more aromatic rings fused in linear, angular, or clustered arrangements. The USEPA had listed 16 PAHs as priority pollutants in aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems. According to ECHA (2016) based on the available information from degradation experiments, B[a]P degraded very slowly in soil with half-lives of > 180 d and, therefore, met the P criterion. The bioaccumulation of B[a]P in aquatic species was measured and BCFs > 5000 obtained, which qualified for the B criterion. In addition, B[a]P was a very toxic substance. Based on the available information, the most sensitive organism to B[a]P was *Crassostrea gigas*. With a calculated EC₁₀ of 0.22 µg L⁻¹. Also, its human health hazard classification as a CMR

compound contributed to its qualification for the T criterion. Similar assessments were available for other listed PAHs. PBT information available on the 16 USEPA PAHs was listed in Appendix, Table A1.

Eight of the 16 US EPA PAHs including benzo[a]pyrene were classified as PBTs in the EU in accordance with the REACH Regulation (ECHA (2008, 2016, 2017a, 2017b, 2018a, 2018b, 2018c, 2018d). In the USA benzo[a]pyrene and 8 other PAHs were included in EPA's Persistent Bioaccumulative and Toxic Chemical Program covering 16 PBT chemicals and 5 PBT chemical compound categories (US EPA (2018). The information in Table 16 provided an indication on the PBT status of 16 EPA PAHs currently available in the USA and the EU. The 16 EPA PAHs were a selection of a much larger group of PAHs that would be contained in EGCS washwater as the PAHs were fuel and lube oil constituents and may be formed during combustion of the fuel. Depending on molecular size and structure, PAHs would have a range of environmental fate properties. EGCS washwaters would exhibit a certain PAHs profile. For the purpose of a risk assessment focusing on PBT properties of PAHs it was, therefore, appropriate to consider the 16 EPA PAHs as indicators for the overall presence of the larger group of molecules. The finding that some PAHs should be considered PBT chemicals did not necessarily mean that other PAHs had the same property. However, since the larger group of PAHs had the same source in a risk assessment the group should be considered as a whole. No specific information relevant for PBT assessment was available in any of the MEPC and PPR documents provided to the Task Team.

Table 16. Legally established PBT properties of 16 EPA PAHs in the US and EU

PAH	CAS No.	PBT	Reference
Naphthalene	91-20-3	NA	
Acenaphthylene	208-96-8	NA	
Acenaphthene	83-82-9	NA	
Fluorene	86-73-7	NA	
Anthracene	120-12-7	Yes	ECHA (2008)
Phenanthrene	85-01-8	NA	
Fluoranthene	206-44-0	Yes	ECHA (2018a) US EPA (2018)
Pyrene	129-00-0	Yes	ECHA (2018b)
Benzo[a]anthracene	56-55-3	Yes	ECHA (2017a) US EPA (2018)
Chrysene	218-01-9	Yes	ECHA (2017b) US EPA (2018)
Benzo[b]fluoranthene	205-99-2	Yes	US EPA (2018)
Benzo[k]fluoranthene	207-08-9	Yes	ECHA (2018c) US EPA (2018)
Benzo[a]pyrene	50-32-8	Yes	ECHA (2016) US EPA (2018)
Indeno[1,2,3-cd]pyrene	193-39-5	Yes	US EPA (2018)
Dibenzo[a,h]anthracene	53-70-3	Yes	US EPA (2018)
Benzo[ghi]perylene	191-24-2	Yes	ECHA (2018d) US EPA (2018)

NA: Classification not assigned or unknown

7.2.3 Environmental hazard assessment for aquatic toxicity

Assessing the aquatic environmental hazards of EGCS washwater constituents may be performed either by examining individual chemical constituents and their respective toxicological properties or by whole effluent approaches. Information available from whole effluent toxicity testing on EGCS washwater was described in section 7.2.4. Both short-term and long-term effects should be considered and effects on organisms living in the water column as well as on sediment dwelling organisms should be considered. The latter was of specific relevance as in the intermediate or long-term some of the chemical constituents of EGCS washwater may be distributed from the water column to marine sediment. The primary focus of the assessment was to the marine aquatic compartment including sediment. However, the Task Team noted that because in some harbour or estuarine areas the alkalinity may be much lower and even be closer to brackish or freshwater conditions, a hazard assessment should also account for low-alkalinity conditions.

As EGCS washwater may contain many constituents, the focus of this report and any future hazard and risk assessment should be on those chemicals that were of highest concern and for which information was available on their appearance and concentrations in EGCS washwater. The analyses focused, therefore, on the 16 EPA PAHs, and trace metals (As, Cd, Cr, Cu, Ni, Pb, Se, V, Zn).

7.2.3.1 Availability of data

PAHs

Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons were substances that had both natural and anthropogenic origins. They could be formed as a result of combustion, and were constituents of many petroleum products as well. PAHs had different physicochemical and environmental properties (*e.g.* log K_{ow} , log K_{oc} , solubility and Bio Concentration Factors (BCF)). Different PAHs exhibited different levels of toxicity and induced different kinds of effects in aquatic organisms (Incardona, *et al.*, 2004; Lee and Anderson, 2005) depending on their physico-chemical properties and the speed of microbial transformation (Heintz, *et al.*, 1999). PAH toxicity was related to both low molecular weight and high molecular weight PAHs. Toxicity studies were mostly related to oil spills. Toxicity tests on crude and heavy fuel oils had shown that alkyl-PAH were substantially more toxic than unsubstituted PAH (specifically alkyl-phenanthrene versus phenanthrene) (Turcotte, *et al.*, 2011; Barron, *et al.*, 2004). Similarly, Barron, *et al.* (2004) suggested that alkyl-phenanthrenes were a primary cause of toxicity of crude oil in the early life stages of fish. The high aromatic content of HFO caused a high concentration of naphthalene derivatives. For almost all PAHs, the highest concentrations of alkylated PAHs were present, *e.g.* the C3-alkylated naphthalene derivatives. In the BSH study (PPR, 2018) also methylated naphthalenes were analyzed and found in notable concentrations (2 – 19 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$) for 1-methyl and 2-methyl naphthalene) in OL EGCS discharge water. These physical properties of PAHs affected their bioavailability and toxicity to freshwater and marine organisms (Neff, *et al.*, 2004).

The ecotoxicity of PAHs to freshwater and marine organisms was widely investigated and a large database of ecotoxicological studies was available in literature. For the purpose of the EGCS washwater environmental risk assessment reference was made to a comprehensive literature review including many studies across the world performed by the Dutch Institute for Public Health and the

Environment (RIVM) (Verbruggen, 2012). The resulting conclusions on Predicted No Effect Concentrations could be found in section 7.2.3.2.

Trace metals

Metals found in EGCS washwater may be in dissolved or particulate form. Many trace metals may be found but for practical reasons the Task Team considered that the assessment should be limited to the metals that are in the analysis scheme of the 2015 EGCS Guidelines which are arsenic (As), cadmium (Cd), copper (Cu), chromium (Cr), lead (Pb), nickel (Ni), selenium (Se), vanadium (V) and zinc (Zn). As regarding the hazards for aquatic and sediment organisms, most metals were very data rich and to arrive at a proper hazard evaluation review of many studies or review of usability of hazard assessments provided by regulatory bodies across the globe would be needed which was not feasible within the timeframe provided for this report. Most information was relevant for freshwater ecosystems but also data relevant marine risk assessment was available. For metals hazard assessment of the marine aquatic compartment, a specific assessment would be needed. Due to high alkalinity and buffering capacity of seawater, the hazards assessment of metals was very different from freshwater assessment.

Arsenic (As)

For arsenic an environmental hazard assessment was made in the framework of the International Commission for the Protection of the river Rhine (IKSR-CIPR-ICBR, 2009). The authors concluded that based on the available data algae, crustaceans and other invertebrates were among the most sensitive species for effects of arsenic. The lowest long-term No Observed Effect Levels were concluded to be at levels $<10 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$. For marine organisms a lowest effect level (EC50) of $11 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ was found for mortality of the copepod *Tigriopus brevicornis*. The authors concluded no valid sediment data were available for derivation of toxicity reference values. The data were used in a species sensitivity distribution to arrive at relevant environmental toxicity reference values.

Cadmium (Cd)

An environmental hazard assessment of cadmium metal and cadmium oxide was available in a European Risk Assessment report (European Commission, 2007). For environmental hazard assessment of cadmium a comprehensive dataset was available. The authors concluded on a PNEC_{water} of Cd based on a median HC₅ value from 44 chronic NOEC values, some of which were geometric species means. The HC₅ was defined as a minimum effect value representative for the most sensitive species (5% of the population was more sensitive) derived by statistical species sensitivity distribution analyses. These data were derived from 19 tests with fish / amphibians, 22 tests with aquatic invertebrates and 8 tests with primary producers and represent 28 species in total. All these tests belonged to reliable data. The NOEC values were obtained from laboratory based, single species studies and refer to the dissolved fraction. An assessment factor of two was applied on the HC₅ and a PNEC_{water} was set at $0.19 \mu\text{g Cd L}^{-1}$. The assessment included an evaluation of the effect of environmental parameters such as the water hardness on the toxicity. In the derivation of the EQS

reference values (European Commission, 2013) water hardness was included in the criteria covering 5 different water hardness classes. For sediment similar assessment was performed.

Chromium (Cr)

For chromium and chromium compounds an environmental hazard assessment was made in the framework of the International Commission for the Protection of the river Rhine (IKSR-CIPR-ICBR, 2009). Long-term toxicity data for chromium III were concluded to be available for bacteria, algae, crustaceans and fish. The lowest No Observed Effect level reported for the crustacean *Daphnia magna* was at $47 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$. The lowest NOEC for chromium VI was determined for reproduction effects in the crustacean *Ceriodaphnia dubia* at $4.7 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$. The data were used in a species sensitivity distribution to arrive at relevant environmental toxicity reference values.

Copper (Cu)

Copper was widely known as a compound with a relatively high aquatic toxicity and was generally accepted to be classified according to GHS as Acute Aquatic Category 1 and Chronic Aquatic Category 1. The European Commission's Scientific Committee on Health and Environmental Risks (SCHER, European Commission, 2009a) provided an opinion on a voluntary risk assessment performed by industry on copper and copper compounds. In the report, it was summarized that for the marine environment 57 chronic toxicity data (NOECs) on 24 species (4 algae, 18 invertebrates, and 2 fishes) were selected as highly reliable. The lowest copper effect levels were found in the low $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ range. The lowest effect concentration was $5.2 \mu\text{g Cu L}^{-1}$ normalized at Dissolved Organic Carbon (DOC) content of 0.2 mg L^{-1} . On the basis of the available dataset species sensitivity distribution curves were generated to arrive at PNECs. For sediments, sufficient reliable toxicity data were concluded not to be available. Therefore, the so-called equilibrium partitioning method was applied to arrive at reference values.

As copper was an extremely data rich metal, normally species sensitivity distribution would be applied to arrive at a PNEC. The European Commission's Scientific Committee on Health and Environmental Risks (European Commission, 2009a) provided an opinion on a voluntary risk assessment performed by industry on copper and copper compounds. For the marine environment, 57 chronic toxicity data (NOECs) on 24 species (4 algae, 18 invertebrates, and 2 fishes) were selected as highly reliable using different statistical approaches, HC_{5-50} values (50 meant the median value) ranging from 4.8 and $5.2 \mu\text{g Cu L}^{-1}$ were calculated from data normalized on 2 mg L^{-1} DOC (corresponding to 1.3 to $1.4 \mu\text{g Cu L}^{-1}$ normalized on 0.2 mg L^{-1} DOC). Based on a large dataset on copper and copper compounds the SCHER arrived at $\text{PNEC}_{\text{marine}}$ of $2.6 \mu\text{g Cu L}^{-1}$, applying an assessment factor of 2 to the lowest effect concentration of $5.2 \mu\text{g Cu L}^{-1}$ normalized at Dissolved Organic Carbon (DOC) content of 0.2 mg L^{-1} . For the freshwater compartment $\text{HC}_{5-50\text{sediment}}$ values specific for a range of different scenarios were calculated ranging from 7.8 and $27.2 \mu\text{g Cu L}^{-1}$.

For marine sediments, the SCHER considered sufficient reliable toxicity data were not available. Therefore, a partitioning method was applied. Considering the characteristics of marine and estuarine sediments, PNECs of 338 and $144 \text{ mg Cu kg}^{-1}$ dry weight respectively were calculated. (European Commission, 2009a). For freshwater sediments the $\text{HC}_{5-50\text{sediment}}$ was calculated at an indicative level of a PNEC of $1741 \text{ mg Cu kg}^{-1}$ organic carbon.

Lead (Pb)

An environmental hazard assessment on lead and lead compounds was available in a voluntary risk assessment report performed by the metals industry. In an opinion by the Scientific Committee on Health and Environmental Risks (SCHER) the environmental effect data were summarized (European Commission, 2009b). The SCHER concluded that the risk assessment contained too few marine NOEC data to derive a reliable PNEC. It was acknowledged that sensitivity comparisons between freshwater and marine species might be influenced by biological (*e.g.* different physiology) and chemical factors (different bioavailability) and that using a combined freshwater and marine database was not the most scientific way forward. SCHER concluded to support the generation of more reliable NOECs for more marine species. A preliminary HC₅ of 6.1 µg L⁻¹ was derived from NOECs for 6 species (2 algae, 2 annelids and 2 crustaceans). This HC₅ reference value was higher than the annual average environmental quality standard of 1.3 µg L⁻¹ that was established in 2013 in the framework of the EU Water Framework Directive (See Table 18). The task team recognized there was a need to further investigate the justification of appropriate guidance values for lead in marine water also in relation to the background concentration of lead and recommended a more international approach instead of a regional approach.

Nickel (Ni)

Soluble nickel compounds such as nickel oxide in the EU had a legally harmonized classification according to GHS of Aquatic Chronic 4, which meant that acute and long-term aquatic toxicity were not high but there were some grounds for concern related to the possibilities of nickel to cause long-term effects on aquatic organisms. In an European risk assessment report submitted by Denmark (European Commission, 2003b) the environmental hazards of nickel metal and 4 soluble nickel salts had been assessed. Chronic nickel toxicity data were available for fifteen marine species. The database used included a broad representation of temperate marine organisms, including unicellular algae, macroalgae, invertebrates, and fish. The marine toxicity database used for calculation of an HC₅ included 15 different organisms representing 6 different taxonomic groups (*i.e.*, algae, crustaceans, echinoderms, mollusks, annelids, and fish) and covering a range of different life forms, feeding strategies and trophic levels.

Selenium (Se)

Van Vlaardingen (2005) identified acute toxicity data for cyanobacteria, protozoa, algae, macrophytes, rotifers, molluscs, crustaceans, insects, annelids, fish, and amphibians. Chronic toxicity data were found for bacteria, cyanobacteria, protozoa, algae, macrophytes, crustaceans, insects and fish. The base set for acute toxicity data was considered complete. Since chronic toxicity data were divided over 8 taxonomic groups, for 36 species, it was decided to use the robust dataset for statistical extrapolation for derivation of toxicity reference values.

Vanadium (V)

Van Vlaardingen (2005) found acute toxicity data for protozoa, coelenterata, molluscs, annelids, crustaceans, insects, echinoderms and fish. Chronic toxicity data were found for algae, crustaceans and fish. The base set for acute toxicity data was considered not complete. However, the omission of algae in the acute data was compensated for by chronic data for algae. The lowest NOEC used for deriving toxicity reference values was 41 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ in a study with *Jordanella floridae* in a test that started with eggs.

Zinc (Zn)

For zinc an environmental hazard assessment was made in the framework of the International Commission for the Protection of the river Rhine (IKSR-CIPR-ICBR, 2009). A large database on zinc aquatic and sediment toxicity data was available but the primary focus was on freshwater species. Marine data were concluded to be available for crustaceans and algae only with 'species mean' NOEC values between 10 and 2700 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$. The lowest available NOEC for a benthic species *Hyalella azteca* was 488 mg kg^{-1} dry weight (added zinc). No sediment data on marine sediment dwelling organisms was available.

7.2.3.2 Extrapolation and Derivation of Reference Values

PAHs

The environmental toxicity of PAHs was widely investigated and a large database of ecotoxicological studies was available in literature and in hazard and risk assessment reports from research institutions and within various legal frameworks across the globe. In a report by Verbruggen (2012), among other reference values so-called maximum permissible concentrations for ecosystems (MPC_{eco}) were derived for the 16 EPA PAHs. These environmental risk limits were derived using data on ecotoxicology and environmental chemistry and represented the potential risk of substances to the ecosystem. They were presented as the scientific basis for setting environmental quality standards (EQSs) by policy makers.

Table 17 provided an overview of the relevant MPCs derived from Verbruggen (2012) that were accepted as a reasonable representation on the state of play of scientific knowledge on the environmental hazards of PAHs. The Task Team on EGCS considered that after 2012 more ecotoxicological data may have been generated. However, as the database used for the analysis in 2012 was already extensive and included many tests on various species covering all relevant trophic levels, new information would probably have little impact on the magnitude of the Maximum Permissible Concentrations. The Task Team on EGCS considered the following MPCs as relevant for an environmental risk assessment of EGCS washwater discharges: $\text{MPC}_{\text{eco,water}}$ (for risk assessment of pelagic organisms in freshwater conditions), $\text{MPC}_{\text{eco,marine}}$ (for risk assessment of pelagic organisms in marine water conditions), $\text{MPC}_{\text{eco,sediment}}$ (for risk assessment of benthic organisms in freshwater conditions) and $\text{MPC}_{\text{eco,marine sediment}}$ (for risk assessment of benthic organisms in marine conditions). As the MPC values presented for PAHs were all based on large datasets with an accepted assessment factor, as required, these entities should be considered to represent the PNEC, which was a more globally accepted term. For the sake of this report, the Task Team on EGCS qualified these regional terminologies as the PNECs to be used in potential risk assessments. The Task Team on EGCS noted that the methodology applied for derivation of MPCs was similar to the derivation of PNECs and

hence the MPCs presented in Table 17 would be used as PNECs in the risk assessment performed for EGCS washwater.

Trace metals

Because metal toxicity was largely influenced by pH and alkalinity Predicted No Effect Concentrations (PNECs) for the marine aquatic compartment should preferably be derived based on test data with marine species. In case no test data on marine organisms was available the uncertainty should be accounted for in the derivation of toxicity reference values for the marine aquatic compartment.

In a risk assessment, factors such as water hardness, pH, dissolved organic carbon or other water quality parameters should be accounted for as these affect the bioavailability of metals.

Table 17. Overview of the derived risk limits for 16 EPA PAHs individually. Concentrations in water were in $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$, concentrations in sediment in mg kg^{-1} dw (standard sediment containing 10% organic matter). From Verbruggen (2012)

PAH	CAS No.	MPC _{eco,water}	MPC _{eco,marine}	MPC _{eco,sediment}	MPC _{eco,marine sediment}
Naphthalene	91-20-3	2.0	2.0	0.16	0.16
Acenaphthylene	208-96-8	1.3	0.13	0.17	0.017
Acenaphthene	83-82-9	3.8	0.38	0.97	0.10
Fluorene	86-73-7	1.5	0.30	0.83	0.17
Phenanthrene	85-01-8	1.1	1.1	0.78	0.78
Anthracene	120-12-7	0.10	0.10	0.047	0.0047
Pyrene	129-00-0	0.023	0.023	1.67	0.84
Fluoranthene	206-44-0	0.12	0.12	4.11	4.11
Chrysene	218-01-9	0.07	0.007	1.64	0.16
Benz[a]anthracene	56-55-3	0.012	0.0012	0.35	0.04
Benzo[k]fluoranthene	207-08-9	0.017	0.017	0.79	0.79
Benzo[b]fluoranthene	205-99-2	0.017	0.017	0.79	0.79
Benzo[a]pyrene	50-32-8	0.01	0.01	0.49	0.49
Benzo[ghi]perylene	191-24-2	0.0082	0.00082	0.49	0.049
Dibenzo[a,h]anthracene	53-70-3	0.0014	0.00014	0.18	0.018
Indeno[1,2,3-cd]pyrene	193-39-5	0.0027	0.00027	0.38	0.038

Table 18 provided an overview of the PNECs for trace metals that would be used in the environmental risk assessment of EGCS washwater discharges. For most trace metals Maximum Permissible Concentrations (MPCs) were available derived in the framework of the EU Water Framework Directive (Directive 2000/60/EC) or in reports by scientific institutions. In general MPC could be used as equivalent to the PNEC as the methodology applied for deriving these limit values was the same as used for PNEC derivation. Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) for annual average concentrations (AA) and peak allowable concentrations (MAC) were laid down in the EU Water Framework Directive and also had a similar basis as MPC and could, therefore, also be used as PNEC for environmental risk assessment of EGCS washwater discharges.

The values presented in Table 18 applied to dissolved metal concentrations. For chromium the total of Cr(III) and Cr(VI) was included in the reference value. In metals risk assessment the natural background concentration played an important role. For cadmium and its compounds the EQS values varied depending on the hardness of the water as specified in five class categories (Class 1: < 40 mg CaCO₃ L⁻¹, Class 2: 40 to < 50 mg CaCO₃ L⁻¹, Class 3: 50 to < 100 mg CaCO₃ L⁻¹, Class 4: 100 to < 200 mg CaCO₃ L⁻¹ and Class 5: ≥ 200 mg CaCO₃ L⁻¹). Reference values presented in Table 18 for copper, cadmium, nickel and lead were inclusive of background concentrations while for the other six metals the background concentration was excluded and hence the reference values presented a PNEC for added risk due to the EGCS washwater discharge.

Because metal toxicity was largely influenced by pH and alkalinity Predicted No Effect Concentrations (PNECs) for the marine aquatic compartment should preferably be derived based on test data with marine species. In case no test data on marine organisms was available the uncertainty should be accounted for in the derivation of toxicity reference values for the marine aquatic compartment.

Table 18. Overview of the derived PNECs or similar reference values for individual dissolved trace metals contained in EGCS washwater. Concentrations in water in µg L⁻¹, concentrations in sediment in mg kg⁻¹ dw or otherwise indicated, various sources

Trace metal	PNEC _{water}	PNEC _{marine water}	PNEC _{sediment}	PNEC _{marine sediment}	Reference
Arsenic (As)	Background + 0.5 ³ Background + 8.0 ⁴	Background + 0.6 ³ Background + 1.1 ⁴			IKSR-CIPR-ICBR (2009)
Cadmium (Cd)	≤0.08 – 0.25 ¹¹ ≤0.45 – 1.5 ²¹	0.2 ¹³ ≤0.45 – 1.5 ¹⁴			European Commission (2013)
Chromium (Cr)	Background + 3.4 ⁵	Background + 0.6 ⁵			IKSR-CIPR-ICBR (2009)
Copper (Cu)	7.8 - 27.2 ³	2.6 ¹	1741 ⁴¹	144-338 ¹	European Commission (2009a)
Lead (Pb)	1.2 ¹³ 14 ¹⁴	1.3 ¹³ 14 ¹⁴			European Commission (2013)
Nickel (Ni)	4 ¹³ 34 ¹⁴	8.6 ¹³ 34 ¹⁴			European Commission (2013)
Selenium (Se)	Background + 2.1 ⁶	Background + 2.1 ⁶	Background + 1.3 ⁶		Van Vlaardingen (2005)
Vanadium (V)	Background + 0.40 ³ Background + 2.2 ⁴	Background + 0.4 ⁵			Smit (2012) Van Vlaardingen (2005)
Zinc (Zn)	Background + 7.8 ³ Background + 15.6 ⁴	Background + 3 ⁶			IKSR-CIPR-ICBR (2009)

In a risk assessment factors such as water hardness, pH, dissolved organic carbon or other water quality parameters should be accounted for as these affect the bioavailability of metals.

¹ AA EQS for annual average dissolved concentration

² MAC EQS for maximum allowed dissolved concentration during peak emissions

³ Including background concentration

⁴ Indicative value in mg Cu kg⁻¹ organic carbon.

⁵ Maximum Permissible Concentration

⁶ MAC EQS for maximum allowed dissolved concentration applicable for peak emissions and as annual average concentration

Table 18 provided an overview of the PNECs for trace metals that would be used in the environmental risk assessment of EGCS washwater discharges. For most trace metals Maximum Permissible Concentrations (MPCs) were available derived in the framework of the EU Water Framework Directive (Directive 2000/60/EC) or in reports by scientific institutions. In general MPC could be used as equivalent to the PNEC as the methodology applied for deriving these limit values was the same as used for PNEC derivation. Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) for annual average concentrations (AA) and peak allowable concentrations (MAC) were laid down in the EU Water Framework Directive and also had a similar basis as MPC and could, therefore, also be used as PNEC for environmental risk assessment of EGCS washwater discharges. The values presented in Table 18 applied to dissolved metal concentrations. For chromium the total of Cr(III) and Cr(VI) was included in the reference value. In metals risk assessment the natural background concentration played an important role. For cadmium and its compounds the EQS values varied depending on the hardness of the water as specified in five class categories (Class 1: < 40 mg CaCO₃ L⁻¹, Class 2: 40 to < 50 mg CaCO₃ L⁻¹, Class 3: 50 to < 100 mg CaCO₃ L⁻¹, Class 4: 100 to < 200 mg CaCO₃ L⁻¹ and Class 5: ≥ 200 mg CaCO₃ L⁻¹). Reference values presented in Table 18 for copper, cadmium, nickel and lead were inclusive of background concentrations while for the other six metals the background concentration was excluded and hence the reference values presented a PNEC for added risk due to the EGCS washwater discharge.

7.2.4. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Testing

As stated in section 6.4, it was impossible that the chemical analysis performed could identify all potential organic compounds that may have adverse effects on the marine ecosystem. The advantage of performing Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) testing on the discharge washwater was that it integrated and addressed the potential aquatic toxicity of SO_x, together with other exhaust gas components, including any unidentified PAHs, trace metals and other organic chemicals. Also, the aggregated ecotoxicity from contaminants both dissolved and adsorbed on particulate matter could be taken into account.

In the references provided by PPR together with scientific literatures collected by Task Team, there were four papers performing the WET testing using the actual discharge water from EGCS; Japan (2019), Ytreberg, *et al.* (2019), Koski, *et al.* (2017) and Magnussen, *et al.* (2018). The summary of those tests were shown in the Table 19.

Japan (2019) performed three acute toxicity WET tests using discharge sea water with dilution by clean sea water. They used three test organisms, micro algae (*Skeletonema costatum*), crustacean (*Hyale barbicornis*) and fish (*Oryzias javanicus*), that represented three taxa. The raw discharge water without dilution indicated a certain adverse effect in all three tests. Japan (2019) concluded that the lowest dilution needed to achieve NO mortality (NOEC) was 12.5% (8-fold dilution), also that the lowest EC50 delivered was 20% (5-fold dilution). The Task Team evaluated both the methodologies they applied and validity of their assessment. The Task Team concluded that both NOEC and EC50 reported had sufficient reliability from a methodological viewpoint. In addition, the Task Team concurred with the assessment in the report that the residual toxicity observed was predominantly caused by low pH of the discharge water, because a certain dilution by clean seawater the pH for the exposure recovered to be more than 6.5 in one hour.

However, the Task Team recognized that the discharge water was collected from the test plants set up on land; combination with a middle speed 4 cycle engine and EGCS originally designed for closed loop. The Task Team also recognized that the lower concentration of PAHs rather than those reported in the other documents. Therefore, the Task Team could not conclude that the residual ecotoxicity measured in Japan (2019) had sufficient representativity for discharge water from actual ECGSs onboard. Secondly, the Task Team considered that other adverse effects which led by the other than SO_x may be masked by low pH, and neither be quantified in these tests. The Task Team considered that further tests and assessment will be needed from these viewpoints using pH adjusted discharge water in combination with performing long-term toxicity testing.

Ytreberg, *et al.*, (2019) stated that EGCS discharge water caused increased (positive) growth of two micro algae (*Nodularia spumigena* and *Melosira cf. arctica*). The test organisms were exposed for 13 days, using 5% (20-fold dilution) and 10% dilution (10-fold dilution) of the discharge water. Ytreberg, *et al.*, (2019) concluded that the two species respond differently: *N. spumigena* showed negative responses in photosynthetic activity (EC₁₀ = 8.6% for *N. spumigena*) and increased primary productivity (EC₁₀ = 5.5% for *M. cf. arctica*). However, Ytreberg *et al.* (2019) made only two diluted sections (5% and 10%), so that the Task Team considered the number or dilution series could be insufficient. Also, the tests used different endpoints for growth inhibition than those in internationally accepted standards. Therefore, the Task Team could not perform the further quantitative evaluation to calculate adverse effects.

Koski, *et al.*, (2017) performed three acute WET tests, using the discharge water of actual EGCS diluted by clean water. The test organisms used were micro algae (*Rhodomonas* sp.) for growth inhibition, and crustacean (*Acartia tonsa*) mortality of adults (copepodite) and eggs, respectively. The raw discharge water indicated strong residual ecotoxicity on all three test organisms, by which all the test organisms cannot survive or no growth during the exposure duration. On the other hand, with a certain dilution rate (*e.g.* 10% or 10-fold dilution), no adverse effects were observed. However, all three tests by Koski, *et al.* (2019) were not performed in accordance with internationally accepted standards, for example, log phase of the micro algae growth were NOT kept for the exposure duration of 12 days. Therefore, the Task Team concluded that there are uncertainties on the reported data to calculate EC₅₀ or EC₁₀.

Magnussen, *et al.*, (2018) carried out chronic toxicity tests with juvenile copepods (*Calanus helgolandicus*) using discharge water in a range of dilution series. The Task Team noted that the LOECs for molality were 0.04% and 0.1% for CL (two different tests), and 1% for OL. However, because of the uneven geometric factor for dilution series, the Task Team considered that these toxicities may be overestimated. Also, the Task Team considered that the method to detect the statistical difference was not appropriate for molarity. Therefore, the Task Team concluded the LOEC using Metabolic rate as its endpoint was more appropriate, and in this case, LOEC were >2% and 0.5% for CL (two different tests), and >10% for OL. Magnussen, *et al.* (2018) concluded that not the increased acidity or the reduced alkalinity caused the chronic adverse effects, rather than chemical contaminants. the CL EGCS has a function that the washwater was post-treated and diluted prior to discharge, so that 99% of the organic compounds and large fraction of the metals are removed, even in this case, a higher residual toxicity was observed. Therefore, Magnussen *et al.* assume that the lower molecular weight organics, that are better soluble in water, and the high copper and mercury concentrations might cause the chronic toxicity. However, because of less exposure time, 1 week, the Task Team considered that the test should be classified as semi-chronic. Also, the Task Team

recognized that the methodology to determine the NOEC was not in accordance with internationally accepted standards, therefore, the Task Team could not fully evaluate their EC10 instead of LOEC.

Table 19. Summary results of WET testing using the actual discharge water from EGCS

Reference	Test	Test organisms	pH	End point	References/guidelines
Japan	Growth inhibition testing using micro Algae	<i>Skeletonema Costatum</i>	3.5	growth rate after 72 hours EC50 49%	ISO 10253:2016
Japan	acute toxicity testing using crustacean	<i>Hyale barbicornis</i>	3.5	mortality after 96 hours EC50 20%	USEPA OCSP 850.1020 (2016)
Japan	acute toxicity testing using fish	<i>Oryzias Javanicus</i>	3.5	mortality after 96 hours EC50 35%	OECD TG203(1992)
Ytreberg, et al. (2019)	growth inhibition testing using micro Algae	<i>Nodularia spumigena</i>	2.8	primary productivity after 72 hours, EC10=9%	
Ytreberg, et al. (2019)	growth inhibition testing using micro Algae	<i>Melosira cf. arctica</i>	NA	primary productivity after 72 hours, Positive EC10=6%	
Koski, et al. (2019)	growth inhibition testing using micro Algae	Rhodomonas sp.	NA	growth rate after 12 days because of insufficient data EC50 could not be delivered (LOEC could be 10%)	NO standards were applied
Koski, et al. (2019)	Acute	<i>Acartia tonsa</i> (adult copepods)	3.2	mortality after 24 hours (NOEC could be 30%)	NO standards were applied
Koski, et al. (2019)	Acute	<i>Acartia tonsa</i> (egg)	3.2	Egg hatching after 24 hours (NOEC could be 50%)	NO standards were applied
Magnussen, et al. (2018)	Chronic	<i>Calanus helgolandicus</i> (juvenile copepods)	7.6	CL Metabolic rate after 7 days >2% and 0.5%	NO standards were applied
Magnussen, et al. (2018)	Chronic	<i>Calanus helgolandicus</i> (juvenile copepods)	7.6	OL Metabolic rate after 14 days >10%	NO standards were applied

From all the results, the Task Team considered that the acute adverse effects were dominantly caused by the low pH of the discharge water, associated with low dissolved oxygen concentrations. Among these four results of WET tests, because of the uncertainties identified above, the Task Team could not fully perform a comparison of the ecotoxicity reported. Even though, the Task Team draw a preliminary conclusion that acute toxicity caused by the discharge water of OL could be mitigated with around 10% dilution (10-fold dilution). The Task Team recognized that all EGCS comply with the discharge standard for the pH; more than 6.5 at 4.0 m distance from the discharge point. The Task Team also recognized that at least a 10-fold dilution was needed to reach the standard for the pH of discharge water reported in the papers. It should be noted that a 10-fold dilution caused only approximately one unit increase of pH, the rest of differential pH will be neutralized by the buffer effect of alkalinity. The compliance of the standards implies that the acute adverse effects of the discharge water could be sufficiently mitigated by the initial dilution at 4 m from discharges, together with neutralization by the buffering effect of alkalinity.

It should be noted that this mitigation process would be applied when the alkalinity of surrounding seawater was sufficiently high, to about 2,200 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$, and the pH was higher than 8.2, as assumed in the 2015 Guideline. Therefore, in this extraordinary case of a surrounding environment, such as fresh water with less alkalinity, the adverse effects could not be sufficiently mitigated, and the area with lower pH could be expanded over a distance of more than 4 m.

For the chronic or long-term ecotoxicity, the Task Team could not reach a conclusion from the data mentioned above. The Task Team noted the preliminary assessment approach by Japan that applied an assessment factor (*i.e.* 1000 in accordance with the methodology of GESAMP BWWG (MEPC, 2017)). Using this approach, the Task Team considered that a 1/10,000 (10^{-4}) dilution would be sufficient to mitigate chronic effects from the WET testing considered above. This dilution ratio was lower than the NOEC of the semi chronic test for OL in Magnussen, *et al.* (2018). Therefore, the Task Team considered that further data and assessment will be needed to conclude on chronic or long-term effects by the discharge water.

7.2.4.1 Conclusions and Recommendations for WET

The Task Team determined the following conclusions and corresponding recommendations with respect to WET testing:

1. The Task Team concluded that the concept of Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) testing could be a worthwhile effort to explore further assessment to evaluate the aggregated ecotoxicity of the washwater of EGCS, which may be caused by SOx together with all contaminants.
2. The Task Team recognized that almost all WET tests were not performed in accordance with internationally accepted methodology as these did not exist. It was, therefore, difficult to make a quantitative comparison and full evaluation among the data.
3. Even with the uncertainties mentioned above, the Task Team considered that the acute adverse effects were dominantly caused by the low pH of the discharge water, associated with low dissolved oxygen concentrations.
4. If washwater was discharged to full strength seawater with high alkalinity (*i.e.* 2,200 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$), the acute adverse effects could be sufficiently mitigated.
5. In the extraordinary case of a surrounding environment, such as freshwater with less alkalinity, the adverse acute effects could not be sufficiently mitigated.

6. Also, there was a possibility that the ecotoxicity of the other contaminants was masked by the dominant adverse effects by the low pH, therefore the Task Team recommended that further tests will be needed from these viewpoints using pH adjusted discharge water.
7. For the chronic or long-term ecotoxicity, the Task Team could not reach a conclusion from the data mentioned above. The chronic WET testing, however, was quite expensive and should be performed according to good laboratory practice but could give reliable answers on how the general toxicity, including all the unknown substances, could be tackled. The Task Team recommended that a set of four to five well-established, good quality WET tests should be performed in different relevant areas to study the toxicity for aquatic organisms and subsequently ecosystems.

7.2.5 Conclusions and Recommendations on Hazard Assessment

1. For human health hazard assessment, the Task Team recommended to establish guidance values to be used in the risk characterization. For use in the risk assessment for general public existing guidance values such as those established by for example JECFA or EFSA for food contaminants, such as PTWI or TDI, should be taken into account (see section 7.2.1.1). For chemicals with a non-threshold effect such as genotoxic carcinogens, it was considered more appropriate to use a slope factor or BMDI. The Task Team further recommended establishing exposure scenarios while taking into account exposure pathways for humans via the environmental and coastal amenities. For instance, exposure via food (secondary poisoning in conjunction with bioconcentration and biomagnification in aquatic organisms) as already mentioned earlier this report (section 3, section 5.3), may be a suitable way forward in a human health risk assessment approach.
2. For environmental hazard assessment the Task Team recommended to establish PNECs to be used in risk characterization. The Task Team considered PNECs should be developed for PAHs and all trace metals relevant in the scope of an environmental risk assessment for EGCS wastewater discharges. Preferably PNECs should be derived for the marine aquatic and sediment compartment. As some enclosed areas such as harbours and estuaries could have freshwater rather than marine conditions, the Task Team considered derivation of PNECs for freshwater including sediment would be appropriate. The Task Team further considered that given the comprehensiveness of ecotoxicological datasets available for the chemicals under consideration and evaluations of the data being available in various legal frameworks by regulatory bodies, it would be advisable to refer to conclusions of such analyses in a EGCS risk assessment.
3. The Task Team noted that for PBT classified PAHs present in EGCS wastewater, a risk assessment focusing on comparison of PECs with PNECs had limited or no meaning. It was generally understood by the scientific community that quantitative risk assessment for PBT chemicals could not yet be performed with sufficient certainty. In several legal frameworks across the globe regulating chemical supply and use identified PBTs were considered in a scheme targeted at minimization of use and emissions. The Task Team took note of these findings and concluded a risk assessment targeted at PBT chemicals in EGCS wastewater should be targeted to PBT identification. The Task Team considered that in this respect a comparative analyses of PAHs emissions to the marine aquatic compartment in certain

regions or on a global scale compared with other anthropogenic sources could facilitate the discussions on appropriate risk management measures in the context of maritime policy.

7.3. Potential for Risk Assessment

The general risk assessment process was depicted in Figure 14. There were 2 important routes distinguished: the upper route would give the hazard identification based on (eco)toxicological information, while in the lower route the exposure assessment was indicated. The exposure was based on the emission of the substance under consideration and its physico-chemical characteristics. The ratio of exposure and hazard defined the risk assessment quotient: PEC/PNEC for the environment and the ratio exposure / guidance value for threshold substances (DNEL) or the ratio exposure / guidance value for genotoxic substances (DMEL) for the human health assessment. Each step may be refined to represent more realistic situations: the tiered approach.

In section, 7.1 the exposure assessment possibilities were outlined and in section 7.2 the hazard assessment possibilities.

7.3.1 Human Health Risk Assessment Approaches

The Task Team noted that the SOLAS study (Endres, *et al.*, 2018) stated that IARC had identified 17 PAHs as a threat to human health, and that some of these substances were carcinogenic (Abdel-Shafy and Mansour, 2016). Furthermore, according to the report, PAHs were transported through the food web and end up in marine sediments where sediment dwelling and filter-feeding organisms, shellfish and fish may accumulate PAH. Fish and seafood containing PAH may then be consumed by humans. The Task Team agreed with the conclusion and suggested that in any future risk assessment proper exposure scenarios based on this conclusion may be established, i.e. exposure to trace metals and other chemicals via seafood consumption.




Figure 14. Steps in the risk assessment approach (modified from GESAMP (2019))

The Task Team noted that in the CESA study (MEPC, 2018) the concentrations of PAH, BTEX and metals were compared with the WHO guidelines for drinking water (WHO, 2017b). The Task Team recognized that this approach may be suitable for screening purposes but did not serve as a

complete risk assessment strategy. The reason was that a part of the quantitative exposure assessment part was missing, *i.e.* how many of the various chemicals were taken up in aquatic organisms and humans. Furthermore, the Task Team was of the opinion that the WHO guidelines for drinking water would not be suitable risk characterization guidance values as such, since they were expressed as concentrations (mg L^{-1}). The underlying data that had been used to establish the drinking water guideline values may, however, be used to derive an appropriate guidance value, *i.e.*, an estimate of a substance that could safely be taken in daily per unit body weight (expressed as $\text{mg kg}^{-1} \text{ bw d}^{-1}$). This approach would be applicable for chemicals with a threshold effect.

The Task Team noted that the USEPA (2011) study analyzed data from EGCS water chemical analyses from three different vessels and compared them against US NRWQC (US National recommended water quality criteria). The study concluded that for heavy metals and PAH, IMO guidelines washwater limits may not be sufficiently protective, since measured values exceeded US NRWQC. The Task Team acknowledges the use of the US NRWQC, but however reiterates its preference for the use of more suitable guidance values, such as guidance values derived for contaminants in food, to be used in a human health risk assessment.

7.3.2 Exposure via Different Sources and Background Concentrations

As already stated in section 7.2.1, there were risk management measures directed towards minimization of use of chemicals with CMR properties. Humans were exposed to contaminants in multiple ways other than through point sources of contamination, for example via food, drinking water and air. Since the total exposure from all sources should not exceed the tolerable daily intake (TDI), it was suggested (Naturvårdsverket, 2009) that exposure via an additional source of contaminants, such as from contaminated soil, should not account for more than 50% of the total TDI. Furthermore, it was suggested that for substances where the known background concentrations present were larger than 50% of the TDI, which was the case for lead, cadmium and mercury in that study, maximum 20% of the total TDI may originate from the contaminated area. For persistent organic contaminants such as dioxins and PCB, the corresponding figure was proposed to be 10%. It should be noted that for CMR substances no safe guidance levels could be assigned. For inorganic arsenic, there was little or no margin of exposure since the estimated dietary exposures for average and high level consumers in Europe were already within the range of the BMDL_{01} values identified, and therefore the possibility of a risk to some consumers could not be excluded (EFSA, 2009a).

7.3.3 Possibilities for Environmental Risk Assessment

Chemicals that were classified as PBT by several authorities across the world were given high priority for far reaching risk management measures such as use prohibitions and emission minimization requirements. PBT were generally understood as chemicals having a high potential risk to the environment because they are persistent and may bioaccumulate in food chains. Their risks were unpredictable on the long term and their presence in environmental compartments and biota was irreversible. The possibilities for quantitative risk assessment of PBT chemicals were limited but may progress in future. The Task Team considered currently the scientific methods for risk assessment of PBTs too limited to advance on this within the context of the ToR. Therefore, in an assessment of environmental risks of EGCS washwater, a PBT assessment should focus on PBT identification only.

The Task Team considered that some of the PAHs contained in EGCS washwater in several jurisdictions were classified as PBT chemicals. The Task Team considered also that formation of PAHs was a phenomenon associated with combustion processes in general. PAH releases occurred as a result of various anthropogenic activities involving combustion of oil, coal or biomass and waste and also resulting from natural fires etc. Maritime shipping was a source of global PAH release. An increase in the use of EGCS would mean a shift from primarily atmospheric emissions towards seawater emissions via washwater. It was for policy makers to decide whether appropriate abatement would have to be applied to minimize emissions of PAHs by anthropogenic sources. The Task Team considered that in this respect a comparative analyses of PAHs emissions to the marine aquatic compartment in certain regions or on a global scale compared with other anthropogenic sources could facilitate the discussions on appropriate risk management measures in the context of maritime policy.

As regards the marine aquatic compartment and sediment compartment the Task Team considered that a quantitative risk assessment may be carried out on the short term and long-term toxicological effects on pelagic and benthic ecosystems. In doing this, the Task Team proposed that relevant exposure scenarios were defined to arrive at model-derived Predicted Environmental Concentrations (PECs) in seawater and sediment. This assessment should result in a range of PECs that were predicted based on EGCS washwater concentrations of chemical constituents. For each chemical, a PNEC would have to be derived or used from assessments available from other authorities (such as environmental quality standards or other appropriate guidance or reference values). PNECs were predicted concentrations at which marine aquatic ecosystems were considered not to be adversely affected if exposure to the chemical of concern was below that level. PNECs were established by applying a safety factor (assessment factor) to an ecotoxicological effect value found in tests on the most sensitive species. An assessment factor in general would be lower in case the size of the ecotoxicological dataset would increase. Finally, the risk assessment should include a comparison of PEC and PNEC values arriving at a so-called risk characterization ratio (PEC/PNEC) as indicated in Figure 14. In this deterministic approach, a risk characterization ratio below 1 depicted a numeric representation of a lack of risk. A ratio above 1 was considered a risk at ecosystem level.

7.4. Recommendation on Risk Assessment

1. Whether or not EGCS washwater was harmful to aquatic health depends on the magnitude of predicted concentrations (or dilutions) compared with a reference standard. At least three approaches had been used in the literature: 1) comparison of predicted dilutions against predicted no effects dilution based on whole effluent toxicity testing, usually with a large assessment factor, 2) comparison of predicted concentrations for individual pollutants with corresponding predicted no effects concentrations, and 3) comparison of predicted concentrations with relevant “background” concentrations. The three approaches could lead to significant differences in risk assessment, and therefore, the Task Team on EGCS recommended having a rigorous comparison of the three approaches.

8. UNCERTAINTY

In the area of EGCS there exist still many uncertainties: the amount of substances in the exhaust gas was rather small but the number of substances huge, their toxicological (human health) and ecotoxicological (aquatic organisms) effects are in many cases insufficiently known and the behavior in the environment ((bio-)degradation and sorption) was unknown for many substances, etc. In fact, every measurement and assumption have specific uncertainties. A measurement may have systematic errors and confounding errors in the best case according to a Gaussian distribution, while an assumption may be an educated guess or just a default value but mostly a range of potential values may exist in reality. In the case of a model application, many assumptions are needed for every parameter used. Sometimes, techniques like parameter estimation or sensitivity analysis are used to determine the most appropriate value of a parameter in a certain case, while in another case another value of a parameter maybe more appropriate. The number of possibilities in reality was numerous. Therefore, assumptions and simplifications are required to start to understand the systems under consideration. In this case, the possibilities of carrying out a risk assessment for EGCS, it will not be different. The data required to perform a risk assessment are divided in 3 types of data, emission estimation to determine the load the different chemicals into the aquatic ecosystem, the behavior estimation of the chemicals in the aquatic environment, how they will be distributed based on their physico-chemical characteristics and (bio-)degradation and sorption possibilities and finally the toxicological and ecotoxicological data the determine potential effects on the organisms in the aquatic environment and the subsequent effects on humans that are exposed through the environment. In addition, almost all WET tests were not performed in accordance with internationally accepted methodology, therefore, the comparison and full evaluation through the project was difficult.

EFSA (2018) and OECD (2019) have developed methods to evaluate the uncertainties in a scientifically sound way but it takes many efforts to work along the proposed lines. Therefore, the Task Team on EGCS did not pursue this item further. The Task Team recommended, if considered necessary, to include the uncertainty assessment of the risk assessment of EGCS emissions to aquatic systems in a potential subsequent ToR.

9. FURTHER RESEARCH

To the Task Team on EGCS it was quite clear that additional research on the risk assessment of EGCS effluent washwater was required to fully develop a scientifically sound evaluation. The question is, of course, how much input of manpower and financial resources are required to achieve an acceptable result for policy decisions. The Task Team concluded that a Tier 1 risk assessment would be considered possible, provided sufficient data related on :

- the information in this report on the availability of data of EGCS efficiency,
- information on chemical substances relevant for EGCS with regard to physico-chemical characteristics and (eco-)toxicological endpoints, and
- calculation methods to derive a scientifically sufficiently sound estimation of a PEC or a PNEC for the environmental evaluation and human exposure scenarios related to a PEC including establishing guidance values (*i.e.* TDI or slope factor/BMDL) for human health evaluation.

Sufficient data could be collected for some sample substances and with reasonably sound expert judgement of several parameters to perform this risk assessment. The Task Team considered it feasible to do this in a time period of one year. Several choices on the tools to be used should be made upfront. If a more sophisticated assessment would be considered necessary including *e.g.* the best possible choice for a mathematical model, the time required would increase quickly and may amount to several years of manpower and programming costs. Research results using mathematical modelling are often criticized because of the fact that these tools are simplifications of the real world and therefore always exceptions may be encountered where such a model would not be applicable or the model would need further adaptation to the local situations.

9.1 Conclusions and Recommendations on Future Research

The Task Team on EGCS came to the following more general recommendations related to future work, finally leading to a scientifically sound risk assessment methodology taking into account the current status.

1. The Task Team recommends converting for some example substances the efficiency data into a load to the environment. In principle, this could only be a rough estimate based on a limited number of ships and a limited number of measurements, but for a preliminary risk assessment, this may suffice.
2. The Task Team recommended establishing a data base of these chemicals and their properties *e.g.* in accordance with the GISIS data base on disinfection by-products for ballast water management systems evaluation.
3. The Task Team recommended to focus on certain key parameters, *e.g.* some PAHs (maximally the 16 EPA PAHs and the alkylated PAHs), some trace metals, *e.g.* As, Cr, Cu, Ni, and V and particulate matter.
4. EGCS remove several substances in sufficient quantities from the exhaust gas flows from the engines onboard ships. The application of special features like EGR and SCR may even increase the efficiency, especially for NO_x. Achieving a high efficiency for PM should be strived for as the chemicals adhered to PM, like heavy metals and PAHs could be better controlled in the water phase compared to the gaseous phase. That these substances have to be controlled further was not the question; the question was more what efficiency has to be achieved in controlling these chemicals as the costs may increase disproportionally above 95% or more depending on the chemical. Should the best available technology be applied or was the best available technology not entailing excessive costs (BATNEEC) sufficient, was a question that the Task Team would like to pose to the decision making bodies.
5. The Task Team also presented the following recommendations for further consideration in relation to the use and performance of EGCS. The Task Team decided not to take any position with respect to a complete ban of EGCS and to adhere to the ToR. Nevertheless, although the recommendations below were not directly related to risk assessments, they surely related to a potential reduction of the emission of chemicals to the aquatic environment and potential risks to aquatic organisms and subsequently humans:
 - .1 for HFO-fueled ships the sulfur emission should be controlled to a relevant minimum and other contaminants are removed to environmentally acceptable levels;
 - .2 application of EGR and SCR was preferred to minimize the emission of NO_x;

- .3 closed loop EGCS are preferred because a greater part of contaminants are prevented from pollution of air and water, however, it should be noted that highly concentrated washwater will be emitted in small mass amounts;
 - .4 sufficient reception and processing facilities for residual sludge from closed loop EGCS should be available around the globe in important harbours. Smaller harbours may collect but not process the waste and have to transport the waste to the nearest facility.
6. If a follow-up to the work of the Task Team should be considered, the Task Team recommended the following items to be included in the ToR:
- .1 estimate reasonable emission data based on EGCS efficiency for some example substances, *e.g.* 16 EPA PAHs, some trace metals, *e.g.* As, Cr, Cu, Ni, and V and particulate matter for discharge into a standardized location;
 - .2 collect for some example substances, *e.g.* 16 EPA PAHs, some trace metals, *e.g.* As, Cr, Cu, Ni, and V and particulate matter sufficient data on physico-chemical properties, human and environmental effects to perform a risk assessment and develop a GISIS-like data base for them;
 - .3 develop a standardized emission scenario for the discharge situation of the above mentioned example chemicals;
 - .4 explore the possibilities to adjust the MAMPEC model in the current assessment situation;
 - .5 carry out a risk assessment with the developed substance data, the discharge situation and the environment situation, including a relevant scenario;
 - .6 report the findings in an information document to PPR 8 or PPR 9 depending on the urgency.

10. ROLE OF GESAMP

GESAMP, or in full the IMO/FAO/UNESCO-IOC/UNIDO/WMO/IAEA/UN/UN Environment/UNDP/ISA Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection, was part of the organizational structure of the United Nations, especially in the area of marine environmental protection. It provides advice to the UN member organizations on a wide variety of issues and concerns with the marine environment as a common denominator. GESAMP was not a political body but gives purely scientific advice that may have political implications. Therefore, the current report and the subject fit perfectly in this position in between policy driven organizations and the science driven necessity to provide sound defendable advice. GESAMP was able to put together in a relatively short timeframe a Task Team on EGCS and to provide a peer reviewed report that met the requirements of the ToR. However, as stated before the quality of the advice laid down in this report would have been higher if more time would have been allotted.

GESAMP was available for any follow-up activity in the area of EGCS as decided by PPR and MEPC. A new ToR has to be provided including a reporting time. Whether or not the Task Team could be the same as the current team might be dependent on the wording of the ToR and on which items emphasis should be put to meet the successive ToR. If the MEPC and PPR are of the opinion that more work should be done in this area of EGCS emission to the aquatic environment, GESAMP will be

able to support additional work with its expertise. Potential items for a potential next ToR are indicated in the recommendations.

11. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Considering the available time and complexity of the issue under consideration by the Task Team on EGCS the present information report was not fully conclusive and did not completely cover all aspects of potential environmental impacts of EGCS washwater effluents discharge.

Nevertheless, the Task Team on EGCS reached the following conclusions with respect to its ToR.

11.1 General

Related to the current work performed by the Task Team on EGCS, the following more general conclusions and recommendations were identified compared to the more specific conclusions and recommendations in 11.2 and 11.3.

1. Based on information available the Task Team was not able to conclude on the risks of EGCS discharges to the marine environment as it identified several uncertainties and data gaps.
2. In case a risk assessment would be carried out the Task Team advised that it should include an assessment of ecotoxicological risks to marine pelagic and sediment dwelling organisms, and of human health risks as a result of direct exposure through dermal contact and indirectly via intake of food.
3. In the documentation assessed by the Task Team in submissions to IMO or in other available scientific literature, the Task Team encountered useful information about the potential load to the environment of several chemicals based on measurements of the discharge concentration or an analysis of the efficiency of the EGCS used. Therefore, the Task Team recommended converting, for some example substances, the efficiency data into a load to the environment. In principle, this could only be a rough estimate based on a limited number of ships and a limited number of measurements, but for a preliminary risk assessment, this may suffice.
4. For many chemicals that were commonly identified in EGCS washwater, a full dataset on the required data to perform a (preliminary) risk assessment was not available. The Task Team found gaps in data for physico-chemical properties, and for (bio-)degradation and sorption data. With respect to human health hazards and environmental hazards (i.e. (eco)toxicological effect data) the Task Team considered for most relevant chemicals sufficient information was expected to be available within existing legal frameworks across the globe and in scientific literature. It was recommended to establish a data base of these chemicals and their properties *e.g.* in accordance with the GISIS data base on disinfection by-products for ballast water management systems evaluation. These data were considered essential for a potential risk assessment of these chemicals. Some datasets may, however, already be sufficiently complete to perform a preliminary risk assessment.
5. The potential presence of a large amount of individual chemicals in EGCS washwater could make it impossible to collect all data for these chemicals as identified in point 1. Therefore, it was recommended to focus on certain key parameters, *e.g.* some PAHs (maximally the 16

EPA PAHs and possibly the alkylated PAHs), some trace metals, *e.g.* As, Cr, Cu, Ni, and V and particulate matter, whether or not as such or as a vector for other chemicals. For some of these, sufficient quality data were available. For the metals and PAHs, quite a lot of information on (eco-)toxicological data was available as several organizations evaluated them, *e.g.* USEPA, EU, OECD, WHO, although the speciation of metals are quite variable which would have to be considered in risk assessment.

6. Another building block of the risk assessment was the exposure assessment to estimate the predicted environmental concentration that should be compared to the effect data. The Task Team determined several calculation methods in the literature available to the Task Team. One was *e.g.* a direct comparison of the measured concentration in the discharge of the EGCS with some available results of ecotoxicological tests carried out with some test organisms. Although these tests may not be reliable in all cases, they provide a means of comparison. Other methods calculated the concentration based on a conceptual emission situation like the discharge in a predetermined body of water, *e.g.* a harbour. Several mathematical models were available that in principle may be made suitable for application in the current situation. The Task Team recommended that especially the MAMPEC model that was already used in the evaluation of ballast water management systems, may rather easily be made fit for purpose and this could then serve as a Tier 1 tool to estimate the PEC of the chemical under consideration. In the opinion of the Task Team, some other available models would require too much work and resources to make them operational.
7. Whether or not EGCS washwater was harmful to marine aquatic ecosystems would depend on the magnitude of predicted concentrations (or dilutions) compared with a reference standard. At least three approaches had been used in the literature: 1) comparison of predicted dilutions against predicted no effects dilution based on whole effluent toxicity testing, usually with a large assessment factor, and 2) comparison of predicted concentrations for individual pollutants with corresponding predicted no effects concentrations, and 3) comparison of predicted concentrations with relevant “background” concentrations. The three approaches could lead to significant differences in risk assessments, and therefore, the Task Team on EGCS recommended having a rigorous comparison of the three approaches.
8. The Task Team also concluded it could be worthwhile to explore further the concept of Whole Effluent Toxicity testing (WET). WET testing, if performed according to good laboratory practice, could give useful information on the general toxicity of EGCS washwater to aquatic organisms. WET testing would include all identified and unknown substances and would provide some insight into how complex interactions between chemicals contained in EGCS washwater would affect overall toxicity. The Task Team, therefore, recommended the performance of a set of well-established, good quality WET tests, including short term and long-term endpoints on species of three trophic levels. The Task Team recommended such testing to be performed using a range of representative EGCS washwater samples from open loop systems taken in representative areas.
9. With respect to potential effects to humans the Task Team concluded that a full human health hazard dataset was available for all chemicals under consideration. This information was generated in the framework of many legal frameworks and in existing scientific literature. The Task Team concluded a main challenge was to derive appropriate toxicological

reference values for the EGCS risk assessment scenarios focusing on humans exposed indirectly via the environment.

11.2 With respect to Chapter 6

Task Team recognized also that current available evidence on chemicals in EGCS washwater effluents and its importance for the environment, should call for an increased and broad focus on this topic from both the science community and from policymakers. This would provide a framework for future work according to the following lines:

1. Well-documented and established ranges of contaminant ambient concentrations in the open sea, coastal waters and specific areas of bays, estuaries, harbours and ports were recommended for their use in the risk assessment efforts in areas where effluents of OL EGCS was discharged into the ambient environment;
2. Extensive chemical characterization of substances in EGCS washwater effluents, including toxic and genotoxic species (such as heterocycle and alkyl-PAH) was recommended and needed for better appraisal of contaminants emissions through EGCS and their environmental threats for marine life. In this context, EGCS washwater measurements should also include monitoring of particulate and dissolved contaminant concentrations, especially for PAHs, trace metals and all other relevant chemicals. The Task Team recognized also the necessary improvements and need for harmonized procedures in terms of washwater sampling and analysis to ensure better comparability in different data sets. With respect to these points the Task Team recognized also that the current available data and practice was insufficient;
3. Besides improving chemical emissions characterization, the development of spatial and temporal in situ measurements of contaminants along shipping lanes and in all areas of high volume of ship activities was considered important to gain a more comprehensive understanding of EGCS related pollution distribution and the environmental consequences of large-scale uses of EGCS. In respect to this, the ship emissions monitoring network may be further developed. Such developments were recommended by the Task Team, considering also an enhancement of cooperation with independent academic institutions;
4. In terms of total amounts of contaminant discharges through EGCS, it appeared that large scale uses of these systems may lead to deterioration of environmental status, especially in the ecologically vulnerable and sensitive areas such as coastal waters, semi-enclosed seas and also in ports and harbours. In respects to this, the Task Team recommended further assessment and appraisal of contaminant loads discharged with EGCS washwater effluents. The development of alternative effective methods and protocols based on combining ship traffic data with contaminants emission factors were fundamental for the improvement of EGCS contaminants loads monitoring and assessments. The spatial representation of related discharges of pollutants would require further modeling efforts combining ship traffic data with ship emission factors and in-situ measurements of contaminants. The amounts of EGCS contaminants should also be further taken into account in the appreciation of their environmental impacts and risk assessment approaches and methods;
5. Considering the complexity of the topic and its importance for the marine environment, the Task Team recognized a great need for more interdisciplinary research development to

better predict ship emissions and the use of EGCS and their chemicals impacts on acidification, eutrophication and related climate feed backs.

11.3 With respect to chapter 7

11.3.1 Exposure Assessment

1. In relatively open waterbodies with heavy ship traffic, dilution of EGCS washwater occurred mainly through turbulent mixing. Near the ship this mixing was generated mainly by the ship, its propeller, and the EGCS discharge, while further away it was mainly from turbulent diffusion caused by wind, waves and currents. In order to better characterize the lateral and vertical mixing, the Task Team on EGCS recommended conducting a field tracer study in which a tracer was injected into the EGCS from one or more ships, and tracer concentrations were measured in cross sections at various distances aft of a ship employing EGCS.
2. One of the most significant factors affecting predicted concentrations in an enclosed waterbody was the exchange rate between the water body and the surrounding environment. MAMPEC had an elegant structure to account for such flows based on various physical processes. The models for each process had been developed by different researchers using different techniques and therefore, the Task Team on EGCS recommended having a more comprehensive model validation, perhaps involving a carefully conducted field study in one or more harbours, focusing on EGCS loading.
3. In situations where exposure could be long term, physical/chemical/biological fate processes such as volatilization, photo-degradation, sedimentation, etc. could be important. Some studies had omitted these processes, while others had included them but with little description. As a recommendation the Task Team considered that a comprehensive analysis could be made to characterize the importance of the various processes, and the conditions under which they were expected to be important.
4. MAMPEC (or MAMPEC-BW) had been used in several studies of EGCS in enclosed waterbodies, but there were several other models that could also be used, including STEAM3 and DREAM. The Task Team on EGCS recommended seeing a side by side comparison of these, and possibly other, models, not yet known to the Task Team.
5. The Task Team recommended that especially the MAMPEC model, that was already used in the evaluation of ballast water management systems may rather easily be made fit for purpose and this could then serve as a Tier 1 tool to estimate the PEC of the chemical under consideration.

11.3.2 Hazard Assessment

1. For human health hazard assessment, the Task Team recommended to establish guidance values to be used in the risk characterization. For use in the risk assessment for general public existing guidance values such as those established by for example JECFA or EFSA for food contaminants, such as PTWI or TDI, should be taken into account (see section 7.2.1.1). For chemicals with a non-threshold effect such as genotoxic carcinogens, it was considered more appropriate to use a slope factor or BMDI. The Task Team further recommended establishing exposure scenarios while taking into account exposure pathways for humans via

the environmental and coastal amenities. For instance, exposure via food (secondary poisoning in conjunction with bioconcentration and biomagnification in aquatic organisms) as already mentioned earlier in this report (section 3, section 5.3), may be a suitable way forward in a human health risk assessment approach.

2. For environmental hazard assessment the Task Team recommended to establish PNECs to be used in risk characterization. The Task Team considered PNECs should be developed for PAHs and all trace metals relevant in the scope of an environmental risk assessment for EGCS wastewater discharges. Preferably PNECs should be derived for the marine aquatic and sediment compartment. As some enclosed areas such as harbours and estuaries could have freshwater rather than marine conditions, the Task Team considered derivation of PNECs for freshwater including sediment would be appropriate. The Task Team further considered that given the comprehensiveness of ecotoxicological datasets available for the chemicals under consideration and evaluations of the data being available in various legal frameworks by regulatory bodies, it would be advisable to refer to conclusions of such analyses in a EGCS risk assessment.
3. The Task Team noted that for PBT classified PAHs present in EGCS wastewater a risk assessment focusing on comparison of PECs with PNECs had limited or no meaning. It was generally understood by the scientific community that quantitative risk assessment for PBT chemicals could not yet be performed with sufficient certainty. In several legal frameworks across the globe regulating chemical supply and use, identified PBTs were considered in a scheme targeted at minimization of use and emissions. The Task Team took note of these findings and concluded a risk assessment targeted at PBT chemicals in EGCS wastewater should be targeted to PBT identification. The Task Team considered that in this respect a comparative analyses of PAHs emissions to the marine aquatic compartment in certain regions or on a global scale compared with other anthropogenic sources could facilitate the discussions on appropriate risk management measures in the context of maritime policy.
4. The Task Team recommended establishing PNECs for PAHs and all trace metals in EGCS wastewater to be used for environmental risk assessment. Preferably PNECs should be derived for the marine aquatic and sediment compartment and for freshwater conditions if deemed appropriate. The Task Team further considered that, given the comprehensiveness of ecotoxicological datasets available for the chemicals under consideration and evaluations of the data being available in various legal frameworks by regulatory bodies, it would be advisable to refer to conclusions of such analyses in a EGCS risk assessment.

11.3.3 Whole Effluent Toxicity

1. The Task Team concluded that the concept of Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) testing could be a worthwhile effort to explore further assessment to evaluate the aggregated ecotoxicity of the wastewater of EGCS, which may be caused by SOx together with all contaminants.
2. Task Team recognized that almost all WET tests were not performed in accordance with internationally accepted methodology as these did not exist. It was, therefore, difficult to make a quantitative comparison and full evaluation among the data.
3. Even with the uncertainties mentioned above, the Task Team considered that the acute adverse effects were dominantly caused by the low pH of the discharge water, associated with low dissolved oxygen concentrations.

4. If washwater was discharged to full strength seawater with high alkalinity (i.e. 2,200 µg L-), the acute adverse effects could be sufficiently mitigated.
5. In the extraordinary case of a surrounding environment, such as freshwater with less alkalinity, the adverse acute effects could not be sufficiently mitigated.
6. Also, there was a possibility that the ecotoxicity of the other contaminants was masked by the dominant adverse effects by the low pH, therefore the Task Team recommended that further tests will be needed from these viewpoints using pH adjusted discharge water.
7. For the chronic or long-term ecotoxicity, the Task Team could not reach a conclusion from the data mentioned above. The chronic WET testing, however, was quite expensive and should be performed according to good laboratory practice but could give reliable answers on how the general toxicity, including all the unknown substances, could be tackled. The Task Team recommended that a set of four to five well-established, good quality WET tests should be performed in different relevant areas to study the toxicity for aquatic organisms and subsequently ecosystems.
8. The Task Team, therefore, recommended that a set of four to five well-established, good quality WET tests should be performed in different relevant areas to study the toxicity for aquatic organisms and subsequently ecosystems. Almost all WET tests were not performed in accordance with internationally accepted methodology, therefore, the comparison and full evaluation through the project was difficult.

11.3.4 Risk Assessment

1. Whether or not EGCS washwater was harmful to aquatic health depends on the magnitude of predicted concentrations (or dilutions) compared with a reference standard. At least three approaches had been used in the literature: 1) comparison of predicted dilutions against predicted no effects dilution based on whole effluent toxicity testing, usually with a large assessment factor, 2) comparison of predicted concentrations for individual pollutants with corresponding predicted no effects concentrations, and 3) comparison of predicted concentrations with relevant “background” concentrations. The three approaches could lead to significant differences in risk assessment, and therefore, the Task Team on EGCS recommended having a rigorous comparison of the three approaches.

11.4 Recommendations for future work

The Task Team on EGCS came to the following more general recommendations related to future work, finally leading to a scientifically sound risk assessment methodology taking into account the current status.

1. The Task Team recommends converting for some example substances the efficiency data into a load to the environment. In principle, this could only be a rough estimate based on a limited number of ships and a limited number of measurements, but for a preliminary risk assessment, this may suffice.
2. The Task Team recommended establishing a data base of these chemicals and their properties *e.g.* in accordance with the GISIS data base on disinfection by-products for ballast water management systems evaluation.

3. The Task Team recommended to focus on certain key parameters, *e.g.* some PAHs (maximally the 16 EPA PAHs and the alkylated PAHs), some trace metals, *e.g.* As, Cr, Cu, Ni, and V and particulate matter.
4. EGCS remove several substances in sufficient quantities from the exhaust gas flows from the engines onboard ships. The application of special features like EGR and SCR may even increase the efficiency, especially for NO_x. Achieving a high efficiency for PM should be strived for as the chemicals adhered to PM, like heavy metals and PAHs could be better controlled in the water phase compared to the gaseous phase. That these substances have to be controlled further was not the question; the question was more what efficiency has to be achieved in controlling these chemicals as the costs may increase disproportionately above 95% or more depending on the chemical. Should the best available technology be applied or was the best available technology not entailing excessive costs (BATNEEC) sufficient, was a question that the Task Team would like to pose to the decision making bodies.
5. The Task Team also presented the following recommendations for further consideration in relation to the use and performance of EGCS. The Task Team decided not to take any position with respect to a complete ban of EGCS and to adhere to the ToR. Nevertheless, although the recommendations below were not directly related to risk assessments, they surely related to a potential reduction of the emission of chemicals to the aquatic environment and potential risks to aquatic organisms and subsequently humans:
 - .1 for HFO-fueled ships the sulfur emission should be controlled to a relevant minimum and other contaminants are removed to environmentally acceptable levels;
 - .2 application of EGR and SCR was preferred to minimize the emission of NO_x;
 - .3 closed loop EGCS are preferred because a greater part of contaminants are prevented from pollution of air and water, however, it should be noted that highly concentrated washwater will be emitted in small mass amounts;
 - .4 sufficient reception and processing facilities for residual sludge from closed loop EGCS should be available around the globe in important harbours. Smaller harbours may collect but not process the waste and have to transport the waste to the nearest facility.
6. If a follow-up to the work of the Task Team should be considered, the Task Team recommended the following items to be included in the ToR:
 - .1 estimate reasonable emission data based on EGCS efficiency for some example substances, *e.g.* 16 EPA PAHs, some trace metals, *e.g.* As, Cr, Cu, Ni, and V and particulate matter for discharge into a standardized location;
 - .2 collect for some example substances, *e.g.* 16 EPA PAHs, some trace metals, *e.g.* As, Cr, Cu, Ni, and V and particulate matter sufficient data on physico-chemical properties, human and environmental effects to perform a risk assessment and develop a GISIS-like data base for them;
 - .3 develop a standardized emission scenario for the discharge situation of the above mentioned example chemicals;
 - .4 explore the possibilities to adjust the MAMPEC model in the current assessment situation;

- .5 carry out a risk assessment with the developed substance data, the discharge situation and the environment situation, including a relevant scenario;
- .6 report the findings in an information document to PPR 8 or PPR 9 depending on the urgency.

12. REFERENCES

- Aalborg (2010). EGCS SMM Workshop 2010 presentation.
(http://www.aalborgindustries.com/EGCS/documents/ExhaustGasCleaning_000.pdf) .
- Abdel-Shafy, H. I. and Mansour, M. S.M., 2016. A review on polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons: Source, environmental impact, effect on human health and remediation. *Egypt. J. Petrol.* 25, 107–123. doi:10.1016/j.ejpe.2015.03.011 .
- ABS, 2018. ABS Advisory On Exhaust Gas EGCS Systems. American Bureau of Shipping, Houston TX, July 2018, 52 pp.
- Agrawal H., Welch, W.A., Henningsen, S., Miller, J.W., and Cocker, D.R., 2010. Journal of Geophysical Research, Emissions from main propulsion engine on container ship at sea VOL. 115, D23205, doi:10.1029/2009JD013346, 2010.
- Agrawal, H.; Malloy, Q. G. J.; Welch, W. A.; Miller, J.W.; Cocker, D. R. 2008a. In-use gaseous and particulate matter emissions from a modern ocean going container vessel. *Atmos. Environ.* 2008, 42 (21), 5504–5510.
- Agrawal, H.; Welch, W. A.; Miller, J. W.; Cocker, D. R. 2008b. Emission measurements from a crude oil tanker at sea. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2008, 42 (19), 7098–7103.
- Allen, J.O., Durant, J.L., Dookeran, N.M., Taghizadeh, K., Plummer, E.F., Lafleur, A.L., Sarofim, A.F., Smith, K.A., 1998. Measurement of C₂₄H₁₄ polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons associated with a size-segregated urban aerosol. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 32, 1928-1932.
- Andersson, J.T. and Achten, C., 2015. Time to Say Goodbye to the 16 EPA PAHs? Toward an Up-to-Date Use of PACs for Environmental Purposes. *Polycyclic Aromatic Compounds*, 35: 330–354.
- Attfield, M.D., Schleiff, P.L., Lubin, J.H., Blair, A., Stewart, P.A., Vermeulen, R., Coble, J.B., Silverman, D.T., 2012. The Diesel Exhaust in Miners Study: A Cohort Mortality Study With Emphasis on Lung Cancer *jnci.oxfordjournals.org* Vol. 104, Issue 11.
- Azzaro, F., 2013. Automated Nutrients Analysis for Buoys in Sea-Water and Intercalibration. *International Journal of Environmental, Monitoring and Analysis*. Vol. 1, No. 6, 2013, pp. 315-322. doi: 10.11648/j.ijema.20130106.17 .
- Barron, M. G.; Carls, M. G.; Heintz, R.; Rice, S. D., 2004. Evaluation of Fish Early Life-Stage Toxicity Models of Chronic Embryonic Exposures to Complex Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbon Mixtures. *Toxicological Sciences*, 78, 60-67.
- Beland, F. and Culp, S., 1998. Chronic bioassay of two composite samples from selected manufactured gas plant waste sites [unpublished report]. (Technical Report 6722.02). Jefferson, AK: National Center for Toxicological Research.
- Benbrahim-Tallaa, L., Baan, R.A., Grosse, Y., Lauby-Secretan, B., El Ghissassi, F., Bouvard, V., 2012. Carcinogenicity of diesel-engine and gasoline-engine exhausts and some nitroarenes. *The Lancet Oncology*, 13(7):663-4.
- Berrojalbiz, N., Dachs, J., Ojeda, M. J., Valle, M. C., Castro-Jiménez, J., Wollgast, J., 2011. Biogeochemical and physical controls on concentrations of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in water and plankton of the Mediterranean and Black Seas. *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles* 25, 1–14. doi: 10.1029/2010GB003775.

- Boer, E. den and Hoen, M. 't, 2015. EGCSs – An economic and ecological assessment. Delft, CE Delft, March 2015, 45 pp.
- Broeker, W.S. and Peng, T.-H., 1982. Tracers in the Sea. Eldigio Press, New York.
- Bruland, K. and Lohan, M.C., 2004. Controls on trace metals in seawater. In: Elderfield, H. (ed.) The Oceans and Marine Geochemistry. Vol. 6 in Holland, H.D. and Turekian, K.K. (Exec. eds) Treatise on Geochemistry. Elsevier Pergamon, Amsterdam, pp. 23–47.
- BSH, 2019. "Scrubber Washwater Survey". Preliminary report, Federal Maritime and Hydrographic Agency Germany.
- Buhaug, Ø.; Fløgstad, H.; Bakke, T., 2006. MARULS WP3: Washwater Criteria for Seawater Exhaust Gas-SOx EGCSs, in MEPC 56/INF.5 ANNEX 1.
- Byrne, C.D., Law, R.J., Hudson, P.J., Thain, J.E. and Fileman, T.W., 1988. Measurements of the dispersion of liquid industrial wastes discharged into the wake of a dumping vessel. *Water Research* 22, 1577-1574.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0043135488901716> .
- Casala, C.S., Arbillab, G. and Corrêaa, S.M., 2014. Alkyl polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons emissions in diesel/biodiesel exhaust. *Atmospheric Environment*, Volume 96, Pages 107-116.
- Celo, V., Dabek-Zlotorzynska, E. and McCurdy, M., 2015. Chemical Characterization of Exhaust Emissions from Selected Canadian Marine Vessels: The Case of Trace Metals and Lanthanoids *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2015, 49, 5220–5226 ; DOI: 10.1021/acs.est.5b00127.
- Chakraborty S. and Owens G., 2014. Metal distributions in seawater, sediment and marine benthic macroalgae from the South Australian coastline. *Int. J. Environ. Sci. Technol.* 11:1259–1270.
- Chouvelon, T., Strady, E., Harmelin-Vivien, M., Radakovitch, O., Brach-Papa, C., Crochet, S., Knoery, J., Rozuel, E., Thomas, B., Tronczynski, J., Chiffolleau, J.-F., 2019. Patterns of trace metal bioaccumulation and trophic transfer in a phytoplankton-zooplankton-small pelagic fish marine food web. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 146 (2019) 1013–1030.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2019.07.047> .
- Cooper D. and Gustafsson, T., 2004. Methodology for calculating emissions from ships. 1. Update of emission factors. IVL; Report series for SMED and SMED&SLU.
- Cooper, D.A., 2001. Exhaust emissions from high speed passenger ferries, *Atmos. Environ.*, 35(24), 4189–4200, doi:10.1016/S1352-2310(01)00192-3 .
- Cooper, D.A., and Andreasson, K., 1999. Predictive NOx emission monitoring on board a passenger ferry, *Atmos. Environ.*, 33(28), 4637–4650, doi:10.1016/S1352-2310(99)00239-3.
- Cooper, D.A., and Peterson, K., 1996. Hydrocarbon, PAH and PCB emissions from ferries: A case study in the Skagerak - Kattegatt - Oresund region, *Atmos. Environ.*, 30(14), 2463–2473, doi:10.1016/1352-2310 (95)00494-7.
- Corbett, J.J., Winebrake, J. J., Green, E. H., Kasibhatla, P., Eyring, V., and Lauer, A., 2007. Mortality from ship emissions: a global assessment. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 41, 8512–8518. doi: 10.1021/es071686z .

- Corbin J.C., Mensah, A.A., Pieber, S.M., Orasche, J., Michalke, B., Zanatta, M., Czech, H., Massabò, D., Buatier de Mongeot, F., Mennucci, C., El Haddad, I., Kumar, N.K., Stenge, B., Huang, Y., Zimmermann, R., Prévôt, A.S.H., and Gysel, M., 2018. Trace Metals in Soot and PM2.5 from Heavy-Fuel-Oil Combustion in a Marine Engine. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2018, 52, 6714 – 6722.
- Culp, S.J., Gaylor, D.W., Sheldon, W.G., Goldstein, L.S. and Beland, F.A. 1998. A comparison of the tumours induced by coal tar and benzo[a]pyrene in a 2-year bioassay. *Carcinogenesis*, 19: 117-124.
- Czech, H., Orasche, J., Miersch, T., Stengel, B., Buchholz, B., Streibel, T. and Zimmermann, R., 2018. Smoke on the water: Rußpartikel aus Schiffen. *Nachrichten aus der Chemie*, 66; Dezember 2018. www.gdch.de/nachrichten.
- David, M.; Linders J.; Gollasch, S.; David, J., 2018. Is the aquatic environment sufficiently protected from chemicals discharged with treated ballast water from vessels worldwide? – a decadal environmental perspective and risk assessment. *Chemosphere* 207 (2018) 590 – 600.
- De Flora, S., Camoirano, A., Bagnasco, M., Bennicelli, C., Corbett, G.E., Kerger, B.D., 1997. Estimates of the chromium(VI) reducing capacity in human body compartments as a mechanism for attenuating its potential toxicity and carcinogenicity. *Carcinogenesis*, 18(3):531-7.
- Delvigne, G.A.L. (1987) Experiments on the dilution capacity of wakes from tankers dumping in the North Sea. In 'Oceanic processes in marine pollution', T.P O'Connor, W.V.Burt and I.W. Duedall (Eds.), R.E.Krieger Publ. Co., Malabar, Florida, USA. Vol. 2: 11-19.
- Dock, A.; Linders, J., David, M., Gollasch, S., David, J., 2019. Is human health sufficiently protected from chemicals discharged with treated ballast water from vessels worldwide? – A decadal perspective and risk assessment. *Chemosphere* 235 (2019) 194 – 204.
- Draft USEPA (2010). Toxicological review of hexavalent chromium. In support of summary information on the Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS). September 2010. EPA/635/R-10/004A.
- Durant, J.L., Lafleur, A.L., Plummer, E.F., Taghizadeh, K., Busby, W.F., Thilly, W.G., 1998. Human lymphoblast mutagens in urban airborne particles. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 32, 1894-1906.
- ECHA, 2008. Member State Committee support document for identification of anthracene as a substance of very high concern. According to Articles 57 and 59 of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006, Adopted on 8 October 2008.
- ECHA, 2013. Services to support the assessment of remaining cancer risks related to the use of chromium- and arsenic-containing substances in Applications for Authorisation. Final report 4 December 2013. ECHA/2011/01-SR-11.
- ECHA, 2016. Member State Committee support document for identification of benzo[def]chrysene (benzo[a]pyrene) as a substance of very high concern, According to Articles 57 and 59 of Regulation (EC) 1907/2006, Adopted on 27 May 2016.
- ECHA, 2017. Member State Committee support document for identification of benzo[a]anthracene as a substance of very high concern, According to Articles 57 and 59 of Regulation (EC) 1907/2006, Adopted, August 2017.

- ECHA, 2017b. Member State Committee support document for identification of chrysene as a substance of very high concern, According to Articles 57 and 59 of Regulation (EC) 1907/2006, Adopted on 30 November 2017.
- ECHA, 2018a. Member State Committee support document for identification of fluoranthene as a substance of very high concern, According to Articles 57 and 59 of Regulation (EC) 1907/2006, Adopted on 12 December 2018.
- ECHA, 2018b. Member State Committee support document for identification of pyrene as a substance of very high concern, According to Articles 57 and 59 of Regulation (EC) 1907/2006, Adopted on 12 December 2018.
- ECHA, 2018c. Member State Committee support document for identification of benzo[k]fluoranthene as a substance of very high concern, According to Articles 57 and 59 of Regulation (EC) 1907/2006, Adopted on 12 December 2018.
- ECHA, 2018d. Member State Committee support document for identification of benzo[ghi]perylene as a substance of very high concern, According to Articles 57 and 59 of Regulation (EC) 1907/2006, Adopted on 1 June 2018.
- ECHA, 2019a. ECHA registration dossier for formaldehyde. <https://echa.europa.eu/de/registration-dossier/-/registered-dossier/15858/4/9> .
- ECHA, 2019b. ECHA registration dossier for divanadium pentaoxide. <https://echa.europa.eu/de/registration-dossier/-/registered-dossier/15418/6/1> , First published: 17-Feb-2011, Last modified: 10-Dec-2019.
- Echeveste, P., Agusti, S. and Tovar-Sa Nchez, A., 2012. Toxic Thresholds Of Cadmium And Lead To Oceanic Phytoplankton: Cell Size And Ocean Basin–Dependent Effects Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, Vol. 31, No. 8, pp. 1887–1894.
- Echeveste, P., Agustí, S., and Dachs, J., 2011. Cell size dependence of additive versus synergetic effects of UV radiation and PAHs on oceanic phytoplankton. Environ. Pollut. 159, 1307–1316. doi: 10.1016/j.envpol.2011. 01.023 .
- EEA, 2013. The impact of international shipping on European air quality and climate forcing. EEA Technical report No 4/2013.
- EFSA, 2004. Opinion of the Scientific Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies on a request from the Commission related to the Tolerable Upper Intake Level of Vanadium. EFSA Journal, 33, 1-22.
- EFSA, 2006. Tolerable upper intake levels for vitamins and minerals. Scientific Committee on Food. Scientific Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies. February 2006.
- EFSA, 2008. Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons in Food. Scientific Opinion of the Panel on Contaminants in the Food Chain. EFSA Journal, 724, 1-114.
- EFSA, 2009a. Scientific opinion on Arsenic in Food. EFSA Panel on Contaminants in the Food Chain (CONTAM). EFSA Journal, 7 (10), 1351.
- EFSA, 2009b. Scientific opinion. Cadmium in Food. EFSA Panel on Contaminants in the Food Chain (CONTAM). EFSA Journal, 980, 1 – 139.

- EFSA, 2010. Scientific opinion. Lead in Food. EFSA Panel on Contaminants in the Food Chain (CONTAM). EFSA Journal, 8(4), 1570.
- EFSA, 2014a. Scientific opinion on Dietary Reference Values for chromium. EFSA Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies (NDA). EFSA Journal, 12 (10), 3845.
- EFSA, 2014b. Scientific opinion on Dietary Reference Values for selenium. EFSA Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies (NDA). EFSA Journal, 12 (10), 3846.
- EFSA, 2014c. Scientific opinion on Dietary Reference Values for zinc. EFSA Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies (NDA). EFSA Journal, 12 (10), 3844.
- EFSA, 2014d. Scientific opinion on the risks to public health related to the presence of chromium in food and drinking water. EFSA Journal, 12 (3), 3595.
- EFSA, 2015a. Scientific opinion on Dietary Reference Values for copper. EFSA Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies (NDA). EFSA Journal, 13 (10), 4253.
- EFSA, 2015b. Scientific opinion on the risks to public health related to the presence of nickel in food and drinking water. EFSA Panel on Contaminants in the Food Chain (CONTAM). EFSA Journal, 13(2), 4002. Published on 28 February 2018.
- EFSA, 2018. Guidance on Uncertainty Analysis in Scientific Assessments. EFSA Journal 2018;16(1):5123, 39 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2018.5123>
- EFSA, 2019. Risk evaluation of chemical contaminants in food in the context of RASFF notifications: Rapid Assessment of Contaminant Exposure tool (RACE). Technical report. Approved: 16 April 2019. doi:10.2903/sp.efsa.2019.EN-1625 .
- EGCSA, 2019. <https://www.egcsa.com/technical-reference/what-is-an-exhaust-gas-cleaning-system/> Accessed 13 November 2019.
- Endres, S.; Maes, F.; Hopkins, F.; Houghton, K.; Mårtensson, E.M.; Oeffner, J.; Quack, B.; Singh, P. and Turner, D., 2018. A New Perspective at the Ship-Air-Sea-Interface: The Environmental Impacts of Exhaust Gas EGCS Discharge. Front. Mar. Sci. 5:139. doi:10.3389/fmars.2018.00139 .
- EPA, 2014. EPA Priority Pollutant List, 2014. 40 CFR Part 423, Appendix a. <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/priority-pollutant-list-epa.pdf>.
- European Commission, 1998. Council Directive 98/83/EC of 3 November 1998 on the quality of water intended for human consumption, OJ L 330 of 5.12.98, pp.32-54.
- European Commission, 2003. Commission Directive 2003/40/EC of 16 May 2003 establishing the list, concentration limits, and labelling requirements for the constituents of natural mineral waters and the conditions for using ozone-enriched air for the treatment of natural mineral waters and spring waters. OJ L126 22.5.2003, p. 34–39.
- European Commission, 2006. Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH), establishing a European Chemicals Agency, amending Directive 1999/45/EC and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 793/93 and Commission Regulation (EC) No 1488/94 as well as Council Directive 76/769/EEC and Commission Directives 91/155/EEC, 93/67/EEC, 93/105/EC and 2000/21/EC.

- European Commission, 2007. European Union Risk Assessment Report Cadmium oxide and cadmium metal, Part I – Environment.
- European Commission, 2008a. Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 on classification, labelling and packaging of substances and mixtures, amending and repealing Directives 67/548/EEC and 1999/45/EC, and amending Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006.
- European Commission, 2008. European Union Risk Assessment Report Nickel and nickel compounds, Final Version, 30 May, 2008, Denmark, 1715pp.
- European Commission, 2009a. Scientific Committee on Health and Environmental Risks (SCHER) scientific opinion on the voluntary risk assessment report on copper and its compounds, environmental part, 12 February 2009.
- European Commission, 2009b. Scientific Committee on Health and Environmental Risks (SCHER) scientific opinion on the voluntary Risk Assessment Report on Lead and its compounds Environmental part.
- European Commission, 2013. Directive 2013/39/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 August 2013 amending Directives 2000/60/EC and 2008/105/EC as regards priority substances in the field of water policy.
- Faber, J., Hattum, B. v., and Kleissen, F., 2019. The impacts of EGCS washwater discharges on port harbour and sediment, CE Delft, Delft Holland (draft report).
- Fisher T., Law, R.J., Rumney, H.S., Kirby, M.F., Kelly, C., 2011. Towards a scheme of toxic equivalency factors (TEFs) for the acute toxicity of PAHs in sediment. *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety* 74 (2011) 2245–2251
- FNB, 2001. Dietary reference intakes for vitamin A, vitamin K, arsenic, boron, chromium, copper, iodine, iron, manganese, molybdenum, nickel, silicon, vanadium and zinc. Institute of Medicine. National Academy Press, Washington D.C., US, pp. 532-553.
- Fuglestvedt, J.S., Berntsen, T., Eyring, V., Isaksen, I., Lee, D.S., Sausen, R., 2009. Shipping Emissions: From Cooling to Warming of Climate and Reducing Impacts on Health *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 43, 9057–9062.
- Gauss, M., Benedictow, A., Hjellbrekke, A.-G., Mareckova, K., Nyíri, Á., 2013. Status of transboundary pollution in 2011. Transboundary Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground Level Ozone in Europe in 2011, EMEP/MSC-W 1/2013; 17–42. Oslo: Norwegian Meteorological Institute.
- GESAMP, 2019. GESAMP (IMO/FAO/UNESCO-IOC/UNIDO/WMO/IAEA/UN/UN Environment/UNDP/ISA Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection). Methodology for the Evaluation of Ballast Water Management Systems using Active Substances. GESAMP Working Group 34. Rep. Stud. GESAMP No. 101, 110pp.
- United Nations, 2019. Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS). Eighth revised edition, United Nations, 2019.
- González, J.J., Viñas, L., Franco, M.A., Fumega, J., Soriano, J.A., Grueiro, G., 2006. Spatial and temporal distribution of dissolved/dispersed aromatic hydrocarbons in seawater in the area

- affected by the Prestige oil spill. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 53, 250–259. doi: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2005.09.039.
- González-Gaya B., Fernández-Pinos, M.-C., Morales, L., Méjanelle, L., Abad, E., Piña, B., Duarte, C.M., Jiménez, B. and Dachs, J., 2016. High atmosphere–ocean exchange of semivolatile aromatic hydrocarbons. Nature Geoscience, 9, 438 – 442. DOI: 10.1038/NGEO2714.
- Guitart, C., García-Flor, N., Bayona, J. M., and Albaigés, J., 2007. Occurrence and fate of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in the coastal surface microlayer. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 54, 186–194. doi: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2006.10.008.
- Hansen, P., 2012. Exhaust Gas EGCS Installed Onboard MV Ficaria Seaways. Public Test Report, Environmental Project No. 1429, 2012.
- Hassellöv, I.-M., Turner, D.R., Lauer, A. and Corbett, J.J., 2013. Shipping contributes to ocean acidification. Geophysical Research Letters 40: 2731–2736. doi:10.1002/grl.50521.
- Hatje, V., Payne, T.E., Hill, D.M., McOrist, G., Birch, G.F., Szymczak, R., 2003. Kinetics of trace element uptake and release by particles in estuarine waters: effects of pH, salinity, and particle loading. Environment International 29 (2003) 619– 629.
- Hattum, B. van; Gils, J. van; Markus, A.; Elzinga, H.; Jansen, M.; and Baart, A., 2016. Integrated hydrodynamic and chemical fate model, MAMPEC Handbook. Deltares systems. Technical Reference Manual. Deltares, Delft, Netherlands, 11 October 2016.
- Heintz, R.A., Short, J.W. and Rice, S.D., 1999. Sensitivity of fish embryos to weathered crude oil: Part II. Increased mortality of pink salmon (*Oncorhynchus gorbuscha*) embryos incubating downstream from weathered Exxon Valdez crude oil. Environ Toxicol Chem. 1999;18:494–503.
- HELCOM, 2015. Updated Fifth Baltic Sea Pollution Load Compilation (PLC-5.5): Baltic Sea Environmental Proceedings No. 145.
- Hufnagl, M.; Liebezeit, G.; Behrends, B., 2005. Effects of Sea Water Scrubbing, Final Report to BP Marine. Research Centre Terramare, Wilhelmshaven, Germany and School of Marine Science and Technology, University of Newcastle, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK.
- IARC, 1996. IARC Monographs on the evaluation of carcinogenic risks to humans. Chromium, Nickel and Welding. Volume 49 (1996). World Health Organization, International Agency for Research on cancer, Lyon, France.
- IARC, 2003. IARC Monographs on the evaluation of carcinogenic risks to humans. Cobalt in hard metals and cobalt sulfate, gallium arsenide, indium phosphide and vanadium pentoxide. Volume 86 (2003). World Health Organization, International Agency for Research on cancer, Lyon, France.
- IARC, 2010. IARC Monographs on the evaluation of carcinogenic risks to humans. Some non-heterocyclic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and some related exposures. Volume 9 (2010). World Health Organization, International Agency for Research on cancer, Lyon, France.
- IARC, 2011. Bitumens and bitumen emissions, and some N- and S-heterocyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. IARC Monogr. Eval. Carcinog. Risks Hum. 103, 1–311.

- IARC, 2012a. IARC Monographs on the evaluation of carcinogenic risks to humans. Volume 84 (2004) and Volume 100 (2012). World Health Organization, International Agency for Research on cancer, Lyon, France.
- IARC, 2012b. IARC Monographs on the evaluation of carcinogenic risks to humans. Arsenic, Metals, Fibers, And Dusts. Volume 100C (2012). World Health Organization, International Agency for Research on cancer, Lyon, France.
- IARC, 2012c. IARC (International Agency for Research on Cancer), 2012. Nickel and nickel compounds. IARC Monographs 100 C. World Health Organization, Lyon. Available at: <http://monographs.iarc.fr/ENG/Monographs/vol100C/mono100C.pdf>.
- IARC, 2018. IARC Monographs on the evaluation of carcinogenic risks to humans. Benzene. Volume 120 (2018). World Health Organization, International Agency for Research on cancer, Lyon, France.
- IARC/WHO, 2012. Diesel engine exhaust carcinogenic ; IARC PRESS RELEASE N° 213
file:///F:/OMI_2019/GESAMP/BIBLIO/PAH/IARC_diesel%20engine%20carcigenic.pdf .
- IKSR-CIPR-ICBR, 2009. International Commission for protection of the river Rhine. Ableitung von Umweltqualitätsnormen für die Rhein-relevanten Stoffe.
- IMO, 2009. 2009 Guidelines for Exhaust Gas Cleaning Systems. Resolution MEPC.184(59), Adopted on 17 July 2009.
- Incardona, J. P., Collier, T. K. and Scholz, N. L. 2004. Defects in cardiac function precede morphological abnormalities in fish embryos exposed to polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. *Toxicol. Appl. Pharmacol.* 2004; 196: 191–205.
- IRIS, 1991. Integrated Risk Information System, USEPA.
- IRIS, 2003. Benzene. Integrated Risk Information System, USEPA.
- Ishinishi, N., Tsuchiya, K., Vahter, M. and Fowler, B.A., 1986. Arsenic. In: Friberg, L., Nordberg, G.F. & Vouk, B.V., ed. *Handbook of the toxicology of metals*, Vol. II. Amsterdam-New York-Oxford, Elsevier.
- Jahan, S., and Strezov, V, 2017. Water quality assessment of Australian ports using water quality evaluation indices. *PLoS ONE* 12(12): e0189284. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0189284>.
- Japan, 2019. Washwater discharge from open looped SOx EGCS system. Presentation of Japan during PPR 6, Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism (MLIT), JAPAN, 19 February 2019, 20 pp.
- JECFA, 1982. Evaluations of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA). Evaluation of certain food additives and contaminants. Technical Report Series 683.
- JECFA, 2005. Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA). Sixty fourth meeting, Rome, 8-17 February 2005. Summary and Conclusions. http://www.who.int/ipcs/food/jecfa/summaries/summary_report_64_final.pdf.

- Jiang, H., Wu, G., Li, T., He, P., and Chen, R., 2019. Characteristics of Particulate Matter Emissions from a Low-Speed Marine Diesel Engine at Various Loads. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2019, 53, 11552–11559.
- Jiang, H.; Li, T.; Wang, Y.; He, P.; Wang, B., 2019. The evolution of soot morphology and nanostructure along axial direction in diesel spray jet flames. *Combust. Flame* 2019, 199, 204–212.
- Jiang, L., Kronbak, J., and Christensen, L.P., 2014. The costs and benefits of sulphur reduction measures: sulphur scrubbers versus marine gas oil. *Transpor. Res. D Transp. Environ.* 28, 19–27. doi: 10.1016/j.trd.2013.12.005.
- Johansson, L., Jalkanen, J.-P., Kukkonen, J., 2017. Global assessment of shipping emissions in 2015 on a high spatial and temporal resolution. *Atmospheric Environment* 167 (2017) 403-415.
- Jonson, J. E., Jalkanen, J. P., Johansson, L., Gauss, M., and Denier van der Gon, H. A. C., 2015. Model calculations of the effects of present and future emissions of air pollutants from shipping in the Baltic Sea and the North Sea *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15, 783–798, 2015 www.atmos-chem-phys.net/15/783/2015/doi:10.5194/acp-15-783-2015.
- Käfer U., Gröger, T., Rohbogner, C.J., Struckmeier, D., Saraji-Bozorgzad M.R., Wilharm, T., and Zimmermann, R., 2019. Detailed Chemical Characterization of Bunker Fuels by High-Resolution Time-of-Flight Mass Spectrometry Hyphenated to GC xGC and Thermal Analysis. DOI: 10.1021/acs.energyfuels.9b02626; *Energy Fuels*.
- Karlberg, M., 2017. The future for microplankton in the Baltic Sea – Effects of SWS and climate change. Doctoral Thesis, University of Gothenburg, ISBN 978-91-88509-04-8 (PRINT), ISBN 978-91-88509-05-5 (PDF), Available at <http://hdl.handle.net/2077/51556>, 54pp.
- Kjølholt, J.; Aakre, S.; Jørgensen, C. and Lauridsen, J., 2012. Assessment of possible impacts of EGCS water discharges on the marine environment, COWI, Danish Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Project No. 1431.
- Køcks, M., Butcher, A., Mølgaard, S., Fuglsang, K., Rosenørn, T., Hansen, J. P., 2013. “Shipboard characterization of a wet scrubber system during operation (part II): Influence on particle number concentration, particle size distribution and chemical composition,” in *ETH-Conference on Combustion Generated Nanoparticles* (Zurich).
- Koski, M.; Stedmon, C. and Trapp, S., 2017. Ecological effects of EGCS water discharge on coastal plankton: potential synergistic effects of contaminants reduce survival and feeding of the copepod *Acartia tonsa*. *Mar. Environ. Res.* 129, 374–385. doi:10.1016/j.marenvres.2017.06.006 .
- Lange, B., 2014 Auswirkungen von Abgasnachbehandlungsanlagen (EGCSn) auf die Umweltsituation in Häfen und Küstengewässern. UBA Texte 83/2014.
- Lange, B., Markus, T., and Helfst, L. P., 2015. “Impacts of scrubbers on the environmental situation in ports and coastal waters,” in *Texte 65/2015* (Dessau-Roßlau).
- Lehtoranta, K.; Aakko-Saksa, P.; Murtonen, T.; Vesala, H.; Ntziachristos, L.; Ronkko, T.; Karjalainen, P.; Kuittinen, N.; Timonen, H., 2019. Particulate Mass and Nonvolatile Particle Number

- Emissions from Marine Engines Using Low-Sulfur Fuels, Natural Gas, or Scrubbers. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2019, 53 (6), 3315–3322.
- Lewis, R.E., 1985. The dilution of waste in the wake of a ship. *Water Research* 19(8): 941-945.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0043135485903604> .
- Lohmann, R., Klanova, J., Pribylova, P., Liskova, H., Yonis, S., and Bollinger, K., 2013. PAHs on a West-to-East Transect Across the Tropical Atlantic Ocean. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2013, 47, 2570–2578.
- Magnusson, K.; Thor, P.; and Granberg, M., 2018. Risk Assessment of marine exhaust gas EGCS water, Task 2, Activity 3, EGCSs closing the loop, IVL Swedish Environmental Research Institute, Report B 2319, ISBN 978-91-7883-017-6, 44 pp.
- Martínez-Soto, M.C, Tovar-Sánchez, A., Sánchez-Quiles, D., Rodellas, V., Garcia-Orellana, J., Basterretxea, G., 2016. Seasonal variation and sources of dissolved trace metals in Maó Harbour, Minorca Island. *Science of the Total Environment* 565 (2016) 191–199.
- Mason, R.P., 2013. Trace Metals in Aquatic Systems. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Mathews, T., Fisher, N.S., 2009. Dominance of dietary intake of metals in marine elasmobranch and teleost fish. *Sci. Total Environ.* 407, 5156–5161.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2009.06.003>.
- MEPC, 2008. Report of the Marine Environment Protection Committee on its fifty-eighth session. International Maritime Organization, 2008. MEPC 58/23 Annex 16.
- MEPC, 2015. Resolution MEPC.259(68), 2015 Guidelines for Exhaust Gas Cleaning Systems, adopted 15 May 2015, 23 pp.
- MEPC, 2016. Assessment of fuel oil availability – final report, Marine Environment Protection Committee, 70th session, Agenda item 5, MEPC 70/INF.6, 25 July 2016, 183pp.
- MEPC, 2017. Methodology for information gathering and conduct of work of the GESAMP-BWWG, International Maritime Organization, BWM.2/Circ.13/Rev.4, 20 July 2017, 99pp.
- MEPC, 2018. MEPC 73/INF.5, Study Report on Analyses of Water Samples from Exhaust Gas Cleaning Systems. Submitted by CESA, 20 July 2018, 39 pp.
- MEPC, 2019a. MEPC 74/14/1, Proposal for evaluation and developing harmonized rules and guidance on the discharge of liquid effluents from exhaust gas cleaning systems. Submitted by Austria *et al.*, 8 February 2019, 10 pp.
- MEPC, 2019b. MEPC 74/INF.10, EGCS Environmental Impact Literature Review. Submitted by Panama, 8 February 2019, 21 pp.
- MEPC, 2019c. MEPC 74/INF.24, Report on the environmental impact assessment of discharge water from exhaust gas cleaning systems. Submitted by Japan, 8 March 2019, 72 pp.
- MEPC, 2019d. MEPC 74/INF.27, Compilation and assessment of 281 cruise ship EGCS washwater samples. Submitted by CLIA, 8 March 2019, 8 pp.
- MEPC, 2019e. MEPC 74/14/7, Comments on the proposal for evaluation and developing harmonized rules and guidance on the discharge of liquid effluents from exhaust gas cleaning systems. Submitted by CLIA, 22 March 2019, 3 pp.

- MEPC, 2019f. MEPC 74/14/8, Environmental impact assessment of EGCS discharges for generic risk-based, requirements adequately addressing all available technologies. Submitted by CESA, 22 March 2019, 4pp.
- MEPC, 2019g. MEPC 74/14/9, Comments on document MEPC 74/14/1. Submitted by China, 22 March 2019, 4 pp.
- MEPC, 2019h. 2019 Guidelines for Consistent Implementation of the 0.50% Sulphur Limit under MARPOL Annex VI, Annex 14, Resolution MEPC.320(74), (adopted 17 May 2019).
- Moldanová, J., Fridell, E., Popovicheva, O., Demirdjian, B., Tishkova, V., Faccinetto, A. and Focsa, C., 2009. Characterisation of particulate matter and gaseous emissions from a large ship diesel engine. *Atmospheric Environment*, [online] 43(16), pp.2632-2641. Available at: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1352231009001253>.
- Naturvårdsverket, 2009. Riktvärden för förorenad mark. Modellbeskrivning och vägledning. Rapport 5976, September 2009.
- Neff, J.M., 2002. Bioaccumulation in marine organisms. Effects of contaminants from oil well produced water. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier. 452 p.
- Neff, J.M., Stout, S. A. and Gunster, D.G., 2004. Ecological Risk Assessment of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons in Sediments: Identifying Sources and Ecological Hazard. *Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management*, Volume 1, Number 1: pp.22–33, SETAC 2005.
- Netherlands and Norway, 1975. Method for the calculation of dilution capacity in the ship's wake. MEPC III/7, MEPC, 3rd session, Agenda item 7.
- Nisbet, I.C.T. and LaGoy P., 1992. Toxic equivalency factors (TEFs) for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). *Reg. Toxicol. Pharma.* 16, 290-300.
- Nizzetto, L.; Lohmann, R.; Gioia, R.; Jahnke, A.; Temme, C.; Dachs, J.; Herckes, P.; Di Guardo, A.; Jones, K. C., 2008. PAHs in air and seawater along a North–South Atlantic transect: trends, processes and possible sources. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2008, 42 (5), 1580–1585.
- NRC (National Research Council), 2001. Arsenic in drinking water: 2001 update. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.
- Ochoa-González, R.; Díaz-Somoano, M.; López-Antón, M.A.; Martínez-Tarazona, M.R.; 2012. Effect of adding aluminum salts to wet FGD systems upon the stabilization of mercury. *Fuel*, Volume 96, June 2012, Pages 568-571. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2012.01.054> .
- OECD, 1992. OECD Guideline for Testing of Chemicals, Fish, Acute Toxicity Test, TG203, adopted 17 July 1992, 10pp.
- OECD, 2019. Guiding Principles and Key Elements for Establishing a Weight of Evidence for Chemical Assessment, Series on Testing and Assessment No. 311, Environment, Health and Safety Division, Environment Directorate, 37pp.
- Olmer N., Comer B., Roy B., Mao X., Rutherford B., 2017. Greenhouse gas emissions from global shipping, 2013-2015. ICCT Washington DC 20005 USA.
- OSPAR, 2004. Guidelines for monitoring the environmental impact of offshore oil and gas activities. Oslo and Paris commissions, London. Report 2004; pp 20.

- OSPAR, 2012. OSPAR List of Chemicals for Priority Action; pp 6.
- Paytana, A., Mackey, K.R.M., Chena, Y, Lima, I.D., Doney, S.C., Mahowald, N., Labiosa, R. and Post A.F., 2009. Toxicity of atmospheric aerosols on marine phytoplankton. PNAS, 2009 vol. 106, no. 12, 4601–4605.
- Pouil, S., Warnau, M., Oberhansli, F., Teyssie, J.-L., Bustamante, P., Metian, M., 2016. Influence of food on the assimilation of essential elements (Co, Mn, and Zn) by turbot *Scophthalmus maximus*. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 550, 207–218.
- PPR, 2018. PPR 6/INF.20, Results from a German project on washwater from exhaust gas cleaning systems. Submitted by Germany, 14 December 2018, 16pp.
- PPR, 2019. PPR 6/20, Report of the Marine Environment Protection Committee. 19 March 2019, 557 pp.
- Qiu, Y.W., Zhang, G., Liu, G.Q., Guo, L.L., Li, X.D., and Wai, O., 2009. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in the water column and sediment core of Deep Bay, South China. Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci. 83, 60–66. doi: 10.1016/j.ecss.2009.03.018.
- Rainbow, P.S., 2002. Trace metal concentrations in aquatic invertebrates: why and so what? Environ. Pollut. 120, 497–507. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0269-7491\(02\)00238-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0269-7491(02)00238-5).
- Reddy M., Arey, J.S., Seewald, J.S., Sylva, S.P., Lemkau, K.L., Nelson, R.K., Carmichael, C.A., McIntyra, C.P., Fenwick, J., Ventura, G.T., Van Mooy, B.A.S., and Camilli, R., 2012. Composition and fate of gas and oil released to the water column during the Deepwater Horizon oil spill Christopher. Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA 109, 20229_20234 (2012). www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1101242108.
- Reddy, C. M., and Quinn, J. G., 2001. The North Cape oil spill: hydrocarbons in Rhode Island coastal waters and Point Judith Pond. Mar. Environ. Res. 52, 445–461. doi: 10.1016/S0141-1136(01)00100-3.
- Reed, M. and Hetland B., 2002. DREAM: a Dose-Related Exposure Assessment Model Technical Description of Physical-Chemical Fates Components Conference Paper - March 2002, DOI: 10.2523/73856-MS .
- Rice, S.D., Thomas, R.E., Carls, M.G., Heintz, R.A., Alex, C., Murphy, M.L., Short, J.W., Moles, A., Wertheimer, A.C. and Michael L., 2001. Impacts to pink salmon following the Exxon Valdez oil spill : persistence, toxicity, sensitivity, and controversy. Rev Fish Sci 2001; 9: 165–211.
- Rye, H., Brønner, U., Ditlevsen, M.K., Frost, T.K., Furuholt, E., Kjeilen-Eilertsen, G., Nepstad, R., Page, P., Paulsen, J.E., Ramos R., Rønningen P., Sørstrøm, S.E., 2014. Use of the DREAM Model for Control and Prediction of Concentrations and Environmental Risks Associated with Regular Discharges to Sea: Experiences and Challenges. Society of Petroleum Engineers. Presentation at the SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition held in Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 27–29 October 2014.
- Rye,H.; Reed, M.; Frost, T.K.; Smit, M.G.D.; Durgut, I.; Johansen, Ø.; Ditlevsen, M.K., 2008. Development of a Numerical Model for Calculating Exposure to Toxic and Nontoxic Stressors in the Water Column and Sediment from Drilling Discharges. Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management — Volume 4, Number 2—pp. 194–203.

- SCF, 2002. Opinion of the Scientific Committee on Food on the risks to human health of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in food expressed on 4 December 2002, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/food/fs/sc/scf/out153_en.pdf .
- Schiffer S., and Libera, K., 2017. Toxicity of aqueous vanadium to zooplankton and phytoplankton species of relevance to the athabasca oil sands region Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety 137 (2017) 1–11.
- Shen, H., Huang, Ye, Wang, R., Zhu, D., Li, W., Shen, G., Wang, B., Zhang, Y., Chen, Y., Lu, Y., Chen, H., Li, T., Sun, K., Li, B., Liu, W, Liu, J., and Tao, S., 2013. Global Atmospheric Emissions of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons from 1960 to 2008 and Future Predictions. Environ. Sci. Technol. 2013, 47, 6415 – 6424 dx.doi.org/10.1021/es400857z .
- Smit, C.E., 2012. Environmental risk limits for vanadium in water. A proposal for water quality standards in accordance with the Water Framework Directive. RIVM Letter report 601714021/2012.
- Smith, W.P.; Jalkanen, J.P.; Anderson, B.; Corbett, J.J.; Faber, J.; Hanayama, S.; O’Keeffe.; Parker, S.; Johansson, I.; Aldous, I.; Raucci, C.; Traut, M.; Ettinger, S.; Nelissen, D.; Lee, D. S.; S.; Agrawal, A.; Winebrake, J. J.; Hoen, M.; Chesworth, S.; Pandey, A. Third IMO GHG Study 2014; International Maritime Organization, (IMO) London, UK, April 2015; 327pp.
- Stips, A., Bolding, K., Macias, D., Bruggeman, J., and Coughlan C., 2016. Scoping report on the potential impact of on-board desulphurisation on water quality in SOX Emission Control Areas. Report EUR 27886 EN.
- Stortini, A.M., Martellini, T., Del Bubba, M., Lepri, L., Capodaglio, G., and Cincinelli, A., 2009. n-Alkanes, PAHs and surfactants in the sea surface microlayer and sea water samples of the Gerlache Inlet sea (Antarctica). Microchem. J. 92, 37–43. doi: 10.1016/j.microc.2008.11.005 .
- Tennekes, H. and Lumley, J. L., 1972. A first course in turbulence. The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Thompson, K. H.; Orvig, C., 2003. Boon and Bane of Metal Ions in Medicine. Science 2003, 300, 936–939.
- Tripp, L., 2014. The effects of seawater scrubber effluent on marine microbial communities. Master Thesis, University of Gothenburg, 42pp.
- Tronczyński J., Munschy, C., Moisan, K., Guiot, N., Truquet, I., Olivier, N., Men, S., Furaut, A., 2004. Contamination of the Bay of Biscay by polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) following the T/V «Erika» oil spill. Aquat. Living Resour. 17, 243-259.
- Tronstad, L.,M.; Eyring, V.; Fuglestedt, J.; Hendricks, J.; Lauer, A.; Lee, D.; Righi, M. 2012. Global-mean temperature change from shipping toward 2050: Improved representation of the indirect aerosol effect in simple climate models. Environ. Sci. Technol. 2012, 46 (16), 8868–8877.
- Turcotte, D., Akhtar, P., Bowerman, M., Kiparissis, Y., Brown, R. S. and Hodson, P.V., 2011. Measuring the toxicity of alkyl-phenanthrenes to early life stages of medaka (*Oryzias latipes*) using partition-controlled delivery. Environ. Toxicol. Chem. 2011; 30: 487–495.

- Turner, D.R., Edman, M., Gallego-Urrea A.J., Claremar, B., Hassellöv, I.-M., Omstedt, A., Rutgersson, A., 2018. The potential future contribution of shipping to acidification of the Baltic Sea 2018. *Ambio* 2018, 47:368–378.
- Turner, D.R., Hassellöv, I.-M., Ytreberg E. and Rutgersson A., 2017. Shipping and the environment: Smokestack emissions, scrubbers and unregulated oceanic consequences. *Elem Sci Anth*, 5: 45, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1525/elementa.167>.
- Ulphe, H. and Eames, I., 2014. Environmental policy constraints for acidic exhaust gas scrubber discharges from ships. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 88:292 – 301.
- US EPA, 2018. Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) Program. TRI-Listed Chemicals. <https://www.epa.gov/toxics-release-inventory-tri-program/tri-listed-chemicals> .
- USDT, 2011. Exhaust Gas Cleaning Systems Selection Guide. Ship Operations Cooperative Program, File No. 10047.01, 22 February 2011, Rev. A, Ellicott City, MD, USA, 155pp.
- USEPA, 2005. Guidelines for Carcinogen Risk Assessment. Available at: https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2013-09/documents/cancer_guidelines_final_3-25-05.pdf .
- USEPA, 2011. Exhaust Gas Scrubber Washwater Effluent. EPA-800-R-11-006, Washington DC, USA, 46pp.
- USEPA, 2016. ECOTOX knowledgebase. <https://cfpub.epa.gov/ecotox/> . Accessed 22 Oct 2018.
- USEPA, 2017. Toxicological Review of Benzo[a]pyrene. Executive summary. January 2017. EPA/635/R-17/003Fc.
- Ushakov, S.; Stenersen, D.; Einang, P.M.; Ask, T.Ø., 2019. Meeting future emission regulation at sea by combining low-pressure EGR and seawater scrubbing. *Journal of Marine Science and Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00773-019-00655-y> .
- Valavanidis, A., Vlachogianni, T., Triantafyllaki, S., Dassenakis, M., Androutsos, F. and Scoullos, M., 2008. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in surface seawater and in indigenous mussels (*Mytilus galloprovincialis*) from coastal areas of the Saronikos Gulf (Greece). *Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.* 79, 733–739. doi: 10.1016/j.ecss.2008.06.018.
- Van Vlaardingen, P.L.A., Posthumus, R., Posthuma-Doodeman, C.J.A.M., 2005. RIVM report 601501029/2005. Environmental Risk Limits for Nine Trace Elements.
- Verbruggen, 2012. Environmental risk limits for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). For direct aquatic, benthic, and terrestrial toxicity. RIVM Report 607711007/2012.
- Viana, M.; Amato, F.; Alastuey, A.; Querol, X.; Moreno, T.; Dos Santos, S.G.; Herce, M.D.; Fernández-Patier, R., 2009. Chemical tracers of particulate emissions from commercial shipping. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2009, 43 (19), 7472–7477.
- Viana, M.; Hammingh, P.; Colette, A.; Querol, X.; Degraeuwe, B.; Vlieger, I.d.; Aardenne, J.v., 2014. Impact of maritime transport emissions on coastal air quality in Europe. *Atmos. Environ.* 2014, 90, 96–105.
- Wade T.L., Sericano, J.L., Sweet S.T., Knap, A.H., Guinasso Jr., N.L., 2016. Spatial and temporal distribution of water column total polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) and total

- petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) from the Deepwater Horizon (Macondo) incident. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 103 (2016) 286–293.
- Wang, W.-X., and Rainbow, P.S., 2010. Significance of metallothioneins in metal accumulation kinetics in marine animals. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol. Part C Toxicol. Pharmacol.* 152, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpc.2010.02.015>.
- WHO, 2000. *Air Quality Guidelines Second Edition*. Chapter 6.1 Arsenic. GHS (2017). *Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS)*. Eighth revised edition, United Nations, 2019.
- WHO, 2010. WHO Human Health Risk Assessment Toolkit: Chemical hazards. Available at: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/44458/9789241548076_eng.pdf;jsessionid=B0391F6107CFA730BA2D3EC639B92943?sequence=1.
- WHO, 2011a. WHO Food Additives Series: 64. (2011). Safety evaluation of certain food additives and contaminants. Prepared by the Seventy-third meeting of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA). Cadmium (pages 305–380). WHO, Geneva.
- WHO, 2011b. Evaluation of certain food additives and contaminants. WHO TRS 960. Seventy-third report of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA). WHO Geneva.
- WHO, 2017a. Drinking Water Parameter Cooperation Project. Support to the revision of Annex I Council Directive 98/83/EC on the Quality of Water Intended for Human Consumption (Drinking Water Directive). Recommendations. Bonn, 11 September 2017.
- WHO, 2017b. Guidelines for drinking-water quality. 4th ed. [ebook] World Health Organization. Available at: <http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/254637/1/9789241549950-eng.pdf?ua>.
- WHO/IPCS (World Health Organization/International Programme on Chemical Safety). 1998. Selected Non-heterocyclic Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons. *Environmental Health Criteria* 202. International Programme on Chemical Safety, World Health Organization, Geneva.
- Winnes, H.; Fridell, E.; Moldanova, J.; Peterson, K.; Salberg, H., 2018b. Air emission measurements, Task 1, Activity 3, EGCSs closing the loop, IVL Swedish Environmental Research Institute, Report B 2318, ISBN 978-91-7883-015-2, 144 pp.
- Winnes, H.; Granberg, M.; Magnusson, K.; Malmaeus, M.; Mellin, A.; Strippel, H.; Yaramenka,; Zhang, Y., 2018a. Environmental analysis of marine exhaust gas EGCSs on two Stena Line ships, Summary Activity 3, EGCSs closing the loop, IVL Swedish Environmental Research Institute, Report B 2317, ISBN 978-91-7883-016-9, 20 pp.
- Witt, G., and Matthäus, W., 2001. The impact of salt water inflows on the distribution of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in the deep water of the Baltic Sea. *Mar. Chem.* 74, 279–301. doi: 10.1016/S0304-4203(01) 00020-2.
- Ytreberg, E., Hasseløva, I.-M., Nyland, A.T., Hedblom, M., Al-Handal, A.Y., Wulff, A., 2019. Effects of scrubber washwater discharge on microplankton in the Baltic Sea. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 145 (2019) 316–324, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2019.05.023>.

- Zhou, J., Zhou, S., and Zhu, Y., 2017. Experiment and Prediction Studies of Marine Exhaust Gas SO₂ and Particle Removal Based on NaOH Solution with a U-Type Scrubber. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 2017, 56, 12376-12384.
- Zhou, Z., Liu, Z., and Guo, L., 2013. Chemical evolution of Macondo crude oil during laboratory degradation as characterized by fluorescence EEMs and hydrocarbon composition. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 66, 164–175. doi: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2012.09.028.
- Zetterdahl, M., Moldanov, J., Pei, X., Kant-Pathak, R., Demirdjian, B., 2016. Impact of the 0.1% fuel sulfur content limit in SECA on particle and gaseous emissions from marine vessels *Atmospheric Environment* 145 (2016) 338-345.
- Zipperle, A.; van Gils, J.; van Hattum, B.; and Heise, S., 2011. Guidance document for a harmonized Emission Scenario Document (ESD) on Ballast Water discharge. Report 36301205 prepared for Umweltbundesamt, Dessau. BIS-beratungszentrum für integriertes Sediment Management, Technische Hochschule Hamburg-Harburg, Hamburg, Germany.

13. APPENDIX

Table A1. Log K_{ow} , freshwater solubility, and estimated acute and chronic toxicity of PAH frequently found in crude and refined petroleum. The 16 US EPA PAH are marked with an asterix. Solubility and toxicity values are micrograms per liter ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$). Log K_{ow} values and solubilities are from Mackay, *et al.*, 1992, Neff and Burns, 1996, and Ran, *et al.*, 2002; (table from Neff, *et al.*, 2004)

PAH	Log K_{ow}	Freshwater solubility [$\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$]	Acute Toxicity [$\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$]	Chronic toxicity [$\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$]
Naphthalene*	3.37	33.720	4.870	970
C1-Naphthalenes	3.87	27.160	1.420	284
C2-Naphthalenes	4.37	4.725	410	81
C3-Naphthalenes	4.9	2.100	130	17
C4-Naphthalenes	5.55	NA ^a	42	4.1
Biphenyl	3.95	7.728	1.420	250
Acenaphthylene*	4.07	16.688	1.181	180
Acenaphthene*	3.92	16.908	1.360	270
Dibenzofuran	4.12	4.225	860	135
Fluorene*	4.18	2.045	730	150
C1-Fluorenes	4.97	1.090	96	19
C2-Fluorenes	5.2	NA	56	11
C3-Fluorenes	5.5	NA	16	5.3
Anthracene*	4.54	79.6	300	60
Phenanthrene*	4.46	1.100	367	55
C1-Phenanthrenes	5.14	272	64	13
C2-Phenanthrenes	5.51	NA	26	5.1
C3-Phenanthrenes	6	NA	7.4	1.5
C4-Phenanthrenes	6.51	NA	2	0.4
Dibenzothiophene	4.49	1.136	350	70
C1-Dibenzothiophenes	4.86	NA	140	28
C2-Dibenzothiophenes	5.5	NA	27	5.4
C3-Dibenzothiophenes	5.73	NA	16	3.1
Fluoranthene*	5.22	261	55	11
Pyrene*	5.18	134	61	12
C1-Fluoranthenes/pyrenes	5.72	NA	15	3.1
Benzo[a]anthracene*	5.91	14.7	9.8	2
Chrysene*	5.86	6	11	2.2
C1-Chrysenes	6.42	62.2	2.7	0.53
C2-Chrysenes	6.88	25	0.8	0.16
C3-chrysenes	7.44	NA	0.2	0.04
C4-Chrysenes	8	NA	0.06	0.01
Benzo[b]fluoranthene*	5.8	4.1	14	2.9
Benzo[k]fluoranthene*	6	0.8	8.6	1.7
Benzo[e]pyrene	6.04	4	7.6	1.5
Benzo[a]pyrene*	6.04	1.4	7.6	1.5
Perylene	6.25	0.4	4.3	0.86
Indeno[1.2.3-cd]pyrene*	7	6	0.64	0.13
Dibenz[a,h]anthracene*	6.75	0.5	1.3	0.25
Benzo[ghi]perylene*	6.5	0.3	2.4	0.49

a) Not available: No solubility found

In the case of an oil spill, the distribution of dissolved PAHs was generally dominated by low molecular weight petrogenic compounds, mainly naphthalene (Naph), phenanthrene (Phe), fluorene (Flu) and their alkylated derivatives (González, *et al.*, 2006, Zhou, *et al.*, 2013).

The Task Team was of the opinion that this Table A1 was insufficiently evaluated.

Table A2. Trace metal and PAH concentrations ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$) in open loop EGCS washwaters measured in the provided measurement campaigns

	CESA (1)	CESA	CESA	GER (2)	GER	GER	JP (3)	Koski (4)	Kjølholt (5)	Buhug (6)	Hansen (7)	Ushakov (8)
Metals ppb	Min	Max	mean	min	max	mean	mean	mean	mean	mean	mean	mean
Arsenic (As)	0	0	0.00	1	6.9	3.3	1.02	1.4	0.2	< 0.1	1.4	1.71
Cadmium (Cd)	0	0	0.00	0.01	0.07	0.03	0.035	BD	0	0.05	0.1	< 0.010
Chromium (Cr)	2	60	27.29				22.8	1.9	4.8	<1	5.6	1.87
Copper (Cu)	6	140	45.88	1.6	15.7	6.4	8.12	21	187.8	41.6	190	2.31
Iron (Fe)							997					
Lead (Pb)	20	120	72.25	0.04	2.12	0.08	1.755	0.61	17.05	5	26.4	0.64
Mercury (Hg)	8	8	8.00						0.086	< 0.1	<0.05	
Molybdenum, Mo												11.10
Nickel (Ni)	20	240	63.03	4.1	67.4	15.7	17.9	41	42.03	32.8	43.3	29.67
Vanadium (V)	20	860	213.3	10.6	290	78.4	58	162	164.3	35	164	111.09
Zinc (Zn)	20	2000	236.4	2.1	133	4.7	48.3	6.7	325	6	324	10.90
PAH ppb												
Acenaphthene	0.01	1.6	0.34									1.92
Acenaphthylene	0.02	0.58	0.16									0.0265
Anthracene	0.02	1.2	0.12									0.1205
Benzo(a)anthracene	0.02	1.2	0.23	<LOD	0.04	0.02	0.006					0.343
Benzo(a)pyrene	0.01	0.55	0.11	<LOD	0.1	0.04	0.014					1.094
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	0.01	0.37	0.10				0.012					<0.01
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	0.01	0.36	0.08				0.014					0.095
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	0.01	0.09	0.04									0.0735
Chrysene	0.02	1.6	0.26									0.016
Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	0.01	0.08	0.03				0.006					0.012
Fluoranthene	0.01	0.76	0.17									0.021
Fluorene	0.04	1.8	0.63									<0.01
Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene	0.01	0.14	0.04									<0.01
Naphthalene	0.02	14	3.65	0.57	9.47	3.02	0.006		0.48			<0.01
Phenanthrene	0.08	6.1	1.88	0.67	2.89	1.61	0.006					0.012
Pyrene	0.01	2.6	0.42				0.007					<0.01
PAH total	0.31	33.03	8.25	1.24	12.5	4.69	0.071		0.48			3.70

(1) MEPC 73/INF.5; (2) PPR 6/INF.20; (3) MEPC 74/INF.24; (4) Koski, *et al.*, 2017; (5) Kjølholt, *et al.*, 2012; (6) MEPC 56/INF.5; (7) Hansen, 2012; (8) Ushakov, *et al.*, 2019.