

TRIZINC BIS(ORTHOPHOSPHATE)

CAS No: 7779-90-0

EINECS No: 231-944-3

SUMMARY RISK ASSESSMENT REPORT

PART I - ENVIRONMENT

Final report, May 2008

The Netherlands

This document has been prepared by the Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment (VROM) in consultation with the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment (SZW) and the Ministry of Public Health, Welfare and Sport (VWS), on behalf of the European Union.

The scientific work on this report has been prepared by the Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research (TNO) and the National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), by order of the rapporteur.

Contact point:

Bureau Reach
P.O. Box 1
3720 BA Bilthoven
The Netherlands

Date of Last Literature Search: 2003
Review of report by MS Technical Experts finalised: 2006
Final report: May 2008

© European Communities, [ECB: year of publication]

NOTE:

Part II (Human Health) of the Summary Risk Report for zinc phosphate has been published already in 2004 by the European Commission (see <http://ecb.jrc.it>).

PREFACE

This report provides a summary, with conclusions, of the risk assessment report of the substance trizinc bis(orthophosphate), further referred to as zinc phosphate, that has been prepared by The Netherlands in the context of Council Regulation (EEC) No. 793/93 on the evaluation and control of existing substances.

For detailed information on the risk assessment principles and procedures followed, the underlying data and the literature references the reader is referred to the comprehensive Final Risk Assessment Report (Final RAR) that can be obtained from the European Chemicals Bureau¹. The Final RAR should be used for citation purposes rather than this present Summary Report.

It is noted that in the context of Council Regulation (EEC) No. 793/93 risk assessments were carried out for zinc metal (CAS No. 7440-66-6), zinc distearate (CAS No. 557-05-1 / 91051-01-3), zinc oxide (CAS No.1314-13-2), zinc chloride (CAS No.7646-85-7), zinc sulphate (CAS No.7733-02-0) and trizinc bis(orthophosphate) (CAS No.7779-90-0). All six substances are EU priority substances within Council Regulation (EEC) No. 793/93. For each compound a separate RAR and Summary RAR have been prepared. It should be noted, however, that the RAR Zinc metal contains specific sections (as well in the exposure part as in the effect part) that are relevant for the other zinc compounds as well. For these aspects, the reader is referred to the RAR Zinc metal.

¹ European Chemicals Bureau – Existing Chemicals – <http://ecb.jrc.it>

CONTENTS

1	GENERAL SUBSTANCE INFORMATION	3
2	GENERAL INFORMATION ON EXPOSURE	4
2.1	Production	4
2.2	Use Pattern	4
3	ENVIRONMENT	5
3.1	Environmental exposure	5
3.1.1	General introduction	5
3.1.2	Environmental releases and fate.....	5
3.1.3	Local exposure assessment	5
3.1.4	Regional exposure assessment	6
3.2	Effects assessment	6
3.2.1	Aquatic and terrestrial compartment.....	6
3.2.2	Atmosphere	7
3.2.3	Secondary poisoning	7
3.3	Risk characterisation.....	8
3.3.1	Local risk characterisation	8
3.3.1.1	Local risk characterisation – methods	8
3.3.1.2	Local risk characterisation - results	10
3.3.2	Regional risk characterisation.....	11
3.3.3	Secondary poisoning.....	11
4	HUMAN HEALTH	15
5	RESULTS.....	16
5.1	Environment.....	16
5.1.1	Local	16
5.1.2	Regional.....	16
5.2	Human health.....	17

TABLES

Table 2.1	Industrial and use categories of zinc phosphate in the EU
Table 3.1	$PNEC_{add}$ values for zinc (from RAR Zinc metal)
Table 3.2	Bioavailability corrections as applied in the EU RARs on zinc and zinc compounds
Table 3.3	Local exposure assessment – $(PE)C_{add}$ s and $(PE)C_{add}/PNEC_{add}$ ratios for the different scenarios (no correction for bioavailability)
Table 3.4	Local exposure assessment –uncorrected and corrected $(PE)C_{add}/PNEC_{add}$ ratios for the different scenarios

1 GENERAL SUBSTANCE INFORMATION

See **Part II – Human Health** for data on ‘identification’, purity, impurities and additives’ and ‘physico-chemical properties’ of the substance.

CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING

Annex 1 of Directive 67/548/EEC contains a list of harmonised classifications and labellings for substances or groups of substances, which are legally binding within the EU.

For zinc phosphate the current Annex 1 classification and labelling (29th ATP, 2004) is as follows:

Classification

N; R50-53

Labelling

N;

R50/53

S60-61

2 GENERAL INFORMATION ON EXPOSURE

2.1 PRODUCTION

Zinc phosphate is produced (>1000t/y) at five known sites in the European Union.

The total mean production volume of zinc phosphate in the EU is about 22,000 t/y. There is no detailed information available about the imported and exported volume of zinc phosphate in the EU.

2.2 USE PATTERN

Table 2.1 shows the industrial and use category of zinc phosphate. The only known usage of zinc phosphate is as an active inorganic anticorrosive pigment in primers and paints for corrosion protection of metal substrates. The substance is used, when possible, as a non-toxic substitute for lead and chromium(VI) containing anticorrosives. The use category of zinc phosphate can be characterised as non dispersive and use resulting in inclusion into or onto matrix.

Table 2.1 Industrial and use categories of zinc phosphate in the EU

Industrial category	EC no.	Use category	EC no.
Paints, lacquers and varnishes industry	14	Corrosion inhibitors	14

3 ENVIRONMENT

3.1 ENVIRONMENTAL EXPOSURE

3.1.1 General introduction

The EU Technical Guidance Document (TGD, 2003) on risk assessment does not provide detailed information on how to deal with (essential) elements that have a natural background concentration in the environment, such as zinc. In the risk assessment reports (RARs) for zinc metal and zinc compounds, including the RAR for zinc phosphate, the “added risk approach” has been used. In this approach both the "Predicted Environmental Concentration" (PEC) and the "Predicted No Effect Concentration" (PNEC) are determined on the basis of the added amount of zinc, resulting in an “*added* Predicted Environmental Concentration” (PEC_{add}) and “*added* Predicted No Effect Concentration” (PNEC_{add}), respectively.

In the present environmental exposure assessment, the use of the added risk approach implies that the PEC_{add} values have been calculated from zinc emissions due to anthropogenic activities. In the local exposure scenarios for zinc phosphate that are presented in this RAR, the PEC_{add} values (which are expressed as zinc, not as zinc phosphate) are based on the local zinc emissions due to the production or use of zinc phosphate.

In the environmental effect assessment, the use of the added risk approach implies that the PNEC_{add} values have been derived from toxicity data that are based on the added zinc concentration in the tests. Thus, the PNEC_{add} is the maximum permissible addition to the background concentration. From the background concentration (Cb) and the PNEC_{add}, the PNEC can be calculated: $PNEC = C_b + PNEC_{add}$. It is emphasised that the PNEC_{add} values were not derived from ecotoxicity data for zinc phosphate (which is poorly soluble in water), but derived from the combined ecotoxicity data for soluble zinc compounds, see further section 3.2.

Finally, in the environmental risk characterisation, the use of the added risk approach implies the evaluation of the PEC_{add} / PNEC_{add} ratios. In case measured environmental concentrations are used in the risk characterisation, either the background concentration has to be subtracted from the measured environmental concentration (resulting in a "PEC_{add} / PNEC_{add}" ratio) or the background concentration has to be added to the PNEC_{add} (resulting in a traditional "PEC / PNEC" ratio). See section 3.3.1 for additional explanation on the application of the added risk approach in the risk characterisation.

3.1.2 Environmental releases and fate

A general description about the release and fate of zinc in the environmental compartment is presented only in the RAR Zinc metal, but those data are applicable to all zinc compounds.

3.1.3 Local exposure assessment

Table 3.3 (included in section 3.3) shows the added Predicted Environmental Concentrations, i.e. C_{local}_{add} and PEC_{local}_{add} values ((PE)C_{add}s) for STP effluent, surface water, sediment and agricultural soil, based on the local exposure scenarios on the emissions of zinc due to the production or use of zinc phosphate. The (PE)C_{add}s are derived from either modelling or measured exposure data. All concentrations are expressed as zinc and not as zinc phosphate.

These $(PE)C_{add}$ s have been used in the risk characterisation to calculate the $(PE)C_{add} / PNEC_{add}$ ratios (see section 3.3).

It is noted that the PEC_{add} s for agricultural soil include the added regional background concentration ($PEC_{regional_{add}}$), according to the TGD equation $PEC_{local_{add}} = C_{local_{add}} + PEC_{regional_{add}}$. The $PEC_{regional_{add}}$ for soil is 0.5 mg/kg wwt (calculated value). For STP effluent, the PEC_{add} is equal to the $C_{local_{add}}$, as there is no regional PEC_{add} for STP effluent. For water and sediment, the $C_{local_{add}}$ values (thus without the regional PEC_{add}) are listed in **Table 3.3**, as in the risk characterisation for water and sediment initially only the $C_{local_{add}}$ values have been compared with the corresponding $PNEC_{add}$. See section 3.3.1 for further explanation of the local risk characterisation.

The $C_{local_{add}}$ s for air (atmosphere) have been left out of consideration in the environmental part of the Summary RAR, as no $PNEC_{add}$ could be derived for air (there are no useful data on the effects of airborne zinc on environmental organisms. The $C_{local_{add}}$ s for air have been used in the risk assessment of man indirectly exposed via the environment (see Human Health part).

3.1.4 Regional exposure assessment

A regional exposure assessment is described only in the RAR Zinc metal. The regional exposure assessment includes the industrial and diffuse emissions of all six current EU priority zinc compounds. In case of diffuse emissions it is not possible to distinguish between emissions from current EU priority zinc compounds and non-EU priority list zinc compounds. The diffuse emissions may thus also comprise emissions from other zinc compounds.

3.2 EFFECTS ASSESSMENT

3.2.1 Aquatic and terrestrial compartment

Zinc phosphate is much less water soluble than zinc salts such as zinc sulphate and zinc chloride. Based on that, it can be predicted that the bioavailability and (hence) the toxicity of zinc phosphate will be lower than that of soluble zinc compounds. However, once emitted into the environment, zinc phosphate will (partly) dissociate into the zinc cation and the phosphate anion, especially in an acidic environment. The further speciation of zinc, which includes complexation, precipitation and sorption, depends on the environmental conditions. Therefore, emitted zinc phosphate as well as other emitted zinc species (e.g. zinc chloride) will contribute to the effect of the total amount of zinc in the environment, regardless of the original source or chemical form. For this reason the risk characterisation for zinc phosphate is based on zinc, not on zinc phosphate as such, as explained earlier in section 3.1 and in the RAR Zinc metal.

Based on the above, the derogation statements with respect to the missing ecotoxicity data were accepted (i.e., exemptions were given for the required ecotoxicity data in the base set for zinc phosphate) and no effort has been made to retrieve ecotoxicity data on zinc phosphate.

For a comprehensive overview of the aquatic and terrestrial toxicity of (soluble) zinc, see the RAR Zinc metal and especially the Annexes of that report; the Annexes include detailed data on the ecotoxicity data bases for (soluble) zinc.

In the Risk Assessment Report on Zinc metal, PNEC_{add} values have been derived for zinc, on the basis of tests with soluble zinc salts (especially zinc sulphate or zinc chloride), using the “added risk approach” (see also earlier in section 3.1 of the present report for an explanation of the added risk approach). These PNEC_{add} values for zinc are listed in **Table 3.1** and used in the risk characterisation (see section 3.3).

Table 3.1 PNEC_{add} values for zinc (from RAR Zinc metal)

Environmental compartment	PNEC _{add}	PNEC _{add} value, as Zn	Remark
Freshwater (Hardness ≥ 24 mg/L) (1)	PNEC _{add, aquatic}	7.8 µg/l 21 µg/l	Dissolved zinc Total zinc (2)
Freshwater (Hardness <24 mg/L) (1)	PNEC _{add, aquatic softwater}	3.1 µg/l	Dissolved zinc
Freshwater sediment	PNEC _{add, sediment}	49 mg/kg dwt 11 mg/kg wwt	Dry weight of sediment (3) Wet weight of sediment (3)
STP effluent	PNEC _{add, microorganisms}	52 µg/l	Dissolved zinc
Soil	PNEC _{add, terrestrial}	26 mg/kg dwt 23 mg/kg wwt	Dry weight of soil (4) Wet weight of soil (4)

- (1) Total hardness (mg/l), as CaCO₃.
- (2) Total-Zn concentration: calculated from the PNEC_{add, aquatic} of 7.8 µg/l for dissolved zinc, a C_{susp} of 15 mg/l (according to the TGD, 2003) and a K_{p_susp} of 110,000 l/kg.
- (3) For the dry to wet weight normalisation of the PNEC_{add, sediment} it is assumed that wet sediment contains 10% solids (density 2500 kg/m³) and 90% water (density 1000 kg/m³) by volume, i.e. 22% solids by weight. These properties are set equal to those of suspended matter, thus the PNEC_{add, suspended matter} equals the PNEC_{add, sediment} (according to the TGD, 2003).
- (4) For the dry to wet weight normalisation of the PNEC_{add, terrestrial} it is assumed that wet soil contains 60% solids (density 2500 kg/m³) and 20% water (density 1000 kg/m³) by volume, i.e. 88% solids by weight.

3.2.2 Atmosphere

There are no data to derive an ecotoxicological PNEC_(add) for the air compartment.

3.2.3 Secondary poisoning

Based on data on bioaccumulation of zinc in animals and on biomagnification (i.e. accumulation and transfer through the food chain), secondary poisoning is considered to be not relevant in the effect assessment of zinc, see further the RAR Zinc metal.

3.3 RISK CHARACTERISATION

3.3.1 Local risk characterisation

3.3.1.1 Local risk characterisation – methods

In the first step of the risk characterisation, the local added Predicted Environmental Concentrations ($PEC_{local,add}$) in the various environmental compartments are compared with the corresponding added Predicted No Effect Concentrations ($PNEC_{add}$). In case this yields a $PEC_{add} / PNEC_{add}$ ratio above 1, the risk characterisation includes (if possible) a second step in which a bioavailability correction is made, see **Table 3.2** for a summary of the bioavailability correction methods applied and see RAR Zinc metal sections 3.3.2.1.1 (water), 3.3.2.2.1 (sediment) and 3.3.3.1.1 (soil) for a comprehensive explanation of the derivation and application of these bioavailability correction methods². In all cases the bioavailability correction is applied to the PEC_{add} , not to the generic $PNEC_{add}$, although for the resulting corrected $PEC_{add} / PNEC_{add}$ ratio it makes no difference whether the correction is applied to the PEC_{add} or to the $PNEC_{add}$.

- For water there is only a site-specific bioavailability correction, i.e. a bioavailability correction is only applied in case there are reliable site-specific data on the abiotic water characteristics that are needed to apply the BLM models. Bioavailability factors are being derived for two scenarios of abiotic conditions. One scenario refers to an average setting and the second one to a ‘realistic worst case’ setting. The highest bioavailability factor ($BioF_{water}$) is subsequently used in the risk characterisation by multiplying the original $(PE)C_{add}$ with this $BioF_{water}$. If a site has a discharge to seawater, no bioavailability correction is performed, as the BLM models were developed for freshwaters.
- For sediment the bioavailability correction is either site-specific (preference) or generic.
- For soil the bioavailability correction starts with the application of the generic lab-to-field correction factor (R_{L-F}) and if the corrected $PEC_{add} / PNEC_{add}$ ratio still is >1 , then a further, site-specific bioavailability correction is applied.

Final conclusions of the risk assessment are based on the corresponding ‘corrected’ $PEC_{add} / PNEC_{add}$ ratios.

Table 3.2 Bioavailability corrections as applied in the EU RARs on zinc and zinc compounds

Compartment	Added Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC_{add})	
	Bioavailability correction (generic)	Bioavailability correction (site-specific or region-specific)
Water	None	Biotic Ligand Models (BLMs) for algae, Daphnia and fish (a)
Sediment	Factor of 2 (b)	Acid Volatile Sulphide (AVS) method (c)
Soil	Factor of 3 (d) (R_{L-F})	Regression lines for invertebrates, plants and microbial processes (e)

² No bioavailability correction is done for the PEC_{add} in STP effluent. It is noted that in the main report (RAR Zinc phosphate) the notation PEC_{STP} has been used as synonym for the PEC_{add} in STP effluent.

- (a) Water – BLMs: Based on the relationship between toxicity of zinc and water characteristics, e.g. pH, dissolved organic carbon (DOC) and hardness (see RAR Zinc metal Section 3.3.2.1.1 for further explanation).
- (b) The PEC_{add} (or measured concentration) for zinc in sediment is divided by a generic, AVS-related correction factor of 2 to obtain the bioavailable concentration of zinc (note that in the original description of this method in section 3.3.2.2.1 of the RAR Zinc metal it is stated that the PEC_{add} is multiplied with a factor of 0.5). The corrected PEC_{add} is subsequently used in the assessment of the $PEC_{add} / PNEC_{add}$ ratio.
- (c) Sediment – AVS method: Based on the inverse relationship between toxicity of zinc and AVS content in sediment (see RAR Zinc metal Section 3.3.2.2.1 for further explanation).
This method is also described as the SEM/AVS-method, as also the toxicity of other metals, i.e. Cd, Cu, Ni, Hg and Pb, referred to as Simultaneously Extracted Metals (SEM) is reduced by AVS.
- (d) The PEC_{add} (or measured concentration) for zinc in soil is divided by a generic, ageing-related lab-to-field correction factor (R_{L-F}) of 3 to obtain the bioavailable concentration of zinc. The corrected PEC_{add} is subsequently used in the assessment of the $PEC_{add} / PNEC_{add}$ ratio.
- (e) Soil – Regression lines: Based on the relationship between toxicity of zinc and soil characteristics, e.g. pH and cation exchange capacity (CEC) (see RAR Zinc metal Section 3.3.3.1.1 for further explanation).

For STP effluent and soil, the PEC_{add} s are compared in the first step of the risk characterisation with the corresponding $PNEC_{add}$ s, as stated above.

For water and sediment, initially only the $C_{local,add}$ values (thus without the $PEC_{regional,add}$) are compared in the first step of the risk characterisation with the corresponding $PNEC_{add}$ s. At first the local aquatic risk characterisation thus focuses on the contribution of point sources to the potential risks, thereby neglecting the contribution of diffuse sources. If the regional PEC_{add} would have been added for sediment, all local scenarios would have resulted in $PEC_{add}/PNEC_{add}$ ratios larger than 1. This because the regional PEC_{add} for sediment already exceeds the $PNEC_{add}$ of 11 mg/kg wwt. This holds for both calculated and measured sediment concentrations. For this reason for sediment for all scenarios with a $C_{local,add}/PNEC_{add}$ ratio between 0 and 1 a **conclusion iii*** will be drawn, indicating that due to (possibly) high added regional background concentrations a risk for sediment at local scale cannot be excluded. It has to be noted that this conclusion would not be influenced by applying the generic sediment bioavailability correction factor (BioF) of 0.5 in the second step of the risk assessment.

The situation is somewhat less pronounced for the surface water compartment. With a $PNEC_{add}$ of 7.8 µg/l the regional $PEC_{add} / PNEC_{add}$ would lie between 0.8 (regional PEC_{add} of 6.7 µg/l) and 1.1 (regional PEC_{add} of 8.8 µg/l). When using an (arbitrary) average bioavailability correction factor (BioF) of 0.6³ in the second step of the risk assessment, these ratios would become, respectively 0.5 and 0.7. As a result of this, it is decided that for $C_{local,add}/PNEC_{add}$ ratios between 0.5⁴ and 1 a **conclusion iii*** will be drawn, indicating that due to (possibly) high (added) regional background concentrations a local risk for water cannot be excluded. For scenarios with a surface water $C_{local,add} / PNEC_{add}$ ratio < 0.5 the local contribution to the (added) regional background is assumed to be negligible (**conclusion ii**).

For those scenarios in which the involved process type does intrinsically not result in water emissions a **conclusion ii** is drawn for water and sediment.

³ See data in RAR Zinc Metal. Average of realistic worst case and average BioF for average NL data.

⁴ A $C_{local,add} / PNEC_{add}$ of between 0.5 and 1 should theoretically also be corrected for bioavailability. This would give ratios between 0.3 and 0.6 when using the correction factor of 0.6. Such ratios could just raise the overall $PEC_{add} / PNEC_{add}$ ratio, thus including the regional background, to levels above one.

It is important to note that the above-mentioned distinction between a (normal) conclusion iii) and a conclusion iii*) is not only made because of transparency, but also because the regional background is due to a variety of zinc compounds (and thus not only the zinc compound specifically addressed in the local risk characterisation).

In the RAR zinc metal a general reflection is given on the uncertainties in the zinc risk assessments.

3.3.1.2 Local risk characterisation - results

Table 3.3 shows the local C_{add} and PEC_{add} values ((PE) C_{add} values) and the corresponding (PE) C_{add} / $PNEC_{add}$ ratios for STP effluent, surface water, sediment and agricultural soil, based on the local exposure scenarios. It is emphasised that the (PE) C_{add} values and thus the (PE) C_{add} / $PNEC_{add}$ ratios in **Table 3.3** were not corrected for bioavailability. Subsequent corrections for the bioavailability of zinc in water, sediment and soil (if allowed) were then applied on the (PE) C_{add} values in case the uncorrected (PE) C_{add} / PEC_{add} ratio is above 1. No bioavailability correction is done for the PEC_{add} STP.

Table 3.4 presents the overall results of the local risk characterisation after the various bioavailability correction steps (if relevant). The conclusions of the risk assessment for the different local scenarios are based on the data in this table.

Aquatic compartment (including sediment)

STP-effluent

Production:

The PEC_{add} in STP effluent does not exceed the $PNEC_{add}$ for microorganisms at two production sites (no. C and E) of zinc phosphate (**conclusion ii**). The PEC_{add} s are based on site-specific emission data in combination with a site-specific effluent flow rate. The remaining production sites all have a chemical treatment installation.

Use categories:

The PEC_{add} in STP effluent for the formulation and processing sites of zinc phosphate exceeds the $PNEC_{add}$ for microorganisms in two scenarios (plant C and paint formulation) (**conclusion iii**). In contrast with the production scenarios (see above), also a generic scenario has been used for the formulation of zinc phosphate. This due to a lack of (sufficient) site-specific data (atmospheric emission data in particular).

Surface water

Production:

For all production sites the $C_{local,add}$ / $PNEC_{add}$ ratio is < 1 . These scenarios are based on site-specific release data. As all $C_{local,add}$ / $PNEC_{add}$ ratios are < 0.5 a **conclusion ii** is felt to be most appropriate for these production scenarios.

Use categories:

The $C_{local,add}$ in water for the processing sites of zinc phosphate exceeds the $PNEC_{add}$ for surface water in four scenarios (plant 2/B, C 'paint formulation' and 'paint processing'). As relevant data are lacking to perform a correction for bioavailability for surface water (BLM), no additional correction can be carried out for these scenarios. This implies that the original surface water risk characterisation ratios from **Table 3.3** remain unchanged (**conclusion iii**). In contrast with the production scenarios (see above), also a generic scenario has been used for the formulation of zinc phosphate. This due to a lack of (sufficient) site-specific data

(atmospheric emission data in particular). The $C_{local,add} / PNEC_{add}$ ratio is < 0.5 for the remaining scenarios (**conclusion ii**).

Sediment

Production:

Without correction for bioavailability the $C_{local,add} / PNEC_{add}$ ratio is (slightly) larger than 1 for production sites A and D. For all production sites the $C_{local,add}$ in sediment is below the $PNEC_{add}$ in sediment of 11 mg/kg wwt after correction with the generic bioavailability factor of 0.5 ($C_{local,add}$ multiplied with 0.5). A **conclusion iii*** is drawn for these sites as local risks due to high regional background concentrations cannot be excluded.

Use categories:

For sediment the $C_{local,add} / PNEC_{add}$ ratio is larger than 1 for all scenarios. As relevant data are lacking to perform a site-specific correction for bioavailability in sediment (SEM/AVS method), only the generic sediment bioavailability correction factor of 0.5 can be applied these scenarios. This implies that the original sediment $C_{local,add}$ s from **Table 3.3** are multiplied with a factor 0.5. After this correction the $C_{local,add} / PNEC_{add}$ ratio remains above 1 for these scenarios except for plant 4/D (**conclusion iii**).

The corrected $C_{local,add} / PNEC_{add}$ ratio is < 1 for plant 4/D, but due to the possibly high regional background concentration a potential risk at local scale cannot be excluded (**conclusion iii***).

Terrestrial compartment

Production:

For all production sites of zinc phosphate, the $PEC_{add} / PNEC_{add}$ ratios for soil are < 1 (**conclusion ii**).

Use categories:

Two generic use category scenarios ('paint formulation' and 'paint processing water borne') resulted in $PEC_{add} / PNEC_{add}$ ratios > 1 . As relevant data are lacking to perform a site-specific correction for bioavailability in soil (soil type characteristics), only the generic soil correction factor of 3 (R_{L-F} : ageing aspects) can be applied these scenarios. This implies that the original terrestrial PEC_{add} s from **Table 3.3** are divided by a factor 3. After this correction the $PEC_{add} / PNEC_{add}$ ratio for soil remains above 1 for the scenario 'paint formulation' (**conclusion iii**). **Conclusion ii**) holds for the scenario 'paint processing water-borne and solvent borne'.

Atmosphere

Not applicable, as no ecotoxicological $PNEC_{(add)}$ for the air compartment could be derived.

3.3.2 Regional risk characterisation

See RAR Zinc metal.

3.3.3 Secondary poisoning

Not relevant (see section 3.2.3).

Table 3.3 Local exposure assessment – (PE) C_{add} s and (PE) C_{add} /PNEC C_{add} ratios for the different scenarios (no correction for bioavailability)

Company	PEC C_{add} effluent STP (dissolved) (ug/l)	C C_{add} water (dissolved) (ug/l)	C C_{add} sediment (mg/kgwwt)	PEC C_{add} agricultural soil (mg/kgwwt)	PEC C_{add} / PNEC C_{add} STP	C C_{add} / PNEC C_{add} water	C C_{add} / PNEC C_{add} sediment	PEC C_{add} / PNEC C_{add} agr. soil
<i>Production companies:</i>								
Company A	312	0.457	10.9	0.608	not appl. ¹⁾	0.06	1.1	0.03
Company B	187	0.116	2.77	0.509	not appl. ¹⁾	0.01	0.3	0.02
Company C	1	0.189	4.51	0.521	0.02	0.02	0.4	0.02
Company D	116	0.363	8.68	0.520	not appl. ¹⁾	0.05	0.8	0.02
Company E	0.050	8.18.10 ⁻³	0.196	0.530	0.001	0.001	0.01	0.02
<i>Use categories:</i>								
Paint industry: plant 2 / B	9	15.1	361	not calc.	0.18	1.9	35	not calc.
Paint industry: plant 3 / E	46.5	1.96	46.9	not calc.	0.89	0.25	4.5	not calc.
Paint industry: plant 4 / D	3.5	0.566	13.5	not calc.	0.07	0.07	1.3	not calc.
Paint industry: plant C	233	37.7	902	not calc.	4.5	4.8	87	not calc.
Paint industry: plant F	47	1.96	46.9	not calc.	0.89	0.25	4.5	not calc.
Paint industry: formulation	399	64.8	1,548	225.5	7.7	8.3	149	9.4
Paint industry: processing (solvent borne)	11	1.8	43	6.72	0.21	0.23	4.2	0.28
Paint industry: processing (water borne)	55	9	215	31.6	1.1	1.2	21	1.3

1) Not applicable: only chemical treatment in industrial WWTP.

Table 3.4 Local exposure assessment –uncorrected and corrected (PE)_{C_{add}} / PNEC_{C_{add}} ratios for the different scenarios

Company	Uncorrected				Corrected	
	PEC _{C_{add}} / PNEC _{C_{add}} STP	C _{C_{add}} / PNEC _{C_{add}} water	C _{C_{add}} / PNEC _{C_{add}} sediment	PEC _{C_{add}} / PNEC _{C_{add}} agr. soil	C _{C_{add}} / PNEC _{C_{add}} sediment	PEC _{C_{add}} / PNEC _{C_{add}} agr. soil
<i>Production companies:</i>						
Company A	not appl. ¹⁾	0.06	1.1	0.03	0.5	
Company B	not appl. ¹⁾	0.01	0.3	0.02		
Company C	0.02	0.02	0.4	0.02		
Company D	not appl. ¹⁾	0.05	0.8	0.02	0.4	
Company E	0.001	0.001	0.01	0.02		
<i>Use categories:</i>						
Paint industry: plant 2 / B	0.18	1.9	35	not calc.	17	not calc.
Paint industry: plant 3 / E	0.89	0.25	4.5	not calc.	2.2	not calc.
Paint industry: plant 4 / D	0.07	0.07	1.3	not calc.	0.6	not calc.
Paint industry: plant C	4.5	4.8	87	not calc.	43	not calc.
Paint industry: plant F	0.89	0.25	4.5	not calc.	2.3	not calc.
Paint industry: formulation	7.7	8.3	149	9.4	75	3.1
Paint industry: processing (solvent borne)	0.21	0.23	4.2	0.28	2.1	
Paint industry: processing (water borne)	1.1	1.2	21	1.3	11	0.44

1) Not applicable: only chemical treatment in industrial WWTP.

4 HUMAN HEALTH

See Part II – Human Health

5 RESULTS

5.1 ENVIRONMENT

- (X) ii) There is at present no need for further information and/or testing and for risk reduction measures beyond those which are being applied already
- (X) iii) There is a need for limiting the risks; risk reduction measures which are already being applied shall be taken into account
- (X) iii*) A conclusion applied to local scenarios in which the local scenario merits conclusion (ii) but where (possibly) due to high regional background concentrations a local risk cannot be excluded.

5.1.1 Local

Conclusion (ii) is drawn for all local scenarios, including secondary poisoning, except those listed below.

Conclusion (iii) or (iii*) is drawn for the specified scenarios, because:

STP

- the PEC_{add} in STP effluent exceeds the $PNEC_{add}$ for microorganisms in three processing scenarios listed in **Table 3.4 (conclusion iii)**.

Surface water

- the $C_{local,add}$ in water exceeds the $PNEC_{add}$ for surface water in a number of processing scenarios listed in **Table 3.4 (conclusion iii)**.

Sediment

- the $C_{local,add} / PNEC_{add}$ ratio is larger than 1 for a number of processing scenarios listed in **Table 3.4 (conclusion iii)**. For the production sites and remaining processing scenarios listed in **Table 3.4** the $C_{local,add} / PNEC_{add}$ ratio is <1 , but a potential risk at local scale cannot be excluded due to the possible existence of high regional background concentrations (**conclusion iii***).

Soil

- one processing scenario listed in **Table 3.4** resulted in a $PEC_{add} / PNEC_{add}$ ratio >1 (**conclusion iii**).

5.1.2 Regional

The regional risk characterisation is discussed in the RAR on Zinc Metal.

5.2 HUMAN HEALTH

See Part II – Human Health