## Modeling Flows and Concentrations of Nine Engineered Nanomaterials in the Danish Environment

### Fadri Gottschalk<sup>1</sup>, Carsten Lassen<sup>2</sup>, Jesper Kjoelholt<sup>2</sup>, Frans Christensen<sup>2</sup> and Bernd Nowack<sup>3,\*</sup>

- <sup>1</sup> Environmental, technical and scientific services, CH-7558 Strada, Switzerland; E-Mail: fadri.gottschalk@etss.ch
- <sup>2</sup> COWI A/S, Parallelvej 2, Kongens Lyngby, DK 2800, Denmark; E-Mails: CRL@cowi.dk (C.L.); JEK@cowi.dk (J.K.); FMCH@cowi.dk (F.C.)
- <sup>3</sup> Swiss Federal Laboratories for Materials Science and Technology, EMPA, CH-9014 St. Gallen, Switzerland
- \* Author to whom correspondence should be addressed; E-Mail: nowack@empa.ch; Tel.: Tel +41-587-657-692; Fax: +41-587-656-998.

# **Supporting Information**

This Supporting Information is based on the "Annex I: Parameters for estimation of releases of nano-materials to the environment in Denmark", published by The Danish Environmental Protection Agency, Copenhagen, Denmark, in 2014, within the project "NanoDEN - Parameters for estimation of releases of nano-materials to the environment in Denmark".

# Contents

| 1. Gl  | ENERAL MODEL PARAMETERS                                     | 5  |
|--------|---|----|
| 1.1.1  | Geographical data   | 5  |
| 1.1.2  | Aquatic parameters  | 6  |
| 1.1.3  | Waste handling  | 6  |
| 1.1.4  | Environmental fate  | 8  |
| 1.1.5  | Volumes of the technical and environmental compartments     | 9  |
| 2 SI   | IRSTANCE-SPECIFIC MODEL PARAMETERS                          | 13 |
| 2. 50  | DSTANCE-STECHTC MODEL TANAMETERS                            |    |
| 2.1 P  | hotostable nano titanium dioxide (TiO2)                     | 13 |
| 2.1.1  | Manufacturing and import/export of the substance on its own | 13 |
| 2.1.2  | Formulation in Denmark                                      | 13 |
| 2.1.3  | Import/export and end-use in articles and mixtures          | 17 |
| 2.1.4  | Waste water treatment                                       | 22 |
| 2.1.5  | Solid waste treatment (incineration and landfill)           | 23 |
| 2.1.6  | Recycling   | 24 |
| 2.2 P  | hotocatalytic titanium dioxide (TiO2)                       | 26 |
| 2.2.1  | Manufacturing and import/export of the substance on its own | 26 |
| 2.2.2  | Formulation in Denmark                                      |    |
| 2.2.3  | Import/export and end-use in articles and mixtures          |    |
| 2.2.4  | Waste water treatment                                       | 29 |
| 2.2.5  | Solid waste treatment (incineration and landfill)           | 29 |
| 2.2.6  | Recycling   |    |
| 2.3 Zi | inc oxide (ZnO)   | 31 |
| 2.3.1  | Manufacturing and import/export of the substance on its own |    |
| 2.3.2  | Formulation in Denmark                                      |    |
| 2.3.3  | Import/export and end-use in articles and mixtures          |    |
| 2.3.4  | Waste water treatment                                       |    |
| 2.3.5  | Solid waste treatment (incineration and landfill)           |    |
| 2.3.6  | Recycling   |    |
| 2.4 Si | ilver (AgNP)  |    |
| 2.4.1  | Manufacturing and import/export of the substance on its own |    |
| 2.4.2  | Formulation in Denmark                                      |    |
| 2.4.3  | Import/export and end-use in articles and mixtures          |    |
| 2.4.4  | Waste water treatment                                       | 44 |
| 2.4.5  | Solid waste treatment (incineration and landfill)           | 44 |
| 2.4.6  | Recycling   | 45 |
| 2.5 C  | arbon nanotubes (CNT)                                       |    |
| 2.5.1  | General description   |    |
| 2.5.2  | Manufacturing and import/export of the substance on its own |    |
| 2.5.3  | Down stream use of CNT for production processes in Denmark  |    |
| 2.5.4  | Import/export and end-use in articles and mixtures          |    |
|        |   |    |

| 2.0.0 | Waste water treatment                                       | 49 |
|-------|---|----|
| 2.5.6 | Solid waste treatment (incineration and landfill)           | 49 |
| 2.5.7 | Recycling   |    |
| 2.6 C | CuCO3   | 51 |
| 2.6.1 | Manufacturing and import/export of the substance on its own | 51 |
| 2.6.2 | Formulation and industrial uses in Denmark                  | 51 |
| 2.6.3 | Import/export and end-use in articles and mixtures          |    |
| 2.6.4 | Waste water treatment                                       | 53 |
| 2.6.5 | Solid waste treatment (incineration and landfill)           | 54 |
| 2.6.6 | Recycling   | 54 |
| 2.6.7 | Further parameters for a soil exposure scenario             | 54 |
| 2.7 C | Cerium dioxide (CeO2)                                       | 55 |
| 2.7.1 | General description   | 55 |
| 2.7.2 | Manufacturing and import/export of the substance on its own | 55 |
| 2.7.3 | Formulation in Denmark                                      | 55 |
| 2.7.4 | Import/export and end-use in articles and mixtures          | 57 |
| 2.7.5 | Waste water treatment                                       | 61 |
| 2.7.6 | Solid waste treatment (incineration and landfill)           | 61 |
| 2.7.7 | Recycling   |    |
| 2.8 Q | Quantum dots  | 63 |
| 2.8.1 | General description   | 63 |
| 2.8.2 | Manufacturing and import/export of the substance on its own | 63 |
| 2.8.3 | Formulation in Denmark                                      | 63 |
| 2.8.4 | Import/export and end-use in articles and mixtures          | 63 |
| 2.8.5 | Waste water treatment                                       | 65 |
| 2.8.6 | Solid waste treatment (incineration and landfill)           | 66 |
| 2.8.7 | Recycling   | 67 |
| 2.9 C | Carbon black  | 68 |
| 2.9.1 | General description   | 68 |
| 2.9.2 | Manufacturing and import/export of the substance on its own | 68 |
| 2.9.3 | Formulation in Denmark                                      | 69 |
| 2.9.4 | Import/export and end-use in articles and mixtures          | 71 |
| 2.9.5 | Waste water treatment                                       | 75 |
| 2.9.6 | Solid waste treatment (incineration and landfill)           | 76 |
| 2.9.7 | Recycling   | 76 |
| 3 R   | FFERENCES   | 77 |

## 1. General model parameters

#### Table S1: The model parameters for the geographic description and the volume/mass of compartments

| Name of parameter                   | Unit                 | Value    | Remark, data source   |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|----------|---|
| 1.1.1 Geographica                   | l data               |          |   |
| Population of Denmark               | mill.<br>inhabitants | 5.60     | Population 2012 (Statistics Denmark, 2013).   |
| Population of the EU                | mill.<br>inhabitants | 504.4    | Wikipedia, List of European Union member states by population   |
| Total area of Denmark               | km <sup>2</sup>      | 43,000   | Southern Denmark including islands (not including Faroe Islands or Greenland).<br>(Statistics Denmark, 2013)  |
| Height of the air com-<br>partement | km                   | 1        | Height of air considered affected.<br>ECB, 2003. Technical Guidance Document on Risk Assessment. European<br>Chemicals Bureau. Institute for Health and Consumer Protection, European<br>Commission, Dublin.  |
| Area of natural soil                | %                    | 21       | 12% forest + 9% grasslands, heather and moors etc.<br>(Gyldendal, 2013)   |
| Area of agricultural soil           | %                    | 66       | Agriculture and horticulture (Gyldendal, 2013)  |
| Area of urban soil                  | %                    | 11       | Urban areas and infrastructure (roads, railways, airports) (Gyldendal, 2013)  |
| Area of sludge treated soil         | km <sup>2</sup>      | 800      | Estimate based on max. 7 tons dw/ha/year according to the Danish regulations on use of sludge on soils (Statutory Order No. 1650/2006). (DEPA, 2009 and DANVA, 2009a)   |
| Mean depth of natural soil          | m                    | 0.05-0.1 | Depth of agricultural soil compartment considered.<br>Low average value: ECB, 2003. Technical Guidance Document on Risk As-<br>sessment. European Chemicals Bureau. Institute for Health and Consumer<br>Protection, European Commission, Dublin.<br>Hi average value: Vanwalleghem, T., Poesen, J., McBratney, A., Deckers, J.,<br>2010. Spatial variability of soil horizon depth in natural loess-derived soils.<br>Geoderma 157, 37-45. |
| Mean depth of agricultural soil     | m                    | 0.2      | Depth of agricultural soil compartment considered.<br>ECB, 2003. Technical Guidance Document on Risk Assessment. European<br>Chemicals Bureau. Institute for Health and Consumer Protection, European<br>Commission, Dublin.  |
| Mean depth of urban soil            | m                    | 0.05     | Depth of agricultural soil compartment considered.<br>ECB, 2003. Technical Guidance Document on Risk Assessment. European<br>Chemicals Bureau. Institute for Health and Consumer Protection, European<br>Commission, Dublin.  |
| Soil density                        | kg m-3               | 1500     | The dry soil density 1500 kg m-3 was computed by neglecting the water content<br>from the standardized 1700 kg.<br>ECB, 2003. Technical Guidance Document on Risk Assessment. European<br>Chemicals Bureau. Institute for Health and Consumer Protection, European<br>Commission, Dublin.   |

| Name of parameter   | Unit                  | Value           | Remark, data source  |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------|--|
| Water-covered surface<br>(fresh water)  | km <sup>2</sup> and % | 700 (2 %)       | Lakes and rivers (Statistics Denmark, 2013)  |
| Water-covered surface<br>(sea waters)   | km <sup>2</sup>       | 31,500          | Estimate of area within limit of territorial waters<br>(12 nautical miles = 22 km) based on visual assessment of a map of Denmark  |
| Mean depth of fresh water   | m                     | 3               | Depth of water compartment considered.<br>ECB, 2003. Technical Guidance Document on Risk Assessment. European<br>Chemicals Bureau. Institute for Health and Consumer Protection, European<br>Commission, Dublin.   |
| Mean depth of the sea   | m                     | 10              | Rough estimate of mean depth within limit of territorial waters (12 nautical miles = 22 km) based on visual assessment of a map of Denmark showing sea depth isocurves.  |
| Sediment density  | kg m <sup>-3</sup>    | 260             | The dry sediemnt density was computed by neglecting the water content from the standardized 1300 kg m <sup>-3</sup> resulting in 260 kg m <sup>-3</sup> . ECB, 2003. Technical Guidance Document on Risk Assessment. European Chemicals Bureau. Institute for Health and Consumer Protection, European Commission, Dublin.   |
| Coast line (sea water)  | km                    | 7,300           | Official figure (Gyldendal, 2013). Use of it for calculation of the sea volume will lead to a serious overestimate.  |
| Coast line (fresh water)  | km                    | 128,000         | Official figure (Gyldendal, 2013).<br>The length of the Danish shoreline (7300 km) is the length of the shoreline to<br>the sea. The total length of Danish river and streams (mainly the latter) is 64,000<br>km of which 48.00 km are streams with a width of <2.5 metres, while 14.500<br>km are between 2.5-8.0 metres wide and only 1.500 km are >8 metres wide.<br>And this has to be multiplied by 2 as each stream/river has two banks/shores. |
| Sea volume relevant (for<br>discharge of ENM: coastal<br>length, distance from the<br>coast and water depth | km <sup>3</sup>       | 350             | Estimate using the width of the Danish territorial waters (12 nautical miles = 22 km) and the estimated mean sea depth within this limit (10 m).   |
| Locations of the sewage<br>treatment plants (STP),<br>distance from the river<br>source                     | km                    |                 | All the largest STPs in Denmark are located at the coast. A list is provided separately, which gives the names/locations and effluent volumes (2011) of the 12 largest STPs (data from Danish Nature Agency, 2012).  |
| 1.1.2 Aquatic para  | meters                |                 |  |
| Daily water consumption<br>per inhabitant   | l/d                   | 130             | In 2011 the total effluent volume from Danish STPs was 769 mill. m <sup>3</sup> corresponding to 137 l/d/person. The figure includes the volume of urban runoff in combined sewers, therefore some litres have been subtracted (Danish Nature Agency, 2012)  |
| Residence time of water in<br>rivers (from the source to<br>the stream mouth into the<br>sea)               | days                  | 2-2.5           | The mean velocity is 0.33 m/s, but in the largest rivers the velocity is typically a little higher i.e. 0.4-0.5 m/s. This gives a residence in the longest river of approx. 3.5-4 days. The average is estimated at some 2-2.5 days.   |
| Fraction of the wastewater<br>treatment plants connected<br>to a) freshwater and b) sea<br>water            | %                     | 50<br>and<br>50 | Danish Nature Agency (2014). Danish Nature Agency (2012).  |
| 1.1.3 Waste handli  | ing                   |                 |  |

| Name of parameter   | Unit  | Value                    | Remark, data source  |  |  |
|---|---|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| Annual sewage treatment sludge production   | t dw/year   | 130,000                  | Dry weight (2005).(DEPA, 2009)   |  |  |
| Sludge disposed of to agricultural soils  | %   | 55                       | % of the agricultural area in DK receives sludge. Dosage is regulated through criteria for N and P per year and a 5 year period. The figures differ from year to   |  |  |
| Sludge incinerated  | %   | 45                       | year, and from source to source. Estimated average figures.<br>(DANVA, 2009a; Kirkeby <i>et al.</i> , 2005; DEPA, 2009)  |  |  |
| Connection rate of waste<br>water from households<br>and industry to sewage<br>treatment plants                         | %   | 97                       | Based on estimate of the number of homes not connected to sewers (2006)<br>divided by the total number of homes (Statistics Denmark). (Organisation of the<br>Municipalities & Ministry of the Environment, 2010: Report from a working<br>group regarding the performance related to sewage treatment as part of the<br>consultations in connection with the planning in the water sector (in Danish) |  |  |
| Sewage treatment plant<br>overflows (due to heavy<br>rain and flood, overflows<br>escaping STP treatment<br>processes ) | % of total<br>water flow<br>to the<br>treatment<br>plants | 4                        | DANVA (2009b): Water in figures (in Danish)  |  |  |
| Fraction of the industrial<br>and household waste<br>ending up in waste incin-<br>eration plants (WIP)?                 | %   | 24<br>and<br>54          | From Danish waste statistis<br>(DEPA, 2013).   |  |  |
| Fraction of the industrial<br>and household waste<br>ending up in recycling<br>processes                                | %   | appr.<br>67<br>and<br>38 | From Danish waste statistis<br>DEPA, 2013  |  |  |
| Fraction of the industrial<br>and household waste<br>ending up in landfills   | %   | appr.<br>4<br>and<br>4   | From Danish waste statistis<br>DEPA, 2013  |  |  |
| MSWI: burning, filtration,<br>and acid washing  |   |                          | Detailed modelling according to (Walser and Gottschalk, 2014). See also the following information.   |  |  |
| Use of bottom ash in<br>construction works  | %   | 100                      | Bottom ash is recycled almost 100 % in road construction, soil consolidation<br>and anti-frost layers under buildings. A few percent are landfilled.<br>Virksomhedernes Miljøguide (Environmental guide for entreprises), 2013:<br>Slagger fra affaldsforbrændingsanlæg (Bottom ash from waste incinerators).  |  |  |
| Fly ash ending up in recy-<br>cling (cement production),<br>export and landfill   | %   | 39<br>22<br>39           | According to Sun et al. (2014) that base their values on (Walser et al., 2012).  |  |  |

| Name of parameter                                    | Unit                   | Value              | Remark, data source  |
|--|------------------------|--------------------|--|
| Landfills: leachate escape<br>to soils waters?       | % of total<br>leachate | 0                  | At one Danish landfill, leachate from inert waste and other less contaminated waste (7%) is leached through the soil to the sea after recirculation. (DEPA, 2010; RenoDjurs I/S, 2013)<br>However, due to the uncertainties that are too large when considered the whole area of Denmark and totally missing data for ENM fate analysis the modellimg was stopped at the landfill compartment by considering it as an ENM sink. This occurred in accordance to a zero leaching out of landfills as suggested by others (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). |
| Recycling processes:<br>escape to soils waters etc.? |                        | 0                  | See line above second paragraph.   |
| Annual volume of slag<br>from WIPs                   | t/y                    | Approx.<br>850.000 | Hansen and Olsen, 2004   |
| Annual volume of fly ash<br>from WIPs                | t/y                    | Approx.<br>53.000  | Hansen and Olsen, 2004   |
| Annual volume of munici-<br>pal solid waste          | t/y                    | 3.8                | Computed based on the bottom ash volume: After burning, 1 tonne of MSW there will be e.g. a production of 221 kg of bottom ash (slag) (Salzmann, C. Modelling and Quantification of Emissions from Municipal Solid Waste Incineration in Europe. Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zürich Zurich, 2008).   |

| Name of parameter Unit            |          | Value                          | Remark, data source  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 1.1.4 Environment                 | tal fate |                                |  |  |  |  |
| Sedimentation from air            | d/year   | 10<br>retention<br>time in air | No quantitative values on ENM deposition from the atmosphere are available.<br>Sedimentation factors were derived as suggested earlier (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014) from information on life-time of ultrafine particles (Anastasio and Martin, 2001)  |  |  |  |
| Sedimentation from fresh<br>water | %        | 0-100                          | The sedimentation processes in natural waters could not be considered mechanis-<br>tically due to an inconclusive data situation (Praetorius <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Praetorius <i>et al.</i> , to be submitted). Due to a highly complex Danish river and lake scenery the<br>mass transfer from the fresh water phase into sediments (not reaching sea water)<br>was accounted for by considering all events between and including two extreme<br>scenarios of complete sedimentation and absolutely no sedimentation. |  |  |  |
| Sedimentation from sea<br>water   | %        | 100                            | Sea water sediments represent the final sink for ENM that ends up in sea water.<br>The modeled ENM sea water concentrations reflect the worst case situation<br>before the ENM sedimentation process started.  |  |  |  |
| Terrestric compartments           | na       | na                             | Material fate processes were not conisdered in any kind of soils. All solis are therefore modeled as final sinks.  |  |  |  |
| Soil-water transfer               | %        | Approx. 0.6                    | ENM in soil may be trasnported to surface waters due to ersoion or during storm events etc. According to others (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014) 0.549% was used as a transfer factor from soils to surface water, a mean value that has been derived from data of diffuse transfer of linear alkylbenzene sulphonate (LAS) (Kannan <i>et al.</i> , 2007).   |  |  |  |

- 1

г

| Name of parameter                  | Unit         | Value        | Remark, data source   |  |  |
|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---|--|--|
| Dissolution upon contact           | %            | See data     | The elimination of ENM in the product use phase was modeled as dissolution          |  |  |
| with water                         |              | below for    | upon contact with water for different products as indicated below in each specifi   |  |  |
|                                    |              | each specif- | case. For carbon based ENM or e.g. for nano-TiO2 such dissolution was not           |  |  |
|                                    |              | ic material. | considered.   |  |  |
| 1.1.5 Volumes of t                 | he technical | and environm | nental compartments   |  |  |
| Agricultural soils                 | kg           | 8.3e+12      | 43,000*10^6*(0.2*0.66*0.97)*0.6*2500  |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 43,000 km <sup>2</sup> total area of Denmark  |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 10^6 is the transformation factor from km2 to m2                                    |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 0.2 m is the depth considered for agricultural soil                                 |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 0.66 is the share of agricultural land area   |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 0.97 is the proportion of agricultural land not treated with sewage treatment plant |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | (S1P) sludge<br>0.6*2500=1500 kg/m <sup>3</sup> used density of dry soil            |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 0.0 2500-1500 kg m used density of dry som  |  |  |
| Natural soils                      | kg           | 1.1e+12      | 43,000*10^6*((0.05-0.1)*0.21) *0.6*2500   |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 43000 km <sup>2</sup> total area of Denmark   |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 10,^6 is the transformation factor from km2 to m2                                   |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 0.05 -0.1 m depth used for natural soil (mean value)                                |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 0.21 is the share of natural land area  |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 0.6*2500=1500 kg/m <sup>3</sup> used density of dry soil                            |  |  |
| Urban soils                        | kg           | 3.5e+11      | 43,000*10^6*(0.05*0.11)*0.6*2500  |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 43,000 km <sup>2</sup> total area of Denmark  |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 10^6 is the transformation factor from km2 to m2                                    |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 0.05 m depth used for natural soil  |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 0.11 is the share of urban land area  |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 0.6*2500=1500 kg/m <sup>3</sup> used density of dry soil                            |  |  |
| Sludge (biosolid) treated<br>soils | kg           | 2.4e+11      | 800*10^6*0.2*0.6*2500   |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 800 km <sup>2</sup> sludge treated area   |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 10^6 is the transformation factor from km2 to m2                                    |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 0.2 m is the depth considered for agricultural soil                                 |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 0.6*2500=1500 kg/m <sup>2</sup> used density of dry soil                            |  |  |
| Surface water (fresh<br>water)     | 1            | 2.1e+12      | 700*10^6*3*1000   |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 700 km <sup>2</sup> water covered surface (fresh water)                             |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 10^6 is the transformation factor from km2 to m2                                    |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 3 m is the depth of water compartment considered                                    |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 1000 is the transformation factor from m <sup>3</sup> to litre                      |  |  |
| Surface water (sea water)          | 1            | 3.5e+14      | 350*10^9*1000   |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 350*10^9 m <sup>3</sup> relevant water volume                                       |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 1000 is the transformation factor from m <sup>3</sup> to litre                      |  |  |
| Sewage treatment plant             | 1            | 2.57288135   | 130*365*5,590,000*0.97  |  |  |
| (STP) effluents                    |              | e+11         | 130 l/head is the daily water consumption   |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 5590000 Danish population   |  |  |
|                                    |              |              | 0.97 is the connection rate to central sewage facilities                            |  |  |

| Name of parameter                            | Unit           | Value    | Remark, data source   |  |
|--|----------------|----------|---|--|
| Sediments (fresh water)                      | kg             | 5.46e+09 | 700*10^6*0.03*0.2*1300  |  |
|  |                |          | <ul> <li>700 km2 water covered surface (fresh water)</li> <li>10^6 is the transformation factor from km2 to m2</li> <li>0.03 m sediment depth</li> <li>0.2*1300=260 kg/m<sup>3</sup> density of sediments soil</li> </ul> |  |
| Sediments (sea water)                        | kg             | 2.73e+11 | 3.5*10^10*0.03*0.2*1,300  |  |
|  |                |          | <ul> <li>3.5*10^10 m<sup>2</sup> relevant surface (sea water sediment)</li> <li>0.03 m sediment depth</li> <li>0.2*1300=260 kg/m<sup>3</sup> density of sediments soil</li> </ul>   |  |
| Atmosphere                                   | m <sup>3</sup> | 4.3e+13  | 43,000*1*10^9   |  |
|  |                |          | 43000 km <sup>2</sup> total area of Denmark<br>1 km assumed depth of air affected by ENM<br>transformation factor from km <sup>3</sup> to m <sup>3</sup>  |  |
| Sewage treatment plant                       | kg             | 1.3e+08  | 130,000*1,000   |  |
| (511) sludge                                 |                |          | 130,000 t annual sewage treatment sludge volume in Denmark<br>1,000 is the transformation factor from t to kg   |  |
| Municipal waste for incin-                   | kg             | 1.86e +9 | 2,590,000*1000/7997000*5590000  |  |
| eration                                      |                |          | <ul><li>2.59 million tons Swiss waste volume scaled to Danish conditions based on the population numbers</li><li>1000 is the transformation factor from t to kg</li></ul>   |  |
| Waste incineration plant<br>(WIP) bottom ash | kg             | 8.5e+08  | 850,000*1000  |  |
|  |                |          | 1000 is the transformation factor from t to kg  |  |
| Waste incineration plant<br>(WIP) fly ash    | kg             | 5.3e+07  | 53,000*1000   |  |
|  |                |          | Annual volume of fly ash from Danish waste incineration plants (WIP)<br>1000 is the transformation factor from t to kg  |  |

Waste incineration processes were organized as illustrated i Figure 1 and modelled (see Table 1) as suggested by others (Walser and Gottschalk, 2014).



**Figure 1.** Model structure for the engineered nanomaterial (ENM) transport and fate in waste incineration plants shown in (Walser and Gottschalk, 2014). Red: Measurement points. The ENM transport and transfer were 11odelled based on the measurement data and transfer coefficients between the compartments (and subcompartments) of the proto-typical waste incineration plant.

| Table  | <b>S2.</b> N | Aass t  | ransfer  | and fat | e fractions | for all  | relevant | paths  | of the  | metallic   | ENM   | stud- |
|--------|--------------|---------|----------|---------|-------------|----------|----------|--------|---------|------------|-------|-------|
| ied in | a was        | te inci | ineratio | n plant | system de   | rived fr | om (Wal  | ser an | d Gotts | schalk, 20 | 014). |       |

| Transfer | <b>Transfer Factors</b>                 | Madiana                    | 05.9/ Quantilas |  |  |  |
|----------|---|----------------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|
| Path     | 5% Quantiles                            | Ivieuians                  | 95 % Quantiles  |  |  |  |
| 1.       | 1.000E+00                               | 1.000E+00                  | 1.000E+00       |  |  |  |
| 2.       | (                                       | Considered either in path  | 4 or path 5     |  |  |  |
| 3.       | (                                       | Considered either in path  | 4 or path 5     |  |  |  |
| 4.       | 9.524E-01                               | 9.762E-01                  | 1.000E+00       |  |  |  |
| 5.       | 1.228E-13                               | 2.379E-02                  | 4.757E-02       |  |  |  |
| 6.       | Ca                                      | onsidered either in path 8 | , 9 or path 10  |  |  |  |
| 7.       | Ca                                      | onsidered either in path 8 | , 9 or path 10  |  |  |  |
| 8.       | 1.179E-01                               | 1.817E-01                  | 2.455E-01       |  |  |  |
| 9.       | 3.625E-01                               | 5.585E-01                  | 7.545E-01       |  |  |  |
| 10.      | 1.232E-13                               | 2.598E-01                  | 5.195E-01       |  |  |  |
| 11.      | 2.679E-28                               | 5.189E-02                  | 1.038E-01       |  |  |  |
| 12.      | 8.962E-01                               | 9.481E-01                  | 1.000E+00       |  |  |  |
| 13.      | С                                       | onsidered either in path   | 11 or path 12   |  |  |  |
| 14.      | Considered either in path 11 or path 12 |                            |                 |  |  |  |
| 15.      | Сон                                     | nsidered either in path 17 | , 18 or path 19 |  |  |  |
| 16.      | Сон                                     | nsidered either in path 17 | , 18 or path 19 |  |  |  |
| 17.      | 3.165E-01                               | 3.328E-01                  | 3.490E-01       |  |  |  |

| Transfer<br>Path | Transfer Factors<br>5% Quantiles            | Medians                | 95 % Quantiles  |  |  |  |
|------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|
| 18.              | 6.498E-01                                   | 6.504E-01              | 6.510E-01       |  |  |  |
| 19.              | 8.224E-13                                   | 1.683E-02              | 3.367E-02       |  |  |  |
| 20.              | Conside                                     | ered either in path 22 | , 23 or path 24 |  |  |  |
| 21.              | Conside                                     | ered either in path 22 | , 23 or path 24 |  |  |  |
| 22.              | 9.039E-01                                   | 9.517E-01              | 9.995E-01       |  |  |  |
| 23.              | 2.023E-04                                   | 3.680E-04              | 5.337E-04       |  |  |  |
| 24.              | 1.265E-12                                   | 4.794E-02              | 9.587E-02       |  |  |  |
| 25.              | 3.352E-09                                   | 3.501E-01              | 7.001E-01       |  |  |  |
| 26.              | 2.999E-01                                   | 6.499E-01              | 1.000E+00       |  |  |  |
| 27.              | 3.352E-09                                   | 7.264E-09              | 1.118E-08       |  |  |  |
| 28.              | Considered either in path 25, 26 or path 27 |                        |                 |  |  |  |
| 29.              | Considered either in path 25, 26 or path 27 |                        |                 |  |  |  |

Table S2. Cont.

\* The same marked transfer categories do not necessarily exactly add up to one in a particular column of quantiles, for mass balance computations one value has to be derived in dependence of the others.

#### 2. Substance-specific model parameters

#### 2.1 Photostable nano titanium dioxide (TiO<sub>2</sub>)

#### Photostable nano-TiO2 and other applications of nano-TiO2

#### **General applications**

A wide range of applications exist for  $TiO_2$  nanomaterials exploiting the various properties of  $TiO_2$  nanomaterials. Pigmentary  $TiO_2$  is widely used as a pigment in paints, whereas nano-scale  $TiO_2$  is widely used in sunscreens and cosmetics due to the UV-absorption of the material. In paints and for water treatment nano-scale  $TiO_2$  is used as a photo-catalyst producing reactive oxygen that may

degrade organic contaminants. Finally, a number of other and very diverse set of applications exists such as ointments, toothpaste, catalysts, catalyst supports, adsorbents, delustrants, semiconductors, etc. In some consumer products, e.g. sunscreens, the percentage of nano- $TiO_2$  may constitute several percent of the product.  $TiO_2$  rank as one of the most used chemicals world-wide (mainly as a pigment), but the tonnages of nano- $TiO_2$  used nationally, in the EU or worldwide can at present not be estimated. Given the range of possible applications of nano- $TiO_2$ , the use is anticipated to increase significantly in the near future. (Mikkelsen *et al.*, 2011)

In order to discriminate varying life cycle and release (environmental exposure) pathways the report distribute the use categories of TiO2 nanomaterials reported in Sun *et al.* (2014) into two groups:

- Photostable nano-TiO2 and other nano-TiO2 applications: cleaning agent, spray, cosmetics, paper, plastics, batteries & capacitors, light bulbs, glass & ceramics, consumer electronics, textiles, food, ink, sport goods (covered by the next chapter)
- Photocatalytic nano-TiO2: Paints, metals, cement, filters. (covered by this chapter).

**Photostable and other nano-TiO2 applications -** It is difficult to define that other applications only use photostable TiO2, it may be a mixture of those properties. Therefore, the second category comprises both application where the photostability of nano TiO2 is applied and other applications. In such applications the chemical stability is crucial, hence, the photocatalytic properties – when exposed to ultraviolet (UV) radiation – have to be avoided/suppressed by coating the TiO2 nanomaterial e.g. with silica and alumina and other (US EPA, 2010a).

**Photocatalytic TiO2** - Photocatalytic TiO2 is a material category defined as application where the photolytic effects represent the main target material property. The photocatalytic properties of TiO2 are used in experimental and some commercial fields e.g. for the following purposes: degradation of organic compounds, and destruction of microbiological organisms as well as for transforming e.g. metals to less soluble material forms in waters and air environments (waste and drinking water, indoor air (US EPA, 2010). Photostable nano-TiO2 applications include : e.g. cosmetics, coatings and paints etc.

#### 2.1.1 Manufacturing and import/export of the substance on its own

| Manufacturing processes   | A large number of manufacturing processes exist for ultrafine grade of $TiO_2$ many of which use either<br>titanium tetrachloride or titanyl sulfate as starting material. These include precipitation, thermal hydrolysis<br>and flame hydrolysis. For the ultrafine grade, the crystal may be further processed involving milling, then<br>coating and milling again. Depending on the medium relevant to the application for marketing, a possible<br>last dispersion step (with water / cosmetic oils) can be applied for example for UV attenuation dispersion<br>grades. If no further dispersion is done, the products obtained are UV attenuation powder grades. Both<br>fine and ultrafine TiO2 may be surface treated to increase their applicability in products, e.g. to ensure a<br>uniform distribution in sunscreens or to optimize UV-absorption properties. (Mikkelsen <i>et al.</i> , 2011) |         |   |
|---|---|---------|---|
| Manufacturing in Denmark  | Nanosized TiO <sub>2</sub> is not manufactured in Denmark   |         |   |
| Name of parameter   | Unit  | Value   | Remark, data source   |
| Import of the substance on its<br>own or in mixtures to Denmark | t/year  | 2.5-30  | Estimated as the total of the uses for formulation processes in Den-<br>mark mentioned below. |
| Re-export   | % of import   | no data | No export of the substance on its own has been identified                                     |
| 2.1.2 Formulation in Denmark                                    |   |         |   |

| Photostable nano-TiO2 and other applications of nano-TiO2 |   |                   |                     |  |
|---|---|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Identified formulation processes<br>in Denmark            | Titanium dioxide is widely used as a pigment i various mixtures and materials and used for many different formulation processes in Denmark such as manufacture of pigments, paint and varnishes, adhesives, plastics, cosmetics, and food items.  |                   |                     |  |
|   | Intentional use of photostable TiO2 in nanoform for the manufacture of pigments, paint and varnishes, and cosmetics has been confirmed. In all the mixtures the TiO2 is used for UV protection. TiO2 in nanoform may potentially be used to some extent for the manufacture of UV protective plastics and textiles, but an actual use for manufacturing processes in Denmark has not been confirmed.<br>A survey of nanomaterials in products on the Danish market indicates the use of titanium dioxide as pigment in ostomy and incontinent devices and plasters (Tønning <i>et al.</i> , 2014). According to information obtained from industry, the used titanium dioxide is pigment grade and thus not here considered as nanomaterial |                   |                     |  |
| Name of parameter   | Unit  | Value             | Remark, data source |  |
| Formulation 1: Production of pign                         | nents, paint and  | lacquers and adhe | sives               |  |
| Number of companies                                       | companies2-10The use of TiO2 in nanoform for these formulation processes have<br>been grouped for confidentiality reasons as less than three companies<br>are involved in the production of some of the product types.  |                   |                     |  |
| Quantities used   | t/year  | 2-20              |                     |  |
| Ending up in final products                               | %   | 97%               |                     |  |

| Photostable nano-TiO2 and other applications of nano-TiO2   |                                      |          |   |
|---|--------------------------------------|----------|---|
| Release* to municipal waste<br>water system<br>* without any other indications the<br>release values were reduced/<br>enlarged on each side by 50% for<br>the modeling of symmetrical<br>triangular distributions around the<br>specified quantities. The sym-<br>metry may possibly be by the<br>absolute border values (highest or<br>lowest possible release value, 1<br>and 0). In cases were more values<br>are given, the mean is taken as<br>modeal value for such distribu-<br>tions. | %                                    | <0,25    | The emission scenario document (ESD) for the paint industry from<br>the OECD (2009) assume for manufacture of aqueous dispersion<br>coatings that the total fraction of raw materials lost to waste from the<br>manufacturing process is 1.5%. This includes 1% lost due to residues<br>in the mixing vessels and 0.5% due to residues in bags, spills and<br>product returns. It is in the ESD assumed that half of the residue<br>material in the mixing vessels will be re-used in the manufacturing<br>process (recycling. For aqueous dispersion coatings the remaining<br>equipment residue is assumed to be removed in water washings and<br>hence to waste water.<br>According to information from Danish manufactures waste water<br>originates from cleaning of tanks and other production equipment.<br>Approximately 1-2% of the total used may be released to the waste<br>water for pre-treatment/treatment at the manufacturing sites.<br>The first step at all sites is a precipitation/flocculation where the<br>majority of the TiO2 is precipitated and ends up in a sludge/filter cake<br>which is disposed of for external incineration or gasification.<br>The pre-treated waste water is either directed to municipal waste<br>water plants or further treated at the manufacturing sites.<br>In the latter case, the waste water is further treated. The waste water is<br>first treated by pre-precipitation tank, then by biological treatment (do<br>not remove TiO2) and ultimately by a final polishing.<br>As a worst case estimate, the releases to municipal waste water<br>treatment plants or surface water is estimated to be <0,5%. The actual<br>release is probably significantly below this value. As the pre-treated<br>waste water is either directed to municipal waste water<br>treatment plants or surface water, the emission to each of the pathways is<br>actimeted to be <0.25 %. |
| Direct release to surface water<br>(after internal WW treatment)  | %                                    | <0,25    | Worst case estimate – the total release is probably significantly below the $<0.25\%$ .   |
| Direct release to air   | %                                    |          | The TiO2 is imported as pastes in which the TiO2 is dispersed in water. The generation of dust by handling of the pastes is considered insignificant.   |
| Disposed of as solid waste for incineration   | %                                    | 2        | Filtercake/sludge and TiO2 remaining in packaging are disposed of for incineration or gasification.   |
| Transformation during use into other forms  | %                                    |          | Considered insignificant  |
| Percentage of produced prod-<br>ucts exported   | % of quantity<br>in final<br>product | Majority |   |
| Formulation 2: Production of cosm   | netics                               |          |   |
| Number of companies   | companies                            | <4       |   |

| Photostable nano-TiO2 and other applications of nano-TiO2        |        |        |  |
|--|--------|--------|--|
| Quantities used  | t/year | 0,5-10 | According to a new survey, sunscreens manufactured in Denmark for<br>the Danish market in general do not contain TiO2 in nano-form<br>(Tønning <i>et al.</i> , 2014). Most Danish cosmetic producers offer a range<br>of products in compliance with the ecolabel 'Svanemærket' which<br>does not allow the use of nanomaterials with a few exceptions. This<br>has led to a substitution of the former widespread use of titanium<br>dioxide for the benefit of chemical UV filters in sunscreen (Tønning<br><i>et al.</i> , 2014).<br>According to information from Danish manufacturers of cosmetics,<br>nano-TiO2 is still used for UV protection in mascara, eyeliner, face<br>powder and foundation. The use of TiO2 for these applications has<br>been introduced within the last year.<br>A few years ago one of the major manufacturers was reported to use<br>1-10 tonnes nano TiO2 for sunscreens (Tønning and Poulsen, 2007).<br>It has not been possible to obtain updated information on the use of<br>TiO2 in the Danish cosmetics industry.  |
| Ending up in final products                                      | %      | 95%    |  |
| Release to municipal waste water system                          | %      | 2      | Water used to wash containers is handled as common waste water<br>(Tønning and Poulsen, 2007). The percentage is roughly estimated<br>from the experience from other formulation processes.  |
| Direct release to surface water<br>(after internal WW treatment) | %      |        | No direct discharges to surface water  |
| Direct release to soil   | %      |        | No direct releases to soil   |
| Direct release to air  | %      | <0.01  | According to Tønning and Poulsen (2007), TiO2 nanoparticles are<br>purchased as a powder. The powders are handled in 25 kg bags which<br>are cut open, hereafter the content is dispersed in the mixture that<br>constitutes the base of the products.<br>The OECD has not developed an Emission Scenario Document<br>(ESD) for the cosmetics industry but some of the mixing processes<br>may be comparable with the paint industry. According to the ESD<br>(OECD, 2009) for the paint industry when using pigments and fillers<br>in powder form the emissions are estimated at 0.5-1.0% by weight of<br>the raw materials in powder form. It is supposed, that 95% of this will<br>be removed by the ventilation system. The remaining is assumed to<br>settle on the surfaces inside the workshop. The percentage captured<br>by air extraction systems is assumed to be 95% - and the percentage<br>of solid raw materials released to the atmosphere is estimated at<br>0.0095% of the raw materials used. The remaining part of the gener-<br>ated dust is assumed to be disposed of as solid waste. |
| Disposed of as solid waste for incineration                      | %      | 1      | Empty bags containing small amounts of material are disposed as regular waste. (Tønning and Poulsen, 2007). 0.5-1% in the form of generated dust is estimated to be disposed of as regular waste. The percentage is roughly estimated from the experience from other formulation processes.  |
| Disposed of for other waste<br>management                        | %      | 2      | Whole bags and miss productions are disposed as hazardous waste (Tønning and Poulsen, 2007)<br>The percentage is roughly estimated from the experience from other formulation processes.   |

| Photostable nano-TiO2 and other applications of nano-TiO2 |                         |                        |                                      |   |   |
|---|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Tra<br>oth  | ansformat<br>er forms   | tion during use into   | %                                    |   | Considered insignificant  |
| Per<br>uct  | centage o<br>s exported | f produced prod-<br>d  | % of quantity<br>in final<br>product | no data   |   |
| 2.1   | .3                      | Import/export and      | d end-use in a                       | rticles and mixtu   | res   |
|   |                         | End use                |                                      | ercentage of total *1<br>ower, mean, higher<br>value<br>(l,m,h) |   |
|   | 1                       | Plastics               |                                      | 0, 3.6, 12  |   |
|   | 2                       | 2 Cosmetics            |                                      | 0.33, 59.4, 94  |   |
|   | 3 Cleaning agents       |                        | 0, 6.2, 16                           |   |   |
| 4 Consumer electronics                                    |                         |                        | 0,6.9, 18                            |   |   |
|   | 5 Battery               |                        |                                      | 0, 0.4, 2   |   |
|   | 6                       | Light bulb             |                                      | 0, 0.2, 1   |   |
|   | 7                       | Glass & ceramics       |                                      | 0, 1.7, 10  |   |
|   | 8                       | Textiles               |                                      | 0,0.3, 1  |   |
|   | 9                       | Food                   |                                      | 0, 0.4, 2   |   |
|   | 10                      | Paper                  |                                      | 0, 0.003, 0.02  |   |
|   | 11                      | Ink                    |                                      | < 0.0003  |   |
|   | 12                      | Sporting goods         |                                      | 0, 1.5 , 6  |   |
|   | 13                      | 13 Spray               |                                      | 0, 0.2, 1   |   |
|   | 14                      | Metals                 |                                      | 0, 0.1, 1   |   |
| 1 N   | ote that th             | ese values due not sum | up to 100% sin                       | ce they refer to the to   | tal of both applications (photostable and photocatalytic) nano-TiO2 |

| Photostable nano-TiO2 and other applications of nano-TiO2 |   |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Identified uses in articles and<br>mixtures               | In the model, the total use in Denmark will be computed by scaling raw data from other regions into Danish dimensions based on the comparison of the population figures. Sun <i>et al.</i> (2014) summarize current available quantitative estimations: The US EPA (EPA, 2010) reports for the global use/production of nano-TiO2 12'500 t/y, while a study by Nightingale <i>et al.</i> (2008) suggests such amounts being around 5'000 t/y. A market analysis from 2011 (FutureMarkets, 2011a) indicates that the global production of nanoparticle TiO2 in 2010 was 50,400 t/y and project the production to reach 201,500 tons by 2013. Dupont (2010) indicates the global market to be less than 26,000 t/y in 2010. Considering the different estimates, most likely the total global consumption of nano TiO2 will be in the range of 10,000-50,000 t/y. Piccinno <i>et al.</i> (2012) provided an industry survey indicating European use ranging from 55 to 3'000 tons. The figures are reached by adding up the estimates for each application area. Others (Hendren <i>et al.</i> , 2011) reported for US production volumes a range between 7'800 and 44'400 tons. Schmid <i>et al.</i> (2008) came up with survey based production/use volumes per year of nano-TiO2 for Switzerland of 436 tons. On the basis of the survey of use of nano-TiO2 in Europe (Piccinno <i>et al.</i> , (2012)), the total consumption of nano-TiO2 (both photostable and photocatalytic) in Denmark with finished products (import and domestic production) is roughly estimated at 0.6-465 t/y. This range is used to complement the annual use volume modelled in a reference study by others (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014) and scaled down for Danish conditions. The latter work uses raw values (for Switzerland and appt: by a factor 1.43 tighter than equivalent. Danish figures ) that range from 1.8/a (Piccinno <i>et al.</i> , 2012) to 1'606 t/a (Schmid and Riediker, 2008). This approach seems to be rather conservative and result in a very high uncertainty, but is used in order to the approach is used in order to ensure that the model estimates span the |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |  |  |  |  |

| Photostable nano-TiO2 and other applications of nano-TiO2 |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
|   | Such a release model tracks nano-TiO2 emissions throughout the complete life cycle of these categories.  |  |  |  |
|   | The distribution on end uses and parameter values are taken from the 2014 study (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014) and reflect the fraction of the total nano-TiO production that is used in a specific product category. The mean, the lower and upper limit values describe the average quantities of triangular shaped probability distributions produced via the used MC model procedure (Gottschalk <i>et al.</i> , 2010).  |  |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>In order to count the relevant (only commercially available) nanoproducts and allocate them to these product categories, data from several sources was used for this allocation (Sun <i>et al.</i>, 2014):</li> <li>Company survey with direct distributional data (Piccinno <i>et al.</i>, 2012)</li> <li>Inventories of nano-products: Woodrow Wilson Centre for Scholars' Project on Emerging Nanotechnologies (Woodrow Wilson Institute, 2012) ANEC/BEUC Inventory (ANEC/BEUC, 2010); the BUND inventory (BUND, 2011); nanotechnology patents (Lem <i>et al.</i>, 2012)</li> <li>A market report (Future Markets, 2011).</li> <li>Internet search on Google, Yahoo and EC21 in order to count the numbers of products on the market.</li> </ul> |  |  |  |
|   | The knowledge available from these data were either the fraction of ENM in a particular application category or the product numbers containing such ENM.<br>Lower, upper boundary and mean mass fraction of ENM modelled for the allocation to different product applications. Details on such computation from different sources are explained in detail below and exemplary for the nano-TiO2 and based on a recent study (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).<br>The distribution on end-uses of nano-TiO2 presented by Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014 is here divided into two groups: photostable and other applications of TiO2 (this section) and photoactive TiO2 (next section).   |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |  |

г

| Photostable nano-TiO2 and other applications of nano-TiO2 |   |       |  |
|---|---|-------|--|
| Name of parameter   | Unit  | Value | Remark, data source  |
| End-use 1: Plastics                                       |   |       |  |
| Total consumption   | % of total consump-tion of $TiO_2$                | 3.6   | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). |
| Release to municipal waste water system                   | %   |       |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                       | %   | 100   |  |
| End-use 2: Cosmetics                                      |   |       |  |
| Total consumption   | % of total consump-tion of $TiO_2$                | 59.4  | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). |
| Release to municipal waste water system                   | %   | 85    |  |
| Direct release to surface water                           | %   | 10    |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                       | %   | 5     |  |
| End-use 3: Cleaning agent                                 |   |       |  |
| Total consumption   | % of total consump-tion of $TiO_2$                | 6.2   | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). |
| Release to municipal waste water system                   | %   | 95    |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                       | %   | 5     |  |
| End-use 4: Consumer electronics                           |   |       |  |
| Total consumption   | % of total consump-tion of $TiO_2$                | 6.9   | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                       | %   | 5     |  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery)      | %   | 75    |  |
| Export  | %   | 20    |  |
| End-use 5: Batteries and Capacito                         | rs  |       |  |
| Total consumption   | % of total<br>consump-tion<br>of TiO <sub>2</sub> | 0.4   | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                       | %   | 13    |  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery)      | %   | 33    |  |
| Export  |   | 54    |  |
| End-use 6: Light bulbs                                    |   |       |  |

End-use 11: Paper

| Photostable nano-TiO2 and other applications of nano-TiO2 |                                    |        |  |  |
|---|------------------------------------|--------|--|--|
| Total consumption   | % of total consump-tion of $TiO_2$ | 0.2    | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                       | %                                  | 80     |  |  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery)      | %                                  | 20     |  |  |
| End-use 7: Glass and ceramics                             |                                    |        |  |  |
| Total consumption   | % of total consump-tion of $TiO_2$ | 1.7    | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). |  |
| Release to municipal waste<br>water system                | %                                  | 1      |  |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                       | %                                  | 20     |  |  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery)      | %                                  | 79     |  |  |
| End-use 8: Textiles                                       |                                    |        |  |  |
| Total consumption   | % of total consump-tion of $TiO_2$ | 0.3    | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). |  |
| Release to municipal waste water system                   | %                                  | 1      |  |  |
| Direct release to air                                     | %                                  | 1      |  |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                       | %                                  | 50     |  |  |
| Export  | %                                  | 48     |  |  |
| End-use 9: Food   |                                    |        |  |  |
| Total consumption   | % of total consump-tion of $TiO_2$ | 0.4    | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). |  |
| Release to municipal waste water system                   | %                                  | 90     |  |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                       | %                                  | 10     |  |  |
| End-use 10: Ink   |                                    |        |  |  |
| Total consumption   | % of total consump-tion of $TiO_2$ | <0.003 | Not quantified in the model due to extremely low assumed amounts.              |  |
| Release to municipal waste<br>water system                | %                                  | 80     | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                       | %                                  | 20     | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). |  |

| Photostable nano-TiO2 and other applications of nano-TiO2 |   |       |   |  |
|---|---|-------|---|--|
| Total consumption   | % of total consump-tion of $TiO_2$                | 0.003 | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).  |  |
| Release to municipal waste water system                   | %   | 10    |   |  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery)      | %   | 80    |   |  |
| Export  | %   | 10    |   |  |
| End-use 12: Sporting goods                                |   |       |   |  |
| Total consumption   | % of total<br>consump-tion<br>of TiO <sub>2</sub> | 1.5   | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).  |  |
| Release to municipal waste water system                   | %   | 2     |   |  |
| Direct release to air                                     | %   | 2     |   |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                       | %   | 96    |   |  |
| End-use 13: Spray   |   |       |   |  |
| Total consumption   | % of total<br>consump-tion<br>of TiO <sub>2</sub> | 0.2   | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).  |  |
| Release to municipal waste water system                   | %   | 85    |   |  |
| Direct release to air                                     | %   | 10    |   |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                       | %   | 5     |   |  |
| End-use 14: Metals  |   |       |   |  |
| Total consumption   | % of total consump-tion of $TiO_2$                | 0.1   | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).  |  |
| Release to municipal waste<br>water system                | %   | 5     | Release specific data for all end uses were used as presented in the newest study for Swiss conditions (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). This seems reasonable since the crucial release parameters e.g. in landfilling, waste and wastewater treatment are e.g. very similar in these countries. Single data points are given. However, according to Sun <i>et al.</i> (2014) these single values are deviated on each side by 50% and a triangular distribution computed. |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                       | %   | 5     |   |  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery)      | %   | 90    |   |  |
| 2.1.4 Waste water treat                                   | ment  |       |   |  |
| Name of parameter   | Unit  | Value | Remark, data source   |  |
| Transformation during STP treatment into other forms      | %   | 0     | See next line.  |  |

| Photostable nano-TiO2 and other applications of nano-TiO2 |                |                     |  |
|---|----------------|---------------------|--|
| Percentage ending up in sludge                            | % (l, m, u)    | 20, 60, 98          | We modelled empirical distributions with mean, an the lower and<br>upper limit values as indicated in the column adjacent that follow the<br>newest evidence that in turn is based on the following sources:<br>real plant experiments conducted by others (Westerhoff <i>et al.</i> , 2011)<br>showed removal efficiency for Ti between 96.1% to 99.4% with a<br>mean value of 98.3%. Gomez-Rivera <i>et al.</i> (Gomez-Rivera <i>et al.</i> ,<br>2012) (2012) showed in a laboratory-scale activated sludge system<br>the removal of CeO2 that probably can also be used for a TiO2 case.<br>These authors came up with a total CeO2 removal of 96.6%, for the<br>CeO2 smaller than 200 nm removal efficiency of 98.5% was seen.<br>Other CeO2 removal experiments in a model wastewater treatment<br>plant and showed an efficiency between 95% and 98% (Limbach <i>et<br/>al.</i> , 2008). Our values reflect also other sources that cover and con-<br>firm the spectrum as describedabove. (Zhang <i>et al.</i> , 2008; Hwang <i>et<br/>al.</i> , 2011; Johnson <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Wang <i>et al.</i> , 2012)<br>$\sqrt[4]{9} \frac{1}{9} $ |
| Percentage discharges                                     | % (l, u)       | 2-80                | See line above.  |
| 2.1.5 Solid waste treatm                                  | ient (incinera | ation and landfill) |  |
| Name of parameter   | Unit           | Value               | Remark, data source  |

| Photostable nano-TiO2 and other applications of nano-TiO2                                      |              |   |   |
|--|--------------|---|---|
| Transformation or deposition<br>during incineration into other<br>forms (average Danish MSWIs) | %            | approx. 0.1-52<br>(deposition,<br>transformation)   | According to Mueller <i>et al.</i> (2013) three main processes of waste<br>incineration processes are relevant: i) burning, ii) filtration, and iii)<br>acid washing (wet-flue gas cleaning). We considered the nanoparticle<br>fate during such processes based on measurement evidence for CeO2<br>(Walser <i>et al.</i> , 2012). In line with the above mentioned CeO2 study<br>the partition of all target metallic nanomaterials between waste bun-<br>ker, incinerator, boiler, electrostatic filter, wet scrubber, slag and fly<br>ash was modelled as done in Walser and Gottschalk (2014).<br>Mass transfer and fate parameters (see please Figure 1) are modelled<br>as shown below in Table 1 that reflects the values derived from<br>computer based simulations combined with real analytic/experimental<br>results. These results show the steady state mass<br>transport/transformation for all relevant WIP paths reached after<br>steady state mode of such plants (infinite time scale). This means that<br>analytically not detected and not further transported material mass has<br>been assigned to the subsequent further transport and/or to the subse-<br>quent deposition/transformation by covering at each stage in the WIP<br>process the entire range of transport and fate possibilities. A distinc-<br>tion between material deposition and transformation was not possible<br>due to analytical limitations. However, in contrast to others we quan-<br>tified also such not further studied mass volumes that were ignored by<br>others (Gottschalk <i>et al.</i> , 2009; Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014) assuming zero<br>deposition and transformation for nano-TiO2. |
| Percentage emitted to the air<br>(average Danish MSWIs)  | %            | ~0  | See line above.<br>The efficiency of filter processes depends on the particle-size rather<br>than on material composition (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). Others (Walser <i>et al.</i> ,<br>2012) report removal efficiency of filter up to to 99.9%. This is<br>totally in line with earlier evidence (Burtscher <i>et al.</i> , 2001) (>99.5%<br>efficiency) used in other occasions (Gottschalk <i>et al.</i> , 2009; Sun <i>et<br/>al.</i> , 2014). Regarding the removal of acid washing processes the<br>mentioned studies agree on values higher than 99.9%.   |
| Percentage ending up in resi-<br>dues (average Danish MSWIs)                                   | %            | approx. 36-75<br>(slag)<br>approx. 3-9 (fly<br>ash) | See line above on nanoparticle deposition transformation for sources<br>and data.<br>Reijnders (2005) reports for Denmark over 72% of the ash of waste<br>incineration processes being reused for the construction of cycling<br>tracks, parking lots, roads etc.   |
| Release from landfills to munic-<br>ipal waste water treatment                                 | kg/year      | 0   | For landfill, no leachate out is assumed (Sun et al., 2014).  |
| Direct release from landfills to surface water   | kg/year      | 0   | See line above.   |
| Transformation during land-<br>filling into other forms  | %            | No data   | At this point we stopped our modelling. Nanomaterial fate and behav-<br>iour during landfilling was not considered. See also general com-<br>ments on landfilling.  |
| 2.1.6 Recycling  |              |   |   |
| Type of recycling activities   | Recycling of | the bottom ash of was                               | ste incineration processes  |
| Name of parameter  | Unit         | Value   | Remark, data source   |

| Photostable nano-TiO2 and other applications of nano-TiO2 |                  |   |  |  |  |
|---|------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Transformation during recy-<br>cling into other forms     | %                | No data   | Currently quantitative information that could be used to model fate<br>and behaviour of ENM during and after recycling is not available.<br>Hence according to others (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014), we did not track the<br>material fate and mass flows of the studied nanoparticles during and<br>after the recycling process. |  |  |
| Ending up in recycled products                            | %                | 72 (of the bottom<br>ash of waste<br>incineration<br>processes) | See comments above for percentages ending up in residues (average Danish MSWIs).   |  |  |
| Release from recycling process                            | % of<br>recycled | 0   | See first line on transformation during recycling into other forms.  |  |  |

#### 2.2 Photocatalytic titanium dioxide (TiO2)

#### Photocatalytic titanium dioxide (TiO<sub>2</sub>)

#### **General applications**

**Paints** – One use of nano-TiO2 in paint in the intentional use of nano-sized anatase titanium dioxide in paint, which has been developed to exploit the photo-reactive properties of nano-sized anatase titanium dioxide for decomposing organic substances and bacteria on the surface to achieve self-cleaning/antibacterial effects. In the preliminary product screening, a total of 16 paint undertaken by Sørensen *et al.* (2014) products that apply photo-reactive TiO2 particles were identified. Among the paints applied in Denmark is roof paint with photo-reactive TiO2.

**Coatings** - The use of coatings for surfaces has the explicit purpose of protecting the surfaces from bacteria and other pollutants; the so-called Clean Catalytic Surfaces. Herein, the specific use of nano-sized anatase titanium dioxide is very much desired due to its photocatalytic properties. Many of the commercially available coatings are aimed at the DIY market, where surfaces on buildings and metal, stone and glass can be coated to gain the self-cleaning property. The application techniques of the coatings include spray coating at room temperature or elevated temperatures (400-600 °C) and application by brush. In the preliminary product screening by Sørensen *et al.* (2014), a total of 43 coating products that contain photocatalytic titanium dioxide particles were identified.

**Construction materials** - The major applications of titanium dioxide-based photocatalytic construction and building materials are air pollution remediation, self-cleaning and self-disinfection. For all products the driving force is solar light (and the presence of water). Construction and building materials are optimal media for applying the photocatalytic nano materials because large areas are exposed to light. Several pilot projects have been carried out to verify the effectiveness of photocatalytic construction and building materials. Successful commercialization of self-cleaning surfaces includes concrete, mortar, glass, titles and ceramic products. These products enable buildings to maintain their aesthetic appearance over time. Similar, a number of self-disinfecting building materials have been commercialized to achieve a microorganism free environment. Lastly, a number of building materials enable of decomposing air pollutant (including volatile organic compounds and oxides such as NO, NO2 and SO2) have been commercialized; including roofing felt and pavement blocks.

**Water treatment systems** - Photocatalytic water treatment systems are applied for the removal of trace contaminants and pathogens (Savage and Diallo 2005; Qu, Alvarez *et al.* 2013 as cited by Tønning *et al.* (2014)). Two configurations are commonly used: slurry reactors and immobilized. Photocatalytic water-treatment applications have almost become a mature market as systems based on artificial UV light have been on the market for several years and systems for treating municipal, industrial, swimming facility, drinking and ballast water are also available (Saari, Iler *et al.* 2010 as cited by Sørensen *et al.* (2014)).

Photocatalytic UV irradiation using titanium dioxide nanoparticles as a catalyst is applied for removal of bacteria and other pollutants in water treatment systems, air cleaners and construction materials. Contrary to the product groups mentioned above, the nano-sized titanium dioxide has been deposited as a thin film to the surface of most of these product groups at the time of purchase. Most thin films are synthesized using a gas phase method, i.e. chemical/chemical vapour deposition, spray pyrolysis deposition (Carp, Huisman *et al.* 2004). In the preliminary product screening by Sørensen *et al.* (2014), a total of 35 products that apply photo-reactive titanium dioxide particles were identified.

Air cleaners - A limited number of air cleaners using artificial UV light and titanium dioxide as a catalyst for the removal of pathogens, viruses and volatile organic compounds are marketed. Most of the air cleaners have one or more pre-filtration steps before the air is passed over the titanium dioxide-coated surface.

| 2.2.1 Manufacturing and import/export of the substance on its own |   |   |   |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Manufacturing processes   | The overall desc  | The overall description the manufacturing of tiO2 is included in section 2.1.1. |   |  |  |  |
| Manufacturing in Denmark  | Nanosized TiO <sub>2</sub> is not manufactured in Denmark |   |   |  |  |  |
| Name of parameter   | Unit  | Value   | Remark, data source                                       |  |  |  |
| Import of the substance on its                                    | t/year  | 1-10  |   |  |  |  |
| own uses to Denmark   | nmark   |   |   |  |  |  |
| Re-export   | % of import   |   | No export of the substance on its own has been identified |  |  |  |
| 2.2.2 Formulation in Denmark                                      |   |   |   |  |  |  |

| Photocatalytic titanium dioxide (TiO <sub>2</sub> )  |  |              |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Identified formulation processes<br>in Denmark   | The use of photoactive TiO2 for the manufacture of paint in Denmark has been confirmed by Sørensen <i>et al.</i> (2014). The photoactive TiO2 is among others used for protection against microbial growth on roof paints. |              |  |  |  |  |  |
| Name of parameter  | Unit   | Value        | Remark, data source  |  |  |  |  |
| Formulation 1: Production of paint   | and lacquers   | ind lacquers |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of companies  | companies  | <4           |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quantities used  | t/year   | 1-10         | Exact figures not available. The quantities are roughly estimated.   |  |  |  |  |
| Ending up in final products  | %  | 97.5%        |  |  |  |  |  |
| Release to municipal waste water<br>system<br>* Unless otherwise noted the re-<br>lease values were reduced/ enlarged<br>on each side by 50% for the model-<br>ing of symmetrical triangular<br>distributions around the specified<br>quantities. The symmetry may<br>possibly be by the absolute border<br>values (highest or lowest possible<br>release value, 1 and 0). In cases<br>were more values are given, the<br>mean is taken as modeal value for<br>such distributions. | %  | <0,5         | The emission scenario document (ESD) for the paint industry from<br>the OECD (2009) assume for manufacture of aqueous dispersion<br>coatings that the total fraction of raw materials lost to waste from the<br>manufactring process is 1.5%. This includes 1% lost due to residues<br>in the mixing vessels and 0.5% due to residues in bags, spills and<br>product returns. It is in the ESD assumed that half of the residue<br>material in the mixing vessels will be re-used in the manufacturing<br>process (recycling. For aqueous dispersion coatings the remaining<br>equipment residue is assumed to be removed in water washings and<br>hence to waste water.<br>According to information from Danish manufactures waste water<br>originates from cleaning of tanks and other production equipment.<br>Approximately 1-2% of the total used may be released to the waste<br>water for pre-treatment at the manufacturing sites.<br>The first step at all sites is a precipitation/flocculation where the<br>majority of the TiO2 is precipitated and ends up in a sludge/filter<br>cake which is disposed of for external incineration or gasification.<br>The pretreated waste water is directed to municipal waste water<br>plants.<br>As a worst case estimate, the releases to municipal waste water<br>treatment plants are estimated to be <0,5%. The actual release is<br>probably significantly below this value. |  |  |  |  |
| Direct release to surface water<br>(after internal WW treatment)   | %  | 0            | No direct discharge to surface water   |  |  |  |  |
| Direct release to soil   | %  | 0            |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direct release to air  | %  | 0            | The TiO2 is imported as pastes in which the TiO2 is dispersed in water. The generation of dust by handling of the pastes is considered insignificant.  |  |  |  |  |
| Disposed of as solid waste for incineration  | %  | 2            | Filtercake/sludge and TiO2 remaining in packaging are disposed of for incineration or gasification.  |  |  |  |  |
| Transformation during formula-<br>tion into other forms  | %  |              | Considered insignificant   |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of produced products exported   | % of quantity<br>in final<br>product   | No data      |  |  |  |  |  |

| Photocatalytic titanium dioxide (TiO <sub>2</sub> )  |  |                 |                       |   |   |  |
|--|--|-----------------|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| 2.2.3 Import/export and                              | end-us   | e in art        | icles and mixture     | es  |   |  |
| Identified uses in articles and<br>mixtures          | The distribution on end-uses of nano-TiO2 presented by Sun <i>et al.</i> (2014) is here divided into two grouphotostable and other applications of TiO2 (previous section) and photoactive TiO2 (this section). Please note that the indicated percentages of the use of photoactive TiO2 shown below are percentage the total consumption of nano-TiO2. The terms in the brackets indicated the terms used for the applications areas in Sun <i>et al.</i> (2014) |                 |                       |   |   |  |
|  | End use  |                 |                       |   | Percentage of total TiO <sub>2</sub> consumption<br>Lower, modal , higher value<br>(l,m,h)  |  |
|  | 1  | Paints          |                       |   | 0, 8.9, 26  |  |
|  | 2  | Coatin          | gs                    |   | 0, 3.7, 19  |  |
|  | 3  | Constr          | uction materials (Ce  | ment)   | 0, 0.1, 1   |  |
|  | 4  | Waste           | water treatment       |   | 0, 0.7, 4   |  |
|  | 5  | Cleani          | ng of water and air ( | Filters)  | 0, 5.8, 26  |  |
| Name of parameter                                    | Unit   |                 | Value                 | Remar   | k, data source  |  |
| End-use 1: Paints                                    |  |                 |                       | Ι   |   |  |
| Total consumption                                    | % of total<br>consump-tion<br>of TiO <sub>2</sub>  |                 | 8.9                   | Percent<br>2014).<br>A part o<br>TiO2 ap<br>The tran<br>ered for                              | age (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> ,<br>of the nano TiO2 used for paint may in fact be photostable<br>oplied for UV protection.<br>nsfer coefficients used in the Swiss study has been reconsid-<br>the Danish situation as shown below |  |
| Release to municipal waste water<br>system           | %  |                 | 1                     | Dust and flakes from maintenance of painted surfaces and from<br>abrasion of painted surfaces |   |  |
| Direct release to surface water                      | %  |                 | 1                     | Dust and flakes from maintenance of painted surfaces and from abrasion of painted surfaces    |   |  |
| Direct release to soil                               | %  |                 | 1                     | Dust an abrasion  | d flakes from maintenance of painted surfaces and from n of painted surfaces  |  |
| Direct release to air                                | %  |                 | 1                     | Dust an abrasion  | d flakes from maintenance of painted surfaces and from<br>n of painted surfaces   |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | %  |                 |                       | Paint re<br>tible ma  | maining in packaging and paint on wood and other combus-<br>terials   |  |
| Disposed of to landfill                              | %  |                 | 50                    | Paint or  | a concrete and other non-combustible building materials   |  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | %  |                 | 46                    | Paint or  | n metals  |  |
| End-use 2: Coatings                                  |  |                 |                       |   |   |  |
| Total consumption                                    | % of to<br>consum<br>of TiO  | otal<br>n-ption | 3.7                   | Percenta<br>2014).  | age (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun et al.,  |  |
| Direct release to surface water                      | %  |                 |                       | [In the l<br>the envi<br>sewer s  | Danish situation probably a part will be discharged directly to<br>ronment from areas with municipal separate storm water<br>ystems]  |  |

| Photocatalytic titanium dioxide (TiO2)   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Release to municipal waste water system  | %   | 90  |  |  |  |  |
| Direct release to air  | %   | 5   |  |  |  |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI  | %   | 5   |  |  |  |  |
| End-use 3: Construction material (   | Cement)   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Total consumption  | % of total<br>consump-tion<br>of TiO <sub>2</sub> | 0.1   | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).   |  |  |  |
| Release to municipal waste water system  | %   | 1   |  |  |  |  |
| Disposed of to landfill  | %   | 19  |  |  |  |  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery)   | %   | 80  |  |  |  |  |
| End-use 4: Waste water treatment   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Total consumption  | % of total<br>consump-tion<br>of TiO <sub>2</sub> | 0.7   | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).   |  |  |  |
| Release to municipal waste water<br>system   | %   | 95  | [The information on the use of nano TiO2 for waste water treatment<br>in the Danish survey indicates that the nano TiO2 has been deposited<br>as a thin film and is not released to the waste water - Should be<br>reconsidered] |  |  |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI  | %   | 5   |  |  |  |  |
| End-use 5: Cleaning of water and air (Filters)   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Total consumption  | % of total<br>consump-tion<br>of TiO <sub>2</sub> | 5.8   | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).   |  |  |  |
| Release to municipal waste water system  | %   | 25  | (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014)   |  |  |  |
| Direct release to air  | %   | 5   | (Sun et al., 2014)   |  |  |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI  | %   | 70  | (Sun et al., 2014)   |  |  |  |
| 2.2.4 Waste water treatm   | nent  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Name of parameter  | Unit  | Value   | Remark, data source  |  |  |  |
| Transformation during STP<br>treatment into other forms  | %   | -   | See indications for Photo-stable and other nanomaterial titanium dioxide (TiO2)  |  |  |  |
| Percentage ending up in sludge   | % (l, m, u)                                       | -   | See line above.  |  |  |  |
| Percentage discharges  | % (l, u)  | -   | See line above.  |  |  |  |
| 2.2.5 Solid waste treatme  | ent (incinerat                                    | ion and landfill)                                 |  |  |  |  |
| Name of parameter  | Unit  | Value   | Remark, data source  |  |  |  |
| Transformation or deposition<br>during incineration into other<br>forms (average Danish MSWIs) | %   | approx. 0.1-52<br>(deposition,<br>transformation) | See remarks on data and sources for phostostable nano-TiO2.  |  |  |  |

| Photocatalytic titanium dioxide (TiO2)                         |                                    |   |  |  |  |
|--|------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Percentage emitted to the air<br>(average Danish MSWIs)        | %                                  | ~0  | See line above.  |  |  |
| Percentage ending up in residues<br>(average Danish MSWIs)     | %                                  | approx. 36-75<br>(slag)<br>approx. 3-9 (fly<br>ash) | See line above.  |  |  |
| Release from landfills to munici-<br>pal waste water treatment | kg/year                            | 0   | For landfill, no leachate out is assumed (Sun et al., 2014).   |  |  |
| Direct release from landfills to surface water                 | kg/year                            | 0   | See line above   |  |  |
| Transformation during land-<br>filling into other forms        | 0⁄0                                | No data   | At this point we stopped our modelling. Nanomaterial fate and behav-<br>iour during landfilling was not considered. See also general com-<br>ments on landfilling. |  |  |
| 2.2.6 Recycling  |                                    |   |  |  |  |
| Type of recycling activities                                   | No recycling activities identified |   |  |  |  |

#### 2.3 Zinc oxide (ZnO)

## Zinc oxide (ZnO)

#### General applications

Piccinno *et al.* (2012) report for nano-ZnO very similar (compared to nano-TiO<sub>2</sub>) applications by listing all above paints, cosmetics and sunscreens. The cosmetic use is confirmed also by others (AZoNano, 2013) by mentioning popularly known calamine lotions containing zinc oxide powder and the use in ointments for treating skin diseases. Filter application in rubber and cigarettes and the application as an additive in the manufacture of concrete and zinc oxide powders for the Ceramic industry and as additive material for the food industry are also mentioned. Others (Steinfeldt *et al.*, 2013) focused on nano-ZnO application in glass coatings by stressing that this type of ENM would improve the optical material characteristics by reducing (as seen above) UV permeability while simultaneously increasing the visible transmittance. These authors also refer to others (Lowry *et al.*, 2008) that for their part emphasize the use in coatings due to material properties, such as being stable and nonmigratory within coating matrices, ending up in a longer service life for the target coated products. Coating agent use is also mentioned for paints (AZoNano, 2013). A promising future field of applications has been demonstrated for optoelectronics, sensors, transducers and biomedical sciences due to the fact that such ZnO is as seen above a multi-functional material and due to its high variety of growth morphologies, such as nanocombs, nanorings, nanohelixes/nanosprings, nanobelts, nanowires and nanocages (Wang, 2004). Wang (2004) pays particular attention to nanobelts as nanosensors, nanocantilevers, field effect transistors and Nanoresonators.

Nano-ZnO is according to the Cosmetics Regulation (Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009) not included in the list of UV filter allowed in cosmetic products in the EU and Denmark.

| 2.3.1 Manufacturing and import/export of the substance on its own |  |                     |                     |  |  |
|---|--|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Manufacturing processes   |  |                     |                     |  |  |
| Manufacturing in Denmark  | Nanosized zinc   | oxide is not produc | ed in Denmark.      |  |  |
| Name of parameter   | Unit   | Value               | Remark, data source |  |  |
| Import of the substance on its<br>own uses to Denmark             | kg/year  |                     |                     |  |  |
| Re-export   | % of import  |                     |                     |  |  |
| 2.3.2 Formulation in Denmark                                      |  |                     |                     |  |  |
| Identified formulation processes<br>in Denmark                    | No formulation processes involving nanosized zinc oxide in Denmark have been identified. |                     |                     |  |  |
| 2.3.3 Import/export and end-use in articles and mixtures          |  |                     |                     |  |  |



|                      | The computed ENM fraction in each category reflects as described in detail in Gottschalk <i>et al.</i> (2009) the counted number of products per category multiplied by the assumed share of the overall distributed ENM mass in each product.<br>Lower, upper boundary and mean mass fraction of ENM modelled for the allocation to different product applications. Details on such computation from different sources are explained in detail below and exemplary for the nano-TiO2 and based on a recent study (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). Such comprehensive data collection and preparation bases on information from the ANEC/BEUC Inventory (ANEC/BEUC, 2010), the nanomaterial market report (Future Markets, 2011), the Woodrow Wilson Centre inventory of the for Scholars' Project on Emerging Nanotechnologies (WWI, 2012), the BUND inventory (BUND, 2011) as well as a summary of nanotechnology patents (Lem <i>et al.</i> , 2012) and an own internet search using Google, Yahoo and EC21. |  |       |  |   |   |
|----------------------|--|--|-------|--|---|---|
|                      | 1<br>2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>7<br>8<br>8<br>9<br>1<br>1  | End usePercentage of total<br>Lower, modal, higher value<br>(l,m,h)1Cosmetics27, 83, 1002Paints0, 14, 573Filters0, 0.1, 14Consumer electronics0, 0.2, 15Plastics0, 2, 116Textiles0, 0.01, 0.027Paper0, 0.02, 0.148Woods0, 0.01, 0.049Foods0, 0, 0.15, 110Cleaning agents0, 0.15, 1 |       |  |   |   |
| Name of parameter    | Unit   |  | Value | Remark, de<br>Unless othe<br>with 50% d  | ata source<br>rwise noted mean values used for tri<br>eviation on each side that refer to Su  | angular distributions<br>n <i>et al.</i> (2014).  |
| End-use 1: Cosmetics |  |  |       |  |   |   |
| Total consumption    | % of tota<br>consump   | ıl<br>ə-tion   | 83    | Percentage<br>As mention<br>filter allowe<br>some produ<br>seems unlik<br>use nano-Zi<br>The figures | (mean value) of the total nano-ZnO<br>ed elsewhere, nano-ZnO is not inclu<br>ed in cosmetic products in the EU an<br>cts may not be in compliance with the<br>tely that cosmetics should account for<br>nO.<br>are kept here for the first round of c | ded in the list of UV<br>d Denmark. Even<br>ne Regulation it<br>or a majority of the<br>omputing as a worst |

| Zinc oxide (ZnO)   |                         |     |   |
|--|-------------------------|-----|---|
| Release* to municipal waste<br>water system<br>* Unless otherwise noted the re-<br>lease values were reduced/ enlarged<br>on each side by 50% for the model-<br>ing of symmetrical triangular<br>distributions around the specified<br>quantities. The symmetry may<br>possibly be by the absolute border<br>values (highest or lowest possible<br>release value, 1 and 0). In cases<br>were more values are given, the<br>mean is taken as modal value for<br>such distributions. | %                       | 75  |   |
| Direct release to surface water  | %                       | 10  |   |
| Disposed of to MSWI  | %                       | 5   |   |
| Transformation during use into<br>other forms  | %                       | 10  | Transformation in the form of dissolution during the use phase was considered as material elimination due to contact with water (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). |
| End-use 2: Paints  |                         |     |   |
| Total consumption  | % of total consump-tion | 14  | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-ZnO use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).   |
| Release to municipal waste water system  | %                       | 1   |   |
| Direct release to surface water  | %                       | 1   |   |
| Direct release to soil   | %                       | 1   |   |
| Direct release to air  | %                       | 1   |   |
| Disposed of to MSWI  | %                       |     |   |
| Disposed of to landfill  | %                       | 50  | Disposed off with non-combusible building materials   |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery)   | %                       | 41  |   |
| Transformation during use into<br>other forms  | %                       | 5   | Transformation in the form of dissolution during the use phase was considered as material elimination due to contact with water (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). |
| End-use 3: Filters   |                         |     |   |
| Total consumption  | % of total consump-tion | 0.1 | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-ZnO use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).   |
| Release to municipal waste water system  | %                       | 20  |   |
| Direct release to air  | %                       | 5   |   |
| Disposed of to MSWI  | %                       | 70  |   |

| Zinc oxide (ZnO)   |                         |      |   |  |  |  |
|--|-------------------------|------|---|--|--|--|
| Transformation during use into other forms                       | %                       | 5    |   |  |  |  |
| End-use 4: Consumer Electronics                                  |                         |      |   |  |  |  |
| Total consumption  | % of total consump-tion | 0.2  | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-ZnO use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).   |  |  |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI  | %                       | 5    |   |  |  |  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery)             | %                       | 75   |   |  |  |  |
| Transformation during use into other forms                       | %                       | 20   |   |  |  |  |
| End-use 5: Plastics  |                         |      |   |  |  |  |
| Total consumption  | % of total consump-tion | 2    | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-ZnO use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).   |  |  |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI  | %                       | 100  |   |  |  |  |
| End-use 6: Textiles  |                         |      |   |  |  |  |
| Total consumption  | % of total consump-tion | 0.01 | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-ZnO use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).   |  |  |  |
| Release to municipal waste water system                          | %                       | 1    |   |  |  |  |
| Direct release to air  | %                       | 1    |   |  |  |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI  | %                       | 58   |   |  |  |  |
| Transformation during use into other forms                       | %                       | 30   |   |  |  |  |
| Export   |                         | 30   |   |  |  |  |
| End-use 7: Paper   |                         |      |   |  |  |  |
| Total consumption  | % of total consump-tion | 0.02 | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-ZnO use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).   |  |  |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI  | %                       | 25   |   |  |  |  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery)             | %                       | 70   |   |  |  |  |
| Export   | %                       | 10   |   |  |  |  |
| End-use 8: Woods   |                         |      |   |  |  |  |
| Total consumption  | % of total consump-tion | 0.01 | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-ZnO use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).   |  |  |  |
| Release to municipal waste water system                          | %                       | 1    |   |  |  |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI  | %                       | 94   |   |  |  |  |
| Transformation during use into<br>other forms and release to air | %                       | 5    | Transformation in the form of dissolution during the use phase was considered as material elimination due to contact with water (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). |  |  |  |
| End-use 9: Foods   |                         |      |   |  |  |  |

| Zinc oxide (ZnO)  |                         |       |   |  |  |  |
|---|-------------------------|-------|---|--|--|--|
| Total consumption                                       | % of total consump-tion | <0.01 | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-ZnO use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).   |  |  |  |
| Transformation during use into other forms              | %                       | 100   | Complete dissolution is considered due to contact with gastric acid in stomach (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).  |  |  |  |
| End-use 10: Cleaning agent                              |                         |       |   |  |  |  |
| Total consumption                                       | % of total consump-tion | 0.15  | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-ZnO use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).   |  |  |  |
| Release to municipal waste water system                 | %                       | 90    |   |  |  |  |
| Direct release to air                                   | %                       | 5     |   |  |  |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                     | %                       | 5     |   |  |  |  |
| End-use 11: Metals                                      |                         |       |   |  |  |  |
| Total consumption                                       | % of total consump-tion | <0.02 | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-ZnO use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).   |  |  |  |
| Release to municipal waste water system                 | %                       | 5     |   |  |  |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                     | %                       | 5     |   |  |  |  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery)    | %                       | 90    |   |  |  |  |
| Transformation during use into other forms              | %                       |       |   |  |  |  |
| End-use 12: Glass & ceramics                            |                         |       |   |  |  |  |
| Total consumption                                       | % of total consump-tion | 0.7   |   |  |  |  |
| Release to municipal waste water system                 | %                       | 1     |   |  |  |  |
| Direct release to air                                   | %                       |       |   |  |  |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                     | %                       | 20    |   |  |  |  |
| Disposed of to landfill                                 | %                       |       |   |  |  |  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery)    | %                       | 74    |   |  |  |  |
| Transformation during use into other forms              | %                       | 5     |   |  |  |  |
| Export  | %                       |       |   |  |  |  |
| 2.3.4 Waste water treatm                                | nent                    |       |   |  |  |  |
| Name of parameter                                       | Unit                    | Value | Remark, data source   |  |  |  |
| Transformation during STP<br>treatment into other forms | %                       | 100   | (Lombi <i>et al.</i> , 2012) reported on the fate and behaviour of zinc oxide nanosized particles during anaerobic digestion in wastewater and post-treatment processes of sewage sludge. These authors concluded that after such treatments the target particles were transformed into non-nanomaterial forms. |  |  |  |
| Zinc oxide (ZnO)   |                  |   |  |  |  |  |
|--|------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Percentage ending up in sludge   | %                | -   | See comments above.  |  |  |  |
| Percentage discharges  | %                | -   | See comments above.  |  |  |  |
| 2.3.5 Solid waste treatment (incineration and landfill)  |                  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Name of parameter  | Unit             | Value   | Remark, data source  |  |  |  |
| Transformation or deposition<br>during incineration into other<br>forms (average Danish MSWIs) | %                | approx. 0.1-52<br>(deposition,<br>transformation)   | Mass transfer and fate parameters (see please Figure 1) for all metal-<br>lic ENMs in a waste incineration system are modelled as shown<br>below in Table 1 that reflects the values derived from computer<br>based simulations that were combined with real analyt-<br>ic/experimental results of a detailed nano-CeO <sub>2</sub> case study (Walser<br>and Gottschalk, 2014). These results show the steady state mass<br>transport/transformation for all relevant WIP paths reached after<br>steady state mode of such plants (infinite time scale). This means that<br>analytically not detected and not further transported material mass<br>has been assigned to the subsequent further transport and/or to the<br>subsequent deposition/transformation by covering at each stage in<br>the WIP process the entire range of transport and fate possibilities.<br>See also comments on the nano-TiO <sub>2</sub> cases. |  |  |  |
| Percentage emitted to the air<br>(average Danish MSWIs)  | %                | ~0  | See line above.  |  |  |  |
| Percentage ending up in residues<br>(average Danish MSWIs)                                     | %                | approx. 36-75<br>(slag)<br>approx. 3-9 (fly<br>ash) | See line above.  |  |  |  |
| Release from landfills to munici-<br>pal waste water treatment                                 | kg/year          | 0   | For landfill, no leachate out is assumed (Sun et al., 2014).   |  |  |  |
| Direct release from landfills to surface water   | kg/year          | 0   | See line above.  |  |  |  |
| Transformation during land-<br>filling into other forms  | %                | No data   | At this point we stopped our modelling. Nanomaterial fate and<br>behaviour during landfilling was not considered. See also general<br>comments on landfilling.   |  |  |  |
| 2.3.6 Recycling  |                  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Type of recycling activities   | **description*   | *   |  |  |  |  |
| Name of parameter  | Unit             | Value   | Remark, data source  |  |  |  |
| Transformation during recycling into other forms   | %                | No data   | Currently quantitative information that could be used to model fate<br>and behaviour of ENM during and after recycling is not available.<br>We did not track the material fate and mass flows of the studied<br>nanoparticles during and after the recycling process. See also com-<br>ments on the previus cases.   |  |  |  |
| Ending up in recycled products   | %                | ~20   | Most part directly after product use. Bottom ash is e.g. recycled up to 100 % in road construction, soil consolidation and anti-frost layers under buildings. A few percent are landfilled.  |  |  |  |
| Release from recycling process   | % of<br>recycled | 0   | See lines above.   |  |  |  |

### 2.4 Silver (AgNP)

# Silver (Ag) General applications

The use of AgNP is very diverse and include therapeutic applications (diet supplement), personal care products, powdered colours, varnish, textile, paper, interior and exterior paints, printing colours, water and air-purification, polymer-based products and foils for antibacterial protection such as washing machines, kitchenware and food storage. The AgNP concentrations used are unknown for most applications. The scale of use of AgNP is unknown at this point in time, but expected to increase rapidly as more and more consumer products with AgNP are entering the market. (Mikkelsen *et al.*, 2011)

In some types of applications, the AgNP is dispersed in mixture (e.g. paint or printing colours ) whereas in others it may be adhered to a surface (e.g. in textiles), or it may be embedded in a polymer matrix as in hygienic surfaces of kitchenware and equipment for food storage.

| 2.4.1 Manufacturing and import/export of the substance on its own |  |                                |   |  |  |
|---|--|--------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Manufacturing processes   | Ultra-sonic precipitation, chemical vapour deposition, exploding wire synthesis. The size, shape, surface area, etc. can be modified by adding various surface active agents and coatings to syntheses involving silver salts. |                                |   |  |  |
| Manufacturing in Denmark  | AgNP is not manufactured in Denmark  |                                |   |  |  |
| Name of parameter   | Unit   | Unit Value Remark, data source |   |  |  |
| Import of the substance on its<br>own uses to Denmark             | kg/year  | No data indenti-<br>fied       |   |  |  |
| Re-export   | % of import No data indenti-<br>fied   |                                |   |  |  |
| 2.4.2 Formulation in Denmark                                      |  |                                |   |  |  |
| Identified formulation processes<br>in Denmark                    | No formulation processes with the use of AgNP in Denmark have been identified.   |                                |   |  |  |
| 2.4.3 Import/export and   | end-use in art   | icles and mixture              | S |  |  |



#### Silver (Ag)

|                                     |                | Fred   |                   |       |   |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|--------|-------------------|-------|---|
|                                     |                |        |                   |       | Lewer mean higher value   |
|                                     |                |        |                   |       | (] m h)   |
|                                     |                |        |                   |       | (1)   |
|                                     | 1              | Text   | iles              |       | 15, 25, 35  |
|                                     | 2              | Clear  | ning agents       |       | 2, 6, 15  |
|                                     | 3              | Paint  | ts                |       | 0, 3, 15  |
|                                     | 4              | Cons   | sumer electronics |       | 11, 38, 60  |
|                                     | 5              | Cosn   | netics            |       | 4, 10, 31   |
|                                     | 6              | Med    | tech              |       | 0, 4, 15  |
|                                     | 7              | Plast  | ics               |       | 0, 3, 7   |
|                                     | 8              | Food   |                   |       | 0, 7, 24  |
|                                     | 9              | Glass  | s & ceramics      |       | 0, 1, 4   |
|                                     | 10             | Meta   | ls                |       | 0, 2, 12  |
|                                     | 11             | Soil   | remediation       |       | 0, 1, 4   |
|                                     | 12             | Filtra | ation             |       | 0, 0.3, 0.6   |
|                                     | 13             | Sanit  | tary              |       | 0, 0.16, 0.5  |
|                                     | 14             | Pape   | r                 | r     | 0, 0.1, 1   |
| Name of parameter                   | Unit           |        | Value             | Rem   | ark, data source  |
|                                     |                |        |                   |       |   |
| End-use 1: Textiles                 |                |        |                   |       |   |
| Total consumption                   | 0/2            |        | 25                | Derce | entage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al</i>      |
| i otar consumption                  | 70             |        | 25                | 2014  |   |
|                                     |                |        |                   | 201   | ٠ <i>,</i>  |
| Delegas to municipal waste water    | 0/             |        | 22                | Dari  | and from ampirical data as suggested by others (Sup at $al = 2014$ ). |
| kelease to municipal waste water    | <sup>9</sup> 0 |        | 32                | Den   | ved from empirical data as suggested by others (Sun et al., 2014)     |
| * Unless otherwise noted the re-    |                |        |                   |       |   |
| lease values were reduced/ enlarged |                |        |                   |       |   |
| on each side by 50% for the model-  |                |        |                   |       |   |
| ing of symmetrical triangular       |                |        |                   |       |   |
| distributions around the specified  |                |        |                   |       |   |
| quantities. The symmetry may        |                |        |                   |       |   |
| possibly be by the absolute border  |                |        |                   |       |   |
| values (highest or lowest possible  |                |        |                   |       |   |
| release value, 1 and 0). In cases   |                |        |                   |       |   |
| mean is taken as modal value for    |                |        |                   |       |   |
| such distributions                  |                |        |                   |       |   |
| Direct release to air               | 0/2            |        | 5                 |       |   |
|                                     | 70             |        | 3                 |       |   |
| Disposed of to MSWI                 | %              |        | 32                |       |   |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.    | %              |        | 6.4               |       |   |
| energy recovery)                    |                |        |                   |       |   |
| Transformation during use into      | %              |        | 5                 |       |   |
| () ()                               |                |        |                   |       |   |
| other forms                         |                |        |                   |       |   |
| Export                              | %              |        | 25.6              |       |   |

| Silver (Ag)  |    |    |   |
|--|----|----|---|
| Total consumption                                    | %  | 6  | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).  |
| Release to municipal waste water system              | %  | 85 |   |
| Direct release to air                                | %  | 5  |   |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | %  | 5  |   |
| Transformation during use into<br>other forms        | %  | 5  | Transformation in the form of dissolution during the use phase was considered as material elimination due to contact with water (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). |
| End-use 3: Paints                                    | ·  |    |   |
| Total consumption                                    | %  | 3  | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).  |
| Release to municipal waste water system              | %  | 1  |   |
| Direct release to surface water                      | %  | 1  |   |
| Direct release to soil                               | %  | 1  |   |
| Direct release to air                                | %  | 1  |   |
| Disposed of to landfill                              | %  | 50 |   |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | %  | 41 |   |
| Transformation during use into<br>other forms        | %  | 5  | Transformation in the form of dissolution during the use phase was considered as material elimination due to contact with water (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). |
| End-use 4: Consumer electronics                      |    |    |   |
| Total consumption                                    | %  | 38 | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).  |
| Release to municipal waste water system              | %  |    |   |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | %  | 5  |   |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | %  | 75 |   |
| Export   | %  | 20 |   |
| End-use 5: Cosmetics                                 | [] |    |   |
| Total consumption                                    | %  | 10 | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).  |
| Release to municipal waste water system              | %  | 80 |   |

| Silver (Ag)  |   |    |   |
|--|---|----|---|
| Direct release to surface water                      | % | 10 |   |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | % | 5  |   |
| Transformation during use into other forms           | % | 5  |   |
| End-use 6: Medtech                                   |   |    |   |
| Total consumption                                    | % | 4  | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-Ag use (Sun et al., 2014).  |
| Release to municipal waste water system              | % | 5  |   |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | % | 5  |   |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | % | 90 |   |
| Transformation during use into other forms           | % | 0  |   |
| End-use 7: Plastics                                  | 1 |    |   |
| Total consumption                                    | % | 3  | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | % | 95 |   |
| Transformation during use into<br>other forms        | % | 5  | Transformation in the form of dissolution during the use phase was considered as material elimination due to contact with water (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). Such dissolution was modelled based on data presented in Blaser <i>et al.</i> (2008) when studying the release of Ag from biocidal plastics. Sun <i>et al.</i> (2014) did not assume complete dissolution of Ag for natural waters, although suggesting that a continuous dissolution was in principle possible, and that the particle form could persist sufficiently long for allowing new pathways of silver partitioning and mass transfer. |
| End-use 8: Food                                      |   |    |   |
| Total consumption                                    | % | 7  | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).  |
| Release to municipal waste water system              | % | 90 |   |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | % | 10 |   |
| End-use 9: Glass & ceramics                          |   |    |   |
| Total consumption                                    | % | 1  | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).  |
| Release to municipal waste water system              | % | 1  |   |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | % | 20 |   |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | % | 74 |   |
| Transformation during use into other forms           | % | 5  | Transformation in the form of dissolution during the use phase was considered as material elimination due to contact with water (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).   |

| Silver (Ag)  |     |      |   |  |  |
|--|-----|------|---|--|--|
| End-use 10: Metals                                   |     |      |   |  |  |
| Total consumption                                    | ⁰∕₀ | 2    | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).  |  |  |
| Release to municipal waste water system              | %   | 5    |   |  |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | %   | 5    |   |  |  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | %   | 90   |   |  |  |
| End-use 11: Filtration                               |     |      |   |  |  |
| Total consumption                                    | %   | 0.3  | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014)   |  |  |
| Release to municipal waste water system              | %   | 25   |   |  |  |
| Direct release to air                                | %   | 5    |   |  |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | %   | 60   |   |  |  |
| Transformation during use into<br>other forms        | %   | 10   | Transformation in the form of dissolution during the use phase was considered as material elimination due to contact with water (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). |  |  |
| End-use 12: Sanitary                                 |     |      |   |  |  |
| Total consumption                                    | %   | 0.16 | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).  |  |  |
| Release to municipal waste water system              | %   | 5    |   |  |  |
| Direct release to surface water                      | %   |      |   |  |  |
| Direct release to soil                               | %   |      |   |  |  |
| Direct release to air                                | %   |      |   |  |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | %   | 95   |   |  |  |
| Disposed of to landfill                              | %   |      |   |  |  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | %   |      |   |  |  |
| Transformation during use into other forms           | %   |      |   |  |  |
| Export   | %   |      |   |  |  |
| End-use 13: Paper                                    |     |      |   |  |  |
| Total consumption                                    | %   | 0.1  | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).  |  |  |
| Release to municipal waste water system              | %   |      |   |  |  |
| Direct release to surface water                      | %   |      |   |  |  |
| Direct release to soil                               | %   |      |   |  |  |

| Silver (Ag)  |                 |   |   |
|--|-----------------|---|---|
| Direct release to air  | %               |   |   |
| Disposed of to MSWI  | %               | 10  |   |
| Disposed of to landfill  | %               | 16  |   |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery)                               | %               | 63  |   |
| Transformation during use into other forms   | %               |   |   |
| Export   | %               | 10  |   |
| 2.4.4 Waste water treatm   | ient            |   |   |
| Name of parameter  | Unit            | Value   | Remark, data source   |
| Transformation during STP<br>treatment into other forms                            | %               | 85-100  | 85%-100% of the metallic nano-Ag was reported to be transformed<br>into Ag <sub>2</sub> S (Kaegi <i>et al.</i> , 2011), which means only less than 15% of<br>initial nano-Ag entering into STP with wastewater can survive STP<br>process.  |
| Percentage ending up in sludge   | %               | Approx.<br>0-100                                    | As seen above empirical distributions with mean, an the lower and<br>upper limit values as indicated in the column on the left that follow<br>the newest evidence (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014) were modeled. These values<br>reflect data taken from different sources (Kiser <i>et al.</i> , 2010; Tiede <i>et<br/>al.</i> , 2010; Kaegi <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Hou <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Wang <i>et al.</i> , 2012).<br>$\overrightarrow{v}$ - $\overbrace{0.0 \ 0.2 \ 0.4 \ 0.6 \ 0.8 \ 1.0}$<br>Figure 6. Modelled probability distribution of STP removal efficien-<br>cy for nano-Ag (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014)<br>See please for detailed model procedure explanations the equivalent<br>information on the nano-TiO2 case. |
| Percentage discharges  | %               | 0-15  | See line above.   |
| 2.4.5 Solid waste treatme  | ent (incinerati | on and landfill)                                    |   |
| Name of parameter  | Unit            | Value   | Remark, data source   |
| Transformation during incinera-<br>tion into other forms (average<br>Danish MSWIs) | %               | approx. 0.1-52<br>(deposition,<br>transformation)   | Sources of data and all technical details on the processes of waste<br>incineration and landfilling correspond to the ones reported for other<br>metallic nanoparticles (Walser and Gottschalk, 2014). See also<br>comments on the previous nano-ZnO case.  |
| Percentage emitted to the air<br>(average Danish MSWIs)                            | %               | ~0  | See line above.   |
| Percentage ending up in residues<br>(average Danish MSWIs)                         | %               | approx. 36-75<br>(slag)<br>approx. 3-9 (fly<br>ash) | See line above.   |

| Silver (Ag)   |                |   |  |  |
|---|----------------|---|--|--|
| Release from landfills to munici-<br>pal waste water treatment                                    | kg/year        | 0   | For landfill, no leachate out is assumed, see also comments on previ-<br>us cases.   |  |
| Direct release from landfills to surface water  | kg/year        | 0   | See line above.  |  |
| Transformation during land-<br>filling into other forms   | %              | No data   | At this point we stopped our modelling. Nanomaterial fate and<br>behaviour during landfilling was not considered. See also general<br>comments on landfilling.   |  |
| 2.4.6 Recycling   |                |   |  |  |
| Type of recycling activities  | Recycling of   | bottom ash from waste   | e incineration   |  |
|   |                |   |  |  |
| Name of parameter   | Unit           | Value   | Remark, data source  |  |
| Name of parameter<br>Transformation during recycling<br>into other forms                          | Unit<br>%      | Value<br>Not considered in<br>the model.  | Remark, data source See general comments on recycling processes.   |  |
| Name of parameter Transformation during recycling into other forms Ending up in recycled products | Unit<br>%<br>% | Value         Not considered in the model.         Not considered in the model. | Remark, data source         See general comments on recycling processes.         Most part directly after product use. Bottom ash is e.g. recycled up to 100 % in road construction, soil consolidation and anti-frost layers under buildings. A few percent are landfilled. |  |

#### 2.5 Carbon nanotubes (CNT)

#### Carbon nanotubes (CNT)

#### 2.5.1 General description

#### General applications

Steinfeldt *et al.* (2013) emphasized a widespread usage due to properties such as being persistent against degradation, or CNT as composite material (Ma *et al.*, 2010) due to outstanding mechanical properties made perfect by multi-functional properties based e.g. on thermal and electrical conductivity (Bokobza, 2007; Gibson *et al.*, 2007; Hu *et al.*, 2006; Tsu-Wei *et al.*, 2010). Survey results of (Piccinno *et al.*, 2012) show that currently most material is probably used in Composites & polymer additives and Batteries. This includes probably flat panel displays, super composite fibres, and conductive plastics, field storage batteries, micro-electronics based on semiconductors and other conductive material (READE, 2013). Future applications are expected in a very broad (probably the widest one of all studied materials in this work) spectrum, READE (2013) list among other: ,nano-lithography/-tweezers/-balance/-doping, data storage, magnetic nanotube, nano gear, nanotube actuator, molecular quantum wires, hydrogen storage, noble radioactive gas storage, solar storage, waste recycling, electromagnetic shielding, dialysis filters, thermal protection, reinforcement of armour and other materials, avionics, collision-protection materials, fly wheels, body armour and other.

| 2.5.2 Manufacturing and import/export of the substance on its own |  |                   |                     |  |  |
|---|--|-------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Manufacturing processes   |  |                   |                     |  |  |
| Manufacturing in Denmark  |  |                   |                     |  |  |
| Name of parameter   | Unit   | Value             | Remark, data source |  |  |
| Import of the substance on its<br>own uses to Denmark             | kg/year  |                   |                     |  |  |
| Re-export   | % of import  |                   |                     |  |  |
| 2.5.3 Down stream use o   | f CNT for proc   | luction proceses  | in Denmark          |  |  |
| Identified formulation processes<br>in Denmark                    | No information on actual use of carbon nanotubes in production processes in Denmark has been identified.<br>In the Nanoplast project "Nano-technological materials and products in the plastics industry: Exposure<br>assessment and toxicological properties" published in 2012, the exposure to CNTs in the production of<br>fibre-reinforced polymer nano composites was studied (Clausen <i>et al.</i> , 2012). The study mentions the large<br>potential of the use of CNTs in the composite industry but no actual large scale uses. |                   |                     |  |  |
| Name of parameter   | Unit   | Value             | Remark, data source |  |  |
| 2.5.4 Import/export and   | l end-use in art   | icles and mixture | 28                  |  |  |

| Carbon nanotubes (CNT)  |   |       |         |  |                     |  |
|---|---|-------|---------|--|---------------------|--|
| Carbon nanotubes (CNT)<br>Identified uses in articles and<br>mixtures | Total annual use of the substance in Denmark is modelled from approx. 1-18 t/y. The figures are adapted<br>from Swiss (European) values declared to show varying reliability expressed as degree of belief of<br>80% and 20% (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014) on a comparison of the population numbers Denmark-Switzerland.<br>Sun <i>et al.</i> (2014) report current available quantitative estimations for CNT: global production/use: 55 -<br>3'300 t/y (Healy <i>et al.</i> , 2008; Aschberger <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Future Markets, 2011; Piccinno <i>et al.</i> , 2012). Our<br>values leading to anormal use volume distribution reflect different estimations (80% reliability) (Schmid<br>and Riediker, 2008; Future Markets, 2011; Hendren <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Piccinno <i>et al.</i> , 2012) and (20% reliabil-<br>ity) (Healy <i>et al.</i> , 2008; Ray <i>et al.</i> , 2009; Aschberger <i>et al.</i> , 2011).<br>$0 = \frac{1}{0} = \frac{1}{0} = \frac{1}{0} = \frac{1}{15}$<br>Figure 7. Annual use volumes computed for Denmark. |       |         |  |                     |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Please note that Research and Development (R&amp;D) could be significant, but this is not considered an end use, and would be included under the use of the carbon nanotubes for formulation/production processes.</li> <li>Some R&amp;D on the use of CNT has been undertaken in Denmark, among these the Nanoplast project "Nano-technological materials and products in the plastics industry: Exposure assessment and toxicological properties" (Clausen <i>et al.</i>, 2012). The environmental releases from the R&amp;D activities are assumed to be insignificant and no attempt has been done to estimate the potential releases of CNT from R&amp;D in Denmark.</li> <li>Lower, upper boundary and mean mass fraction of ENM modelled for the allocation to different product applications. Details on such computation from different sources are explained in detail below and exemplary for the CNT and based on a recent study (Sun <i>et al.</i> 2014).</li> </ul>  |       |         |  |                     |  |
|   | End usePercentage of total<br>Lower, modal, higher value<br>(1,m,h)1Polymer composites25,84, 1002Paints0, 1, 103Textiles0, 0.02, 0.074Automotive0, 1, 105Consumer electronics0, 3, 246Energy0, 9, 507Sensor0, 0.04, 38Aerospace0, 0.6, 5  |       |         |  |                     |  |
|   |   |       |         |  |                     |  |
| Name of parameter   | Unit  | Value | Remar   | k, data source                                 |                     |  |
| End-use 1: Polymer composites   | %   | 84    | Percent | age (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (S | Sun <i>et al.</i> , |  |
|   | , v   |       | 2014).  |  |                     |  |

| Carbon nanotubes (CNT)                               |   |      |   |
|--|---|------|---|
| Direct release* to air                               | % | 1    | * Unless otherwise noted the release values were reduced/ enlarged<br>on each side by 50% for the modeling of symmetrical triangular<br>distributions around the specified quantities. The symmetry may<br>possibly be by the absolute border values (highest or lowest possi-<br>ble release value, 1 and 0). In cases were more values are given, the<br>mean is taken as modal value for such distributions. |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | % | 99   |   |
| Transformation during use into<br>other forms        | % |      | For all uses (and the uses listed below) no dissolution or transfor-<br>mation/elimination during use and production was considered<br>(Gottschalk <i>et al.</i> , 2009; Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).   |
| End-use 2: Paints                                    |   |      |   |
| Total consumption                                    | % | 1    | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).  |
| Release to municipal waste water system              | % | 1    |   |
| Direct release to surface water                      | % | 1    |   |
| Direct release to soil                               | % | 1    |   |
| Direct release to air                                | % | 1    |   |
| Disposed of to landfill                              | % | 50   |   |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | % | 46   |   |
| End-use 3: Textiles                                  |   |      |   |
| Total consumption                                    | % | 0.02 | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).  |
| Release to municipal waste water system              | % | 2    |   |
| Direct release to air                                | % | 2    |   |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | % | 96   |   |
| End-use 4: Automotive                                |   |      |   |
| Total consumption                                    | % | 1    | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).  |
| Direct release to air                                | % | 1    |   |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | % | 39   |   |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | % | 40   |   |
| Export   | % | 20   |   |
| End-use 5: Consumer electronics                      |   |      |   |
| Total consumption                                    | % | 3    | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | % | 5    |   |

| Carbon nanotubes (CNT)                               |                 |                  |   |
|--|-----------------|------------------|---|
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | %               | 75               |   |
| Export   | %               | 20               |   |
| End-use 6: Energy                                    |                 |                  |   |
| Total consumption                                    | %               | 9                | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | %               | 5                |   |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | %               | 75               |   |
| Export   | %               | 20               |   |
| End-use 7: Sensor                                    |                 |                  |   |
| Total consumption                                    | %               | 0.4              | Percentage (mean value) of the total nano-TiO2 use (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | %               | 5                |   |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | %               | 75               |   |
| Export   | %               | 20               |   |
| End-use 8: Aerospace                                 |                 |                  |   |
| Total consumption                                    | %               | 0.6              |   |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | %               | 39               |   |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | %               | 60               |   |
| Direct release to air                                | %               | 1                |   |
| Export   | %               |                  |   |
| 2.5.5 Waste water treatm                             | nent            |                  |   |
| Name of parameter                                    | Unit            | Value            | Remark, data source   |
| Transformation during STP treatment into other forms | %               | 0                |   |
| Percentage ending up in sludge                       | % (l,m,u)       | 0, 88 , 100      | According to some evidence for Fullerenes used in Sun <i>et al.</i> (2014)<br>we also base the computations on different Fullerene studies (Kiser <i>et al.</i> , 2010; Kiser <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Wang <i>et al.</i> , 2012). |
| Percentage discharges                                | % (l,m,u)       | 0,12,100         | See line above.   |
| 2.5.6 Solid waste treatme                            | ent (incinerati | on and landfill) |   |

| Carbon nanotubes (CNT)   |                |  |  |
|--|----------------|--|--|
| Name of parameter  | Unit           | Value                                  | Remark, data source  |
| Transformation during incinera-<br>tion into other forms (average<br>Danish MSWIs) | % (l,m,u)      | 75, 98, 100                            | As suggested by others (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014) and in accordance to (Mueller <i>et al.</i> , 2013).   |
| Percentage emitted to the air<br>(average Danish MSWIs)                            | %              | 0.05, 0.1, 0.15                        | See line above.  |
| Percentage ending up in residues<br>(average Danish MSWIs)                         | %              | 40, 81, 100<br>(bootom ash)<br>0,19,60 | See line above.  |
| Release from landfills to munici-<br>pal waste water treatment                     | kg/year        | 0                                      | For landfill, no leachate out is assumed, see also comments on previ-<br>us cases.   |
| Direct release from landfills to surface water                                     | kg/year        | 0                                      | See line above.  |
| Transformation during land-<br>filling into other forms                            | %              | No data                                | At this point we stopped our modelling. Nanomaterial fate and<br>behaviour during landfilling was not considered. See also general<br>comments on landfilling. |
| 2.5.7 Recycling  |                |  |  |
| Type of recycling activities   | No relevant re | ecycling activities ider               | ntified  |

# 2.6 CuCO3

| Copper (Cu)  |  |   |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| General applications   |  |   |  |  |
| <b>Copper carbonate -</b> Micronized parti tives.  | cles of cobber car   | bonate are used as v  | wood preservative as alternative to other copper-based wood preserva-  |  |
| <ul> <li>The Nanodatabase of the Danish Cons</li> <li>MesoCopper® - Nanoparticle C</li> <li>0.9999 pure copper suspended in</li> </ul> | sumer Council (Ta<br>olloidal Copper: a<br>n pure deionized v  | enk/Forbrugerrådet)<br>a mineral supplemen<br>water.                  | include two products with nano copper, where links still exist:<br>t in the form of a copper colloid consisting of nanometer particles of                                  |  |
| • DS Laboratories Revita.COR H   | air-Growth Condi   | tioner with nano-cop  | pper peptides.   |  |
| Very limited information on the quant<br>focus on the use of copper carbonate f<br>Denmark and 2) the quatities potentia               | ites of nanosized of wood treatment<br>for wood treatment<br>lly used and relea  | copper oxide and ele<br>t because 1) quantita<br>ses to the environme | emental copper has been available, and the modelling will consequently<br>ative data are available for estimating the potential consumption in<br>ent will be significant. |  |
| 2.6.1 Manufacturing and  | import/export  | of the substance  | e on its own   |  |
| Manufacturing processes  | <b>Cobber carbonate</b> - Micronized particles of cobber carbonate are produced by mechanical grinding of water or oil-insoluble copper compounds with aid of dispersing/wetting agents in a carrier using a commercial grinding mill or by chemical means resulting in 90% or more of the particles being less than 1000 nm size. The commonly used carrier is water, and commonly used dispersing agents are polymeric dispersants, which attach to the surface of particles and keep the particles away from each other. Also, the presence of dispersing/wetting agents improves particle size reduction during milling and stabilizes the particles during storage and treating.  |   |  |  |
| Manufacturing in Denmark   | Micronized part<br>Nanosized copp  | icles of cobber carbo<br>er oxides are not ma                         | onate are not manufactured in Denmark.<br>Inufactured in Denmark   |  |
| Name of parameter  | Unit   | Value   | Remark, data source  |  |
| Import of the substance on its<br>own uses to Denmark  | kg/year  | no data – ex-<br>pected to be<br>zero                                 | According to industry contact it is expected that micronized copper<br>carbonated will be imported as a concentrate  |  |
| Re-export  | % of import  | no data   |  |  |
| 2.6.2 Formulation and in   | dustrial uses ir   | ı Denmark   |  |  |
| Identified formulation processes in<br>Denmark   | dustrial uses in Denmark<br>Copper carbonate -According to the Danish Pesticide Statistics, 91 tonnes of copper carbonate was used<br>as active substances in wood preservatives in Denmark in 2011 whereas the consumption was 63.5 tonnes<br>in 2009 and 84.5 tonnes in 2010 (DEPA, 2012). According to industry contacts (Osmose, 2013) none of<br>the copper carbonate in 2012 was of the micronized type, but potentially in the future all the used copper<br>carbonate could be of this type – resulting in a consumption of the same magnitude as the present use. In<br>the USA, the market penetration of the new technology is about 75-80% (Osmose 2013).<br>It is expected that the formulation of concentrates used by the impregnation companies will take place<br>abroad. By the formulation the micronized copper carbonate is mixed with a solvent. This concentrate is<br>by the impregnation companies mixed with water. The concentrate is typically used in a 2% solution. In<br>Denmark the impregnation of wood currently takes places in automatic closed processes according to<br>BAT. It would be the same if the new technology is introduced. |   |  |  |

| Copper (Cu)  |  |                                       |  |
|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|
|  | 8.0       -         00       -         00       -         00       -         160         Figure 9. Annua         impregnante ma         Modelled norma         Statistics) and a | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 40<br>t for own formulation in Denmark and 100 t imported as part of<br>of copper carbonate for wood treatment.<br>d a relative precise mean of 191 t/a (according to the Danish Pesticide<br>viation of 10.   |
| Name of parameter  | Unit   | Value                                 | Remark, data source  |
| Formulation 1: Production of prese   | rved wood (mod   | el estimates assumi                   | ing all copper carbonate is of the micronized type)  |
| Number of companies  | companies  | 4                                     | Number of companies for pressure impregnation members of Dansk<br>Træbeskyttelse (Danish Wood impregnation)  |
| Quantities used  | tonnes/year  | 91                                    | Assuming the consumption is on the 2011 level.   |
| Ending up in final products  | %  | ~99                                   | Hansen et al., 1997  |
| Release* to municipal waste<br>water system<br>* Unless otherwise noted the re-<br>lease values were reduced/ enlarged<br>on each side by 50% for the model-<br>ing of symmetrical triangular<br>distributions around the specified<br>quantities. The symmetry may<br>possibly be by the absolute border<br>values (highest or lowest possible<br>release value, 1 and 0). In cases<br>were more values are given, the<br>mean is taken as modal value for<br>such distributions. | %  | ~0                                    | According to Hansen <i>et al.</i> (1997) in the late 1990'es pressure im-<br>pregnation took place in closed systems without any losses to waste<br>water. Small releases could be due to leakages in the collection<br>systems or by cleaning of working clothes and cleaning of filters. |
| Direct release to surface water<br>(after internal WW treatment)   | %  | ~0                                    |  |
| Direct release to soil   | %  | ~0                                    |  |
| Direct release to air  | %  | ~0                                    |  |
| Disposed of as solid waste for incineration  | %  | ~0                                    |  |
| Disposed of for other waste man-<br>agement  | %  | ~1                                    | Small amounts of sludge disposed of as hazardous waste – not quan-<br>tified in Hansen <i>et al.</i> (1997). Rough estimate.   |
| Transformation during use into other forms   | %  | Data not availa-<br>ble               |  |
| Percentage of produced products<br>exported  | % of quantity<br>in final<br>product   | Data not availa-<br>ble               |  |
| 2.6.3 Import/export and  | end-use in arti  | cles and mixture                      | S  |

| Copper (Cu)  |  |                                    |  |
|--|--|------------------------------------|--|
| Identified uses in articles and mixtures             | The micronised copper carbonate is present in pressure impregnated wood. The majority of the wood is various timber used for out-door applications |                                    |  |
| Name of parameter                                    | Unit Value Remark, data source   |                                    | Remark, data source  |
| End-use 1: Pressure impregnated w                    | vood   |                                    | ·  |
| Net-import with articles and mixtures                | Tons/year  | 100                                | (Osmose, 2013) assuming a potential market penetration of the new technology by 100%   |
| Total consumption                                    | Tons/year  | 190                                | The amount of impregnated wood in Denmark is about 250.000 m <sup>3</sup> ,<br>about 50% imported and about 50% produced in Denmark (Osmose,<br>2013 based on data from the Danish Impregnation branch)  |
| Trend in consumption                                 | Unit-less  | Stagnating                         | In the model it is anticipated that the micronized copper carbonate has a market penetration of 100%   |
| Average service life time                            | year   | 30                                 | Hansen <i>et al.</i> , 1997. The authors mentions that actual data are not available, but an average of 30 years is expected.  |
| Release to municipal waste water system              | %  | 1                                  | Hansen <i>et al.</i> , 1997 estimate that 25% of copper from CCA (copper/chromium/arsenic) treated wood and 30-40% of the copper from  |
| Direct release to surface water                      | %  | 1 (via urban<br>rainwater run off) | CC (copper/chromium) treated wood during the life time. The releases<br>es from wood treated with micronized copper may be lower. The<br>releases from wood below ground is higher than from wood above  |
| Direct release to soil                               | %  | 28                                 | ground.<br>It is roughly assumed that the total is 30% - a minor part of this is<br>released to surfaces with run off to urban sewage treatment plants<br>and rain water run off directly to surface water<br>[Most probably the micronized copper is released as dissolved cop-<br>per ions]  |
| Direct release to air                                | %  | 0                                  |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | %  | 7%                                 | According to current regulation pressure impregnated wood should   |
| Disposed of to landfill                              | %  | 56%                                | be disposed of for landfill. A small part may be disposed of with<br>non-impregnated wood for recycling (manufacture of wood-chip  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | %  | 7%                                 | boards) and a part may be disposed of for incineration. For the current model estimates it is assumed that 80% (of the 70% remaining in the wood) is disposed of in accordance with the legislation and 10% to MSWI and recycling.   |
| Transformation during use into<br>other forms        | %  | 0                                  | Low levels of copper were detected at every stage of a leaching test<br>of wood treated with micronized copper quat suggesting micronized<br>copper may be capable of redistributing into cell walls. Copper-<br>containing particles were detected in the lumens of micronized<br>copper quat- and but were not present in untreated samples (Stirling<br><i>et al.</i> , 2008). While confirming the presence of copper in the cell<br>wall was difficult, X-ray analysis indicated that there was a small<br>amount of Cu in the cell walls in both Micronized copper quat- and<br>ACQ-treated samples, and not in the untreated samples.<br>[most probably a major part of the micronized copper is transformed<br>before release] |
| 2.6.4 Waste water treatm                             | nent   |                                    |  |
| Name of parameter                                    | Unit   | Value                              | Remark, data source  |

| Copper (Cu)  |  |   |   |  |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| Transformation during STP<br>treatment into other forms  | %  |   | No data   |  |  |
| Percentage ending up in sludge   | %  | 82  | General values for copper in 1995 (Lassen et al., 1996)   |  |  |
| Percentage discharges  | %  | 18  |   |  |  |
| 2.6.5 Solid waste treatme  | nt (incineration and landfill)   |   |   |  |  |
| Name of parameter  | Unit   | Value   | Remark, data source   |  |  |
| Transformation or deposition<br>during incineration into other<br>forms (average Danish MSWIs) | %  | approx. 0.1-52<br>(deposition,<br>transformation)   | Sources of data and all technical details on the processes of waste<br>incineration and landfilling correspond to the ones reported for other<br>metallic nanoparticles (Walser and Gottschalk, 2014). See also<br>comments on the previous nano-Ag case.                                   |  |  |
| Percentage emitted to the air<br>(average Danish MSWIs)  | %  | ~0  | General values for copper in 1995 (Lassen <i>et al.</i> , 1996) were around 0.1 % and have been confirmed in the CeO2 study for metallic nanoparticles (Walser and Gottschalk, 2014). We used the model input values for waste incineration processes as done for other metals in our work. |  |  |
| Percentage ending up in residues<br>(average Danish MSWIs)                                     | %  | approx. 36-75<br>(slag)<br>approx. 3-9 (fly<br>ash) | General values around 99% for copper in 1995 (Lassen <i>et al.</i> , 1996) and see line above.  |  |  |
| Release from landfills to munici-<br>pal waste water treatment                                 | kg/year  | 0   | Lassen <i>et al.</i> , 1996 provides general data for releases of copper from landfills. Specific data on releases from pressure impregnated wood   |  |  |
| Direct release from landfills to surface water   | kg/year  | 0   | are not available. It is assumed that pressure impregnated wood is<br>disposed of to landfill with discharge of percolate to municipal waste<br>water treatment plants. In our model landfills represent final sinks, a<br>further material fate model for such plants is not considered.   |  |  |
| 2.6.6 Recycling  |  |   |   |  |  |
| Type of recycling activities   | Recycling of nated wood n  | pressure impregnated hay end up in wood rec         | wood is not expected to take place. Small amount of pressure impreg-<br>cycled for manufacturing of shipboard.  |  |  |
| 2.6.7 Further parameter  | s for a soil ex  | posure scenario                                     |   |  |  |
| Model considerations   | The releases of copper carbonate from the treated wood is considered a diffuse source and treated as such in a regional model.   |   |   |  |  |
|  | It should be noted that in the context of the Biocidal Products Regulation (Regulation (EU) 528/2012) preserved wood is considered a point source in contrast to the terminology used in this project where such use is considered a diffuse source. Point sources in the present model are sources which on a regional scale can be attributed to a specific geographic location (e.g. an outlet from a specific sewage treatment plant). |   |   |  |  |

# 2.7 Cerium dioxide (CeO<sub>2</sub>)

| Cerium dioxide (CeO <sub>2</sub> )  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| 2.7.1 General description   | n  |  |  |  |
| General applications  |  |  |  |  |
| CeO2 has several applications and due<br>ovens and for hydrogen production in<br>portant from an environmental point of<br>completely with the diesel (concentrat<br>improved engine combustion efficient<br>to increase by 8-9 %. The production<br>tries like the Philippines, New Zealand<br>Other applications involve its ultravio | e the catalytic abil<br>fuel cells. The mo<br>of view, since it m<br>cion: 5-8 ppm; ave<br>cy that results in r<br>and use of CeO2 r<br>d and the UK. Ho<br>let (UV) protectiv | ity of CeO2 to adso<br>ost widespread use of<br>ay lead to direct em-<br>rage particle size: 8<br>educed emissions of<br>nanoparticles (CeO2<br>wever, the amounts<br>e properties and its | rb and release oxygen it is used e.g. to coat the inside of self-cleaning<br>of CeO2 is as an additive to diesel. This use may be particularly im-<br>issions during the use phase. For this application CeO2-NP is mixed<br>-10 nm). The advantage of using CeO2-NP as a fuel catalyst is the<br>2 soot. CO and NOx. Furthermore, the fuel efficiency has been reported<br>2 NP) is rapidly growing and CeO2 is used as a fuel additive in coun-<br>produced and used are at present unknown (Mikkelsen <i>et al.</i> , 2011).<br>anti-microbial effects. |  |
| 2.7.2 Manufacturing and   | d import/export of the substance on its own  |  |  |  |
| Manufacturing processes   | Industrial bulk cerium is extracted from mined minerals. primarily monazite and bastnasite and CeO2 is formed by thermal treatment processes                                   |  |  |  |
| Manufacturing in Denmark  |  |  |  |  |
| Name of parameter   | Unit   | Value  | Remark. data source  |  |
| Import of the substance on its<br>own uses to Denmark   | kg/year  |  | None identified  |  |
| Re-export   | % of import  |  |  |  |
| 2.7.3 Formulation in Der  | ımark  |  |  |  |
| Identified formulation processes<br>in Denmark  | Application of CeO2 as UV filter in paint and lacquers   |  |  |  |
| Formulation 1: Application of CeO2  | 2 as UV filter in J  | paint and lacquers   |  |  |
| Number of companies   | companies  | <4   |  |  |
| Quantities used   | kg/year  | 200  | The estimated use of cerium oxide for manufacturing of wood oil in DK is in the range of 100-500 kg/y  |  |
| Ending up in final products   | %  | 97.5%  | It is assumed that the dispersion of CeO2 is mixed with no major<br>losses into the final product  |  |

г

-

| Cerium dioxide (CeO <sub>2</sub> )   |                                      |         |  |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------|--|
| Release* to municipal waste<br>water system<br>* Unless otherwise noted the re-<br>lease values were reduced/ enlarged<br>on each side by 50% for the model-<br>ing of symmetrical triangular<br>distributions around the specified<br>quantities. The symmetry may<br>possibly be by the absolute border<br>values (highest or lowest possible<br>release value, 1 and 0). In cases<br>were more values are given, the<br>mean is taken as modal value for<br>such distributions. | %                                    | <0,5    | The emission scenario document (ESD) for the paint industry from<br>the OECD (2009) assume for manufacture of aqueous dispersion<br>coatings that the total fraction of raw materials lost to waste from the<br>manufactring process is 1.5%. This includes 1% lost due to residues<br>in the mixing vessels and 0.5% due to residues in bags, spills and<br>product returns. It is in the ESD assumed that half of the residue<br>material in the mixing vessels will be re-used in the manufacturing<br>process (recycling. For aqueous dispersion coatings the remaining<br>equipment residue is assumed to be removed in water washings and<br>hence to waste water.<br>According to information from Danish manufactures waste water<br>originates from cleaning of tanks and other production equipment. A<br>small part (not quantified) of the total used may be released to the<br>waste water for pre-treatment at the manufacturing sites.<br>The first step at all sites is a flocculation where the majority of the<br>CeO2 is precipitated and ends up in a filter cake which is disposed of<br>for external incineration or gasification.<br>The pretreated waste water is directed to municipal waste water<br>plants.<br>As a worst case estimate, the releases to municipal waste water<br>treatment plants are estimated to be <0,5%. The actual release is<br>probably significantly below this value. |
| Direct release to surface water<br>(after internal WW treatment)   | %                                    | 0       | No direct discharge to surface water   |
| Direct release to soil   | %                                    | 0       | No direct releases to soil   |
| Direct release to air  | %                                    | 0       | The TiO2 is imported as pastes in which the CeO2 is dispersed in water. The generation of dust by handling of the pastes is considered insignificant.  |
| Disposed of as solid waste for incineration  | %                                    | 2       | Filtercake/sludge and CeO2 remaining in packaging are disposed of for incineration   |
| Transformation during use into other forms   | %                                    | 0       | Not likely   |
| Percentage of produced products<br>exported  | % of quantity<br>in final<br>product | No data | It is assumed that all of the product is sold in Denmark   |

| Cerium dioxide (CeO <sub>2</sub> )          |   |   |  |   |  |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| 2.7.4 <b>Import/export and</b>              | end-use in arti   | cles and mixtures   | 5  |   |  |
| Identified uses in articles and<br>mixtures | Global estimation<br>specific information<br>included in the transformation<br>Piccinno <i>et al.</i> (<br>75 percentile: 5<br>for US values for<br>We computed n<br>global and US of<br>global estimation<br>Gross Domestic<br>reflects population | ons of the content (ir<br>ation has been possib<br>table. For a range of<br>2011) estimate the to<br>.5-550 t/y). Hendren<br>or such a volume a ra<br>ormally distributed v<br>data. A minimal valu<br>on had to be scaled do<br>e Product as suggeste<br>ion numbers, due to | n percent) of CeO2 in co<br>ole to obtain, global info<br>the possible uses it has<br>otal global production of<br><i>et al.</i> (2011) indicate as<br>ange between 35 and 70<br>values for the Danish us<br>e of 0.03 t/y was fixed l<br>own to European and S<br>ed by (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014).<br>similar consumption ca | onsumer products and articles. As<br>ormation have been used for estim<br>not been possible to estimate the<br>of nano CeOx (all cerium oxides)<br>is summerized elsewhere (Piccinn<br>00 t/y.<br>se volume by reffering our compu-<br>based on the ranges indicated abor<br>wiss conditions based on the prop<br>The sacling EU-US and Switzer<br>pability of these countries. | at 55 t/y (25-<br>o <i>et al.</i> , 2012)<br>ntations on the<br>portion of the<br>land-Denmark |
|   | 8000<br>100<br>100<br>100<br>100<br>100<br>100<br>100   | 5 10 15 20<br>ual use volumes cove  | 25<br>ering nanomaterial mass  | s of import and own formulation   | processes  |
|   |   |   |  | Lower, modal, higher<br>value<br>(l***,m, h***)   |  |
|   | 1 .   | Automotive catalysts  | s converter  | 16,2**  |  |
|   | 2   | Fuel borne catalyst/f   | uel additive   | 1-50*   |  |
|   | 3   | Glass polishing   |  | 44,1**  |  |
|   | 4   | Paint and coatings  |  | 5-10*   |  |
|   | 5   | NiMH batteries  |  | 9,6**   |  |
|   |   | Medicinal   |  | No data available   |  |
|   |   | Solar panels and fue  | l cells (SOFC)   | No data available   |  |
|   |   | Sunscreen and make  | -up  | No data available   |  |
|   |   | Self-cleaning oven  |  | No data available   |  |
|   |   | Fluid cracking cataly   | /st  | No data available   |  |
|   | * Based on a s<br>(Piccinno, Go<br>nanomaterials<br>** (Goonan,<br>***50% reducti   | survey covering 239<br>ttschalk, Seeger, & M<br>in Europe and the w<br>2011)<br>ion and augmentation  | companies (82% of wh<br>Nowack, Industrial prod<br>vorld, 2012)  | ich were European)<br>luction quantities and uses of ten  | engineered   |
| Name of parameter                           | Unit  | Value   | Remark. data source  | 2   |  |
| End-use 1: Automotive catalyst con          | verter  |   |  |   |  |

| Cerium dioxide (CeO2)                                |           |            |  |
|--|-----------|------------|--|
| Net-import with articles and mixtures                | kg/year   | -          | No data available  |
| Total consumption                                    | kg/year   | 780-1,830  | The total mass of catalysts in catalyst-containing vehicles registered<br>in Denmark in 2012 is estimated at 342-802 t/y.<br>The total consumption of CeO2 is based on the total mass (1 <sup>st</sup> inter-<br>val) and the percentage of CeO2 mass in the catalysts. (Belcastro,              |
|  |           |            | 2012); (Aliexpress, 2013); (Statistics Denmark, 2013)  |
| Trend in consumption                                 | Unit-less | Decreasing | Article I. (Wijnhoven, Dekkers, Hagens, & de Jong, 2009)   |
| Average service life time                            | year      | 12         | The average service life of cars in Denmark is 16.3 years (Danmarks<br>Statistik 2010-2011). The service life of car catalysts is expected to<br>be around 75% of the service life of the car. car longevity cannot be<br>used for catalysts longevity   |
| Release to municipal waste water<br>system           | %         | 0          | The CeO2 is embedded in a solid matrix and a potential release to<br>water can only happen during use (i.e. driving the car or exchange of<br>the catalyst). It is expected to be very unlikely that this will involve a<br>release to the municipal waste water system.                         |
| Direct release to surface water                      | %         | <1         | The CeO2 is embedded in a solid matrix and a potential release to<br>water can only happen during use (i.e. driving the car or exchange of<br>the catalyst). It is expected to be very unlikely that this will involve a<br>direct release to the surface water soil in any significant amounts. |
| Direct release to soil                               | %         | <1         | The CeO2 is embedded in a solid matrix and a potential release to<br>water can only happen during use (i.e. driving the car or exchange of<br>the catalyst). It is expected to be very unlikely that this will involve a<br>direct release to soil in any significant amounts.                   |
| Direct release to air                                | %         | <51 %      | (Angelidis & Sklavounos, 1995)   |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | %         | <1         | The CeO2 is embedded in a solid matrix and will not be disposed of<br>in the municipal solid waste fraction  |
| Disposed of to landfill                              | %         | <1         | The CeO2 is embedded in a solid matrix and will not be disposed of<br>in the municipal solid waste fraction  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | %         | >49%       | According to the Danish EPA. all catalyst are recycled; see 60803<br>Used Catalysts (Miljøstyrelsen, 2009)<br>The reuse process for catalyst materials are not known, but if up to<br>51% is released to air during use, the remaining 49% will be found in<br>the catalysts for recycling.      |
| Transformation during use into<br>other forms        | %         | -          | A transformation of CeAlO3 in the car catalyst has been reported but<br>neither the percentage nor the transformation product were not given<br>(Chen <i>et al.</i> , 2011) Ce2(SO4)3 (Zhao <i>et al.</i> , 2005)  |
| End-use 2: Fuel borne catalyst/fuel                  | additive  |            |  |
| Total consumption                                    | kg/year   | 488        | No figures are available to indicate that CeO2 is used as a fuel addi-<br>tive in Denmark. The number listed refers to the calculated amount of<br>CeO2 scaled if it were to be used in Denmark at a level similar to the<br>international use (Mayer, 2008)                                     |
| Trend in consumption                                 | Unit-less | stagnant   |  |
| Average service life time                            | year      | <0.1       | Depending on the refuelling which is expected to be more than once<br>per month.   |

| Cerium dioxide (CeO2)                                |         |       |   |
|--|---------|-------|---|
| Release to municipal waste water<br>system           | %       | 0     | During use, the loss to the municipal wastewater system is not likely.<br>Spills during refuelling are anticipated to be collected in the collec-<br>tion system at gas stations.   |
| Direct release to surface water                      | %       | 1     | 1% release was found by (Johnson & Park, 2012)  |
| Direct release to soil                               | %       | <1%   | 0.06-0.3% release to soil was found by (Johnson & Park, 2012)<br>Futhermore, (Park, et al., 2008) noted that: "No major contamination<br>of the soil would be expected and that soil levels of cerium oxide<br>would be similar of those found naturally."  |
| Direct release to air                                | %       | 1-5   | (Johnson & Park, 2012)  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | %       | 0     | Since CeO2 is added to the diesel it is not likely to end up in MSWI  |
| Disposed of to landfill                              | %       | 0     | Since CeO2 is added to the diesel it is not likely to end up in landfills   |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | %       | 95-99 | In the scrap metal fraction from cars assuming that untransformed<br>CeO2 will be deposited during use in parts of the motor and exhaust<br>system (particle filter as the most likely part).   |
| Transformation during use into<br>other forms        | %       | 0     | There are no exact figures or estimates for transformation. but some<br>indications are identified in the literature.<br>"Some agglomeration and partial reduction of Ce(IV)."<br>(Jung, Kittelson, & Zachariah, 2005)<br>"n-ceria could impact transformations of other atmospheric species."<br>(Majestic BJ, 2010)<br>"Nanoparticulate cerium dioxide (nano-CeO2). when combusted as<br>an additive to diesel fuel. was transformed from 6 nm to 14 nm sizes<br>into particles near 43 nm. with no obvious change in the unit cell<br>dimensions or crystalline form."<br>(Batley, et al., 2013) |
| End-use 3: Glass polishing                           | r       | r     |   |
| Total consumption                                    | kg/year |       | It has not been possible to find any specific information in this area<br>about the use in Denmark or how CeO2 is used for this purpose.<br>Therefore, no estimated released has been given below. Release<br>values were taken from glass & ceramics product category of the<br>ZnO case study.  |
| Release to municipal waste water system              | %       | 1     |   |
| Direct release to air                                | %       |       |   |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | %       | 20    |   |
| Disposed of to landfill                              | %       |       |   |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | %       | 74    |   |
| Transformation during use into other forms           | %       | 5     |   |
| Export   | %       |       |   |
| End-use 4: Use of wood oil                           |         |       |   |

| Cerium dioxide (CeO2)                                |           |                          |  |
|--|-----------|--------------------------|--|
| Total consumption                                    | kg/year   | 100-500                  | Dispersions for preparation of oil containing $0.8\%(w/w)$ of CeO2 in  |
|  | kg/year   | 100-300                  | the formulated product Corresponding to 25,000 liters of formulated product containing 0.8 %(w/w) of CeO2.   |
| Trend in consumption                                 | Unit-less | stagnant                 |  |
| Average service life time                            | year      | 1                        | One yearly application can be assumed  |
| Release to municipal waste water<br>system           | %         | <5                       | The final wood oil is water-based. By application a small part will be discharged to the municipal sewage system by cleaning brushes and other equipment (from less than 1% to a few %).   |
| Direct release to surface water                      | %         | <1                       | Not likely unless a spill occurs.  |
| Direct release to soil                               | %         | <5                       | Related to spill during outdoor application  |
| Direct release to air                                | %         | 0                        | After curing of the wood oil the cerium oxide is bound in the polymer matrix. Over time release of larger dust particles and flakes is possible, but the contribution to the overall mass balance is considered to be marginal.  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | %         | >88                      | Some 2-10 percent may be disposed of to MSWI with oil left in the<br>container. This kind of wood oil is typically applied by brush and not<br>by air brush.<br>Dust from maintaining the wood is expected to be disposed of the<br>MSWI<br>By the end of its service life the treated wood (not pressure impreg-<br>nated) is ultimately expected to be disposed of to MSWI |
| Disposed of to landfill                              | %         | 0                        | Not likely for Denmark   |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | %         | 0                        | Not likely for Denmark   |
| Transformation during use into other forms           | %         | 0                        | Not likely under normal use scenarios. Weathering of painted surfac-<br>es may cause some release, but transformations are not expected.   |
| End-use 5: NiMH-batteries                            |           |                          |  |
| Total consumption                                    | kg/year   | 290*                     | The total mass of NiMH batteries is estimated at 12-98 t/y-<br>The 290 kg/y is an estimate of the amount of CeO 2 in NiMH batter-<br>ies per / year based on (Miljøstyrelsen, Indsamlingssystemer for<br>batterier, 2003)  |
| Trend in consumption                                 | Unit-less | Increasing<br>Decreasing | Article II. (Binnemans, et al., 2013)<br>Article III.<br>Article IV. (Miljøstyrelsen, Status for batteriområdet i Danmark,<br>2005)  |
| Average service life time                            | year      | 10                       | (Binnemans, et al., 2013)  |
|  |           | 1-1.5                    | (forbrug.dk, 2012)   |
| Release to municipal waste water<br>system           | %         | 0                        | CeO2 is incorporated in a solid matrix and release to municipal waste water is not likely during use or disposal.  |
| Direct release to surface water                      | %         | 0                        | CeO2 is incorporated in a solid matrix and direct release to surface<br>water is not likely during use or disposal.  |
| Direct release to soil                               | %         | 5                        | (Mudgal, et al., 2011)   |

Г

| Cerium dioxide (CeO <sub>2</sub> )   |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|
| Direct release to air  | %  | 0   | CeO2 is incorporated in a solid matrix and direct release to air is not likely during use or disposal.  |
| Disposed of to MSWI  | %  | 22  | (Mudgal, et al., 2011)  |
| Disposed of to landfill  | %  | 68<br>89.3*   | Article V. (Mudgal, et al., 2011)<br>Article VI.<br>*Of collected batteries according to (Miljøstyrelsen,<br>Indsamlingssystemer for batterier, 2003)   |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery)   | %  | 10  | (Mudgal, et al., 2011)  |
|  |  | 50<br>10.7*   | (Miljøstyrelsen, Status for batteriområdet i Danmark, 2005) In the EPA report it is stated that the current system is the collection rate estimated to be around 50%., which the Environmental Protection Agency deems are not sufficient. From the collected batteries are separated manually, by both private and municipal waste companies; Pb batteries; NiCd batteries; NiMH batteries; and cell batteries for recycling. "  |
|  |  |   | collected batteries. (Miljøstyrelsen, Indsamlingssystemer for batterier, 2003)  |
| Transformation during use into other forms   | %  | 0   | No data available, but transformation during use is not likely  |
|  |  |   |   |
| 2.7.5 Waste water treatm   | nent   |   |   |
| 2.7.5 Waste water treatm<br>Name of parameter  | nent<br>Unit   | Value   | Remark. data source   |
| 2.7.5 Waste water treatm<br>Name of parameter<br>Transformation during STP<br>treatment into other forms   | nent<br>Unit<br>%  | Value<br>-  | Remark. data source<br>Unknown percentage, though Westerhof <i>et al.</i> (2013) found that<br>interaction with wastewater constituents altered the sorption proper-<br>ties of CeO2. (Westerhoff, Kiser, & Hristovsk, 2013)<br>Limbach <i>et al.</i> (2008) reported that CeO2 agglomerated strongly in<br>STP   |
| 2.7.5 Waste water treatm<br>Name of parameter<br>Transformation during STP<br>treatment into other forms<br>Percentage ending up in sludge   | nent<br>Unit<br>%<br>%<br>(l. u)<br>uniform<br>distribution  | Value           -           96.6           94   | Remark. data source         Unknown percentage, though Westerhof <i>et al.</i> (2013) found that         interaction with wastewater constituents altered the sorption proper-         ties of CeO2. (Westerhoff, Kiser, & Hristovsk, 2013)         Limbach <i>et al.</i> (2008) reported that CeO2 agglomerated strongly in         STP         (Gómez-Rivera, <i>et al.</i> , 2012)         (Limbach, <i>et al.</i> , 2008)   |
| 2.7.5       Waste water treatment         Name of parameter       Image: Comparison of the parameter | Nent<br>Unit<br>%<br>%<br>%<br>%<br>(l. u)<br>uniform<br>distribution<br>% (l. u)<br>uniform<br>distribution   | Value           -           96.6           94           3.4           6                                   | Remark. data source         Unknown percentage, though Westerhof <i>et al.</i> (2013) found that         interaction with wastewater constituents altered the sorption proper-         ties of CeO2. (Westerhoff, Kiser, & Hristovsk, 2013)         Limbach <i>et al.</i> (2008) reported that CeO2 agglomerated strongly in         STP         (Gómez-Rivera, <i>et al.</i> , 2012)         (Limbach, <i>et al.</i> , 2008)         (Gómez-Rivera, <i>et al.</i> , 2012)         (Limbach, <i>et al.</i> , 2008)  |
| 2.7.5       Waste water treatment         Name of parameter       Transformation during STP treatment into other forms         Percentage ending up in sludge       Percentage discharges         Processes in surface waters after discharge       Percentage discharge   | Nent<br>Unit<br>%<br>%<br>%<br>(I. u)<br>uniform<br>distribution<br>%  | Value           -           96.6           94           3.4           6           98 (out of the emitted) | Remark. data source         Unknown percentage, though Westerhof <i>et al.</i> (2013) found that         interaction with wastewater constituents altered the sorption proper-         ties of CeO2. (Westerhoff, Kiser, & Hristovsk, 2013)         Limbach <i>et al.</i> (2008) reported that CeO2 agglomerated strongly in         STP         (Gómez-Rivera, <i>et al.</i> , 2012)         (Limbach, <i>et al.</i> , 2008)         (Gómez-Rivera, <i>et al.</i> , 2012)         (Limbach, <i>et al.</i> , 2008)         "CeO2 nanoparticle hetero-aggregate with or deposition onto natural colloids. followed by sedimentation"         (Quik. <i>et al.</i> , 2012)         Modeled based on zwo extreme scenarios on sedimentation 0 and 100%, see comments e.g. for nano-TiO2. |
| 2.7.5       Waste water treatment         Name of parameter         Transformation during STP         treatment into other forms         Percentage ending up in sludge         Percentage discharges         Processes in surface waters after discharge         2.7.6       Solid waste treatment  | nent<br>Unit<br>%<br>%<br>%<br>% (1. u)<br>uniform<br>distribution<br>% (1. u)<br>uniform<br>distribution<br>% | Value           -           96.6           94           3.4           6           98 (out of the emitted) | Remark. data source         Unknown percentage, though Westerhof <i>et al.</i> (2013) found that         interaction with wastewater constituents altered the sorption proper-         ties of CeO2. (Westerhoff, Kiser, & Hristovsk, 2013)         Limbach <i>et al.</i> (2008) reported that CeO2 agglomerated strongly in         STP         (Gómez-Rivera, <i>et al.</i> , 2012)         (Limbach, <i>et al.</i> , 2008)         (Gómez-Rivera, <i>et al.</i> , 2012)         (Limbach, <i>et al.</i> , 2008)         "CeO2 nanoparticle hetero-aggregate with or deposition onto natural colloids. followed by sedimentation"         (Quik. <i>et al.</i> , 2012)         Modeled based on zwo extreme scenarios on sedimentation 0 and 100%, see comments e.g. for nano-TiO2. |

| Cerium dioxide (CeO2)  |         |   |   |
|--|---------|---|---|
| Transformation or deposition<br>during incineration into other<br>forms (average Danish MSWIs) | %       | approx. 0.1-52<br>(deposition,<br>transformation)   | The CeO2 partition between waste bunker, incinerator, boiler, elec-<br>trostatic filter, wet scrubber, slag and fly ash was modelled as sug-<br>gested in (Walser and Gottschalk, 2014).<br>Mass transfer and fate parameters (see please Figure 1) are modelled<br>as shown below in Table 1 that reflects the values derived from<br>computer based simulations combined with real analyt-<br>ic/experimental results. These results show the steady state mass<br>transport/transformation for all relevant WIP paths reached after<br>steady state mode of such plants (infinite time scale). Analytically not<br>detected and not further transported nano-CeO2 has been assigned to<br>the subsequent further transport and/or to the subsequent deposi-<br>tion/transformation by covering at each stage in the WIP process the<br>entire range of transport and fate possibilities. A distinction between<br>material deposition and transformation was not possible due to ana-<br>lytical limitations |
| Percentage emitted to the air<br>(average Danish MSWIs)  | %       | ~0  | See line above.   |
| Percentage ending up in residues<br>(average Danish MSWIs)                                     | %       | approx. 36-75<br>(slag)<br>approx. 3-9 (fly<br>ash) | See line above.   |
| Transformation during land-<br>filling into other forms  | %       | No data   | At this point we stopped our modelling. Nanomaterial fate and behav-<br>iour during landfilling was not considered. See also general com-<br>ments on landfilling.  |
| Release from landfills to munici-<br>pal waste water treatment                                 | kg/year | 0   | For landfill, no leachate out is assumed, see comments on previous cases.   |
| Direct release from landfills to<br>surface water  | kg/year | 0   | See line above.<br>Expected to be low due to sorption and straining of CeO2 in the<br>waste matrix. For soils Cornelis <i>et al.</i> (2011) found aggregation and<br>sorption to negatively charged soil constituents such as clay<br>(Cornelis, et al., 2011)  |
| 2.7.7 <b>Recycling</b>   |         |   |   |

| Type of recycling activities                        | Recycling Ce     | Recycling CeO2 in the batteries |   |  |  |  |
|---|------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Name of parameter                                   | Unit             | Value                           | Remark. data source   |  |  |  |
| Transformation during recycling<br>into other forms | %                | No data                         | Not likely during recycling, however recycling of batteries in Den-<br>mark (End-use 3) has not shown how the CeO2 in the batteries are<br>recycled.<br>At this point we stopped our modelling. Nanomaterial fate and behav-<br>iour during recycling was not considered. |  |  |  |
| Ending up in recycled products                      | %                | -                               | No data available   |  |  |  |
| Release from recycling process                      | % of<br>recycled | 0                               | See lines above.<br>No data avaiable  |  |  |  |

# 2.8 Quantum dots

| Quantum dots   |   |                                |                   |  |  |  |
|--|---|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|
| 2.8.1 General description  | n   |                                |                   |  |  |  |
| General applications   |   |                                |                   |  |  |  |
| Applications of quantum dots in products and commodities include semiconductors transistors, solar cells, light emitting devices (e.g. LEDs), and diode lasers, medical imaging (and diagnostics/detection) and as possible qubits in quantum computing. |   |                                |                   |  |  |  |
| 2.8.2 Manufacturing and import/export of the substance on its own  |   |                                |                   |  |  |  |
| Manufacturing processes  | None known, but manufacturing in Denmark cannot be excluded   |                                |                   |  |  |  |
| Manufacturing in Denmark   |   |                                |                   |  |  |  |
| Name of parameter  | Unit  | Unit Value Remark. data source |                   |  |  |  |
| Import of the substance on its<br>own uses to Denmark  | kg/year     -     No data available for Denmark.<br>The worldwide production is 600 kg/year<br>(Piccinno, et al., 2012) |                                |                   |  |  |  |
| Re-export  | % of import   | -                              | No data available |  |  |  |
| 2.8.3 Formulation in Der   | nmark   |                                |                   |  |  |  |
| Identified formulation processes<br>in Denmark   | None known. But formulation in Denmark cannot be excluded   |                                |                   |  |  |  |
| 2.8.4 Import/export and  | end-use in art  | icles and mixture              | es                |  |  |  |

| Quantum dots                                |  |  |  |   |         |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|---|---------|--|--|
| Identified uses in articles and<br>mixtures | The worldwide production is 600 kg/year Piccinno <i>et al.</i> (2011) estimates the total global production of quantum dots (QDs) at 0.6 t/y (25-75 percentile: 0.6-5.5 t/y) and the consumption in Europe at the same level. A normal distribution around the European values was modelled with standard deviation 0.1 and by eliminating negative values.<br>As no Danish specific information has been possible to obtain the possible consumption of quantum dots in final articles is estimated on the basis of European/worldwide consumption figures. When no data is given there is no global estimate available; or the end-use known but not quantified; or in marginal percentages; or placed on a future/merging market where there is not data yet.<br>$ \begin{array}{c}             9 \\             9 \\         $ |  |  |   |         |  |  |
|   |  | End use Percentage of total<br>Lower. modal. upper value<br>(l**,m,u**)  |  |   |         |  |  |
|   |  | Light conversion for<br>(electronics etc.)   | LED/OLED   | 90*   |         |  |  |
|   | 2 1  | Lab use for imaging  |  | 10*   |         |  |  |
|   |  | Solar cells  |  | No data   |         |  |  |
|   | I  | Biomedical   |  | No data   |         |  |  |
|   | I  | Product security and a   | nti-counterfeiting   | No data   |         |  |  |
|   | 5  | Sensors  |  | No data   |         |  |  |
|   | 5  | Solid-state lighting   |  | No data   |         |  |  |
|   | * (Piccinno, e   | t al., 2012)   |  | <u>I</u>  |         |  |  |
|   | **50% reduct   | ion and augmentation   | up to the absolute limits                                  |   |         |  |  |
| Name of parameter                           | Unit   | Value  | Remark. data source  |   |         |  |  |
| End-use 1: Light conversion for LE          | D/OLED   |  | I  |   |         |  |  |
| Total consumption                           | % of total consump-tion  | 90   | Percentage (mean value)                                    | of the total QD use (Piccinno, et al.,                            | , 2012) |  |  |
| Trend in consumption                        | Unit-less  | Increasing   | Article VII. (Wijnhoven, Dekkers, Hagens, & de Jong, 2009) |   | ong,    |  |  |
| Average service life time                   | year   | -  | Highly dependent on the type of electronics                |   |         |  |  |
| Release* to municipal waste<br>water system | %  | 0  | QDs are incorporated in likely to be released und          | a solid matrix in the electronics and<br>er normal use conditions | are not |  |  |
|   |  | <ul> <li>* Unless otherwise noted the release values were reduced/ enlarged on each side by 50% for the modeling of symmetrical triangular distributions around the specified quantities. The symmetry may possibly be by the absolute border values (highest or lowest possible release value, 1 and 0). In cases were more values are given, the mean is taken as model value for such distributions.</li> </ul> |  |   |         |  |  |

| Quantum dots   |                         |       |   |
|--|-------------------------|-------|---|
| Direct release to surface water                      | %                       | 0     | QDs are incorporated in a solid matrix in the electronics and are not likely to be released under normal use conditions   |
| Direct release to soil                               | %                       | 0     | QDs are incorporated in a solid matrix in the electronics and are not likely to be released under normal use conditions   |
| Direct release to air                                | %                       | 0     | QDs are incorporated in a solid matrix in the electronics and are not<br>likely to be released under normal use conditions  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | %                       | 10    | For electronic products nearly 100% will be disposed of for recycling (Miljøstyrelsen, ISAG Udtræksmodul, 2009), however if QDs are used for LED lamps and for these the majority is expected to be disposed of for MSWI (even LED lamps contain electronic components) will be higher since light sources usually end up in MSWI of which most is incinerated in Denmark.<br>The spilt in QD use between separate light sources (lamps) and LEDs in electronic equipment is not known. |
| Disposed of to landfill                              | %                       | 0     | Electronic will not be landfilled in Denmark  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | %                       | 90    | The part of the LEDs in electronic equipment is expected nearly 100% to be disposed of for recycling of electronics (Miljøstyrelsen, ISAG Udtræksmodul, 2009)   |
| Transformation during use into other forms           | %                       | 0     | Not likely under normal use scenarios.  |
| End-use 2: Lab use for imaging                       |                         |       |   |
| Total consumption                                    | % of total consump-tion | 10    | Percentage (mean value) of the total QD use (Piccinno, et al., 2012)  |
| Trend in consumption                                 | Unit-less               | -     |   |
| Average service life time                            | year                    | -     | Highly dependent on the type of electronics   |
| Release to municipal waste water system              | %                       | 0     | QDs are incorporated in a solid matrix in the electronics and are not<br>likely to be released under normal use conditions  |
| Direct release to surface water                      | %                       | 0     | QDs are incorporated in a solid matrix in the electronics and are not<br>likely to be released under normal use conditions  |
| Direct release to soil                               | %                       | 0     | QDs are incorporated in a solid matrix in the electronics and are not likely to be released under normal use conditions   |
| Direct release to air                                | %                       | 0     | QDs are incorporated in a solid matrix in the electronics and are not<br>likely to be released under normal use conditions  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | %                       | 0     | For electronic products nearly 100% will be disposed of for recycling (Miljøstyrelsen, ISAG Udtræksmodul, 2009)   |
| Disposed of to landfill                              | %                       | 0     | Electronic will not be landfilled in Denmark  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | %                       | 100   | The part of the LEDs in electronic equipment is expected nearly<br>100% to be disposed of for recycling of electronics<br>(Miljøstyrelsen, ISAG Udtræksmodul, 2009)   |
| Transformation during use into other forms           | %                       | 0     | Not likely under normal use scenarios.  |
| 2.8.5 Waste water treatm                             | nent                    |       |   |
| Name of parameter                                    | Unit                    | Value | Remark. data source   |

| Quantum dots   |                |   |  |
|--|----------------|---|--|
| Transformation during STP<br>treatment into other forms  |                | Possible, but not<br>quantified. We<br>used a zero value<br>for transformation<br>as done also for<br>the nano-TiO2<br>studies. | Changes to the core/shell structure may occur due to e.g. changes in<br>redox conditions. pH, and light conditions may occur as shown by<br>the following quotes:<br>Showed degradation and reduced mobility in soil.<br>(Navarro, Banerjee, Watson, & Aga, 2011)<br>"At pH 4.0. the number and the fluorescence of the individual parti-<br>cles decrease significantly. indicating changes in the electronic<br>environment of the ZnS shell and/or dissolution of the QDS."<br>(Slaveykova & Startchev, 2009)<br>"quantum dots cause toxicity to bacterial cells by releasing harmful<br>components"<br>(Jafar & Hamzeh, 2013)<br>"slight changes in pH degraded quantum dot coatings. releasing the<br>core metals and killing bacteria."<br>(Mahendra, 2009)<br>"most environmental conditions seem to favour QD degradation"<br>(Blickley, 2010)<br>"QDs will become hydrophilic when dispersed in bodies of water"<br>The Toxicological Effects of Engineered Nanoparticles. Quantum<br>Dots. in Estuarine Fish.pdf<br>(Blickley, 2010) |
| Percentage ending up in sludge   | %              | 70-80   | (Zhang, Chen, Westerhoff, & Crittenden, 2007) reports that the phase distribution of CdTe QD favour the solid phase, hence the majority sediment.  |
| Percentage discharges  | %              | 20-30   | (Zhang, Chen, Westerhoff, & Crittenden, 2007)  |
| 2.8.6 Solid waste treatme  | ent (incinerat | ion and landfill)   |  |
| Name of parameter  | Unit           | Value   | Remark. data source  |
| Transformation or deposition<br>during incineration into other<br>forms (average Danish MSWIs) |                | approx. 0.1-52<br>(deposition,<br>transformation)   | The incineration model values for metal nanomaterials has been used also for metallic cadmium and zink based quantum dots. See please the details given in the previous $CeO_2$ case study that is based on Wasler and Gottschalk (2014).  |
| Percentage emitted to the air<br>(average Danish MSWIs)  |                | ~0  | See line above.  |

If Cd-QDs in LED lights are incinerated cadmium can be be volatilized, and condense on small particles. (Institute, 1993) The release will depend on the efficiency of the electrostatic filter for cleaning of the flue gas.

| Quantum dots   |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| Percentage ending up in residues<br>(average Danish MSWIs)     | %  | approx. 36-75<br>(slag)<br>approx. 3-9 (fly<br>ash)                       | See line above   |
| Release from landfills to munici-<br>pal waste water treatment | kg/year  | 0   | Electronics are not expected to be landfilled  |
| Direct release from landfills to surface water                 | kg/year  | 0   | Electronics are not expected to be landfilled  |
| 2.8.7 <b>Recycling</b>   |  |   |  |
| Type of recycling activities                                   | Not known –<br>Is it not likely<br>dissolved and | but expected to follow<br>that further environm<br>not further present as | the normal procedures for EEE waste.<br>The normal procedures for EEE waste.<br>The normal release occurs than the QD by the recycling may be melted or<br>a QD as modelled in this study. |
| Name of parameter  | Unit   | Value   | Remark. data source  |
| Transformation during recycling into other forms               | %  | -   | No data available  |
| Ending up in recycled products                                 | %  | -   | No data available  |
| Release from recycling process                                 | % of<br>recycled                                 | -   | No data available  |

#### 2.9 Carbon black

# Carbon black 2.9.1 General description General applications Worldwide carbon black consumption in 2010 was 9 million t/y and were expected to reach 13 million t/y 2015.

In the EU the registered production and import of carbon black is in the 1,000,000-10,000,000 t/y tonnage band.

**Tires and other rubber products** - Globally, approximately 90% of carbon black produced is used in the rubber industry as a reinforcing filler in a variety of products. The 70% is used as a reinforcement in tyres for automobiles and other vehicles, and 20% is used for other rubber products such as hoses, gaskets, mechanical and moulded goods, and footwear (OECD, 2005; Environment Canada, 2013). The production of tires of all sorts consumed over 7.8 million tonnes in 2011 (Ceresana, 2013). In tires and other rubber articles the carbon black is used for reinforcement. Carbon black constitutes approximately 22% of the mass of a tyre (OECD, 2005).

Other industrial sectors - About 9% of the global consumption is used as black pigment in other industrial sectors like plastics, paints, varnishes and printing inks. The remaining 1% is used in hundreds of diverse products, including batteries, high temperature insulating material, and thickeners for certain high temperature petroleum and synthetic greases. In addition, carbon black is used to impart electrical conductivity in rubber and plastics (Environment Canada, 2013)

According to the U.S. Household Products Database (HPD, 2009 as cited by Environment Canada, 2013), carbon black is used in a variety of household products including paints (liquid and aerosol), primers, stains, paint protectors (i.e., undercoating), rubber gaskets, caulking, concrete repair and sealants, cement colour pigments, fibreglass insulation, pipe seals, shoe polish, laserjet printer toners, inkjet printer cartridges, electronic sealants, and diaper ointment.

The International Carbon Black Association (ICBA, 2013) indicates the following applications in addition to the applications in rubber mentioned above:

**Plastics** - Carbon blacks are now widely used for conductive packaging, films, fibres, mouldings, pipes and semi-conductive cable compounds in products such as refuse sacks, industrial bags, photographic containers, agriculture mulch film, stretch wrap, and thermoplastic molding applications for automotive, electrical/electronics, household appliances and blow-moulded containers.

**Electrostatic Discharge (ESD) Compounds** - Carbon blacks are carefully designed to transform electrical characteristics from insulating to conductive in products such as electronics packaging, safety applications, and automotive parts.

**High Performance Coatings** - Carbon blacks provide pigmentation, conductivity, and UV protection for a number of coating applications including automotive (primer basecoats and clearcoats), marine, aerospace, decorative, wood, and industrial coatings.

Toners and Printing Inks - Carbon blacks enhance formulations and deliver broad flexibility in meeting specific colour requirements.

| 2.9.2 Manufacturing and | l import/export of the substance on its own   |
|-------------------------|---|
| Manufacturing processes | The following description is extracted from OECD (2005). The oil furnace black process uses heavy aromatic oils as feedstock. The production furnace is a tightly enclosed reactor used to react the feed-stock under carefully controlled conditions and at extremely high temperatures. The feedstock is atom-ized in a hot gas stream where it vaporizes and then pyrolyzed in the vapour phase to form microscopic carbon particles. In most furnace reactors, the reaction is controlled by steam or water sprays. The carbon black produced is conveyed through the reactor, cooled, and collected in bag filters in a continuous process. Furnace black is available in several grades. They are mainly used in rubber products, inks, paints and plastics. The thermal black process uses natural gas, mainly consisting of methane, as the starting material in a cyclic operation in which the gas is thermally decomposed (cracked). The process uses a pair of furnaces that alternate approximately every five minutes between preheating and carbon production. The methane |

г

| Carbon black  |   |   |                                     |  |                             |  |
|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|
|   | is injected into a hot refractory-lined furnace. In the absence of air, the heat from the refractory material decomposes the methane into carbon black and hydrogen. The aerosol material stream is quenched with water sprays and filtered. The exiting carbon black may be further processed to remove impurities, pelletized, screened, and then packaged for shipment. The process yields relatively coarse particles. Two other processes (the lamp process for production of lampblack and the cracking of acetylene to produce acetylene black) are use for small-volume specialty carbon blacks that constitute less than 1% of the total production. Lampblack is produced by burning liquid hydrocarbons, e.g. kerosene. Lampblack is often oily. It is used for contact brushes in electrical apparatus. |   |                                     |  |                             |  |
| Manufacturing in Denmark                              | Carbon black is   | not produced in De                              | nmark                               |  |                             |  |
| Name of parameter                                     | Unit  | Value   | Remark,                             | , data source  |                             |  |
| Import of the substance on its<br>own uses to Denmark | kg/year   | no information                                  | In the tra<br>forms of<br>carbon bl | de statistics carbon black is registered toge<br>carbon not elsewhere specified and specif<br>lack cannot be extracted | ether with other ic data on |  |
| Re-export   | % of import   | no information                                  |                                     |  |                             |  |
| 2.9.3 Formulation in Der                              | ımark   |   |                                     |  |                             |  |
| Identified formulation processes<br>in Denmark        | According to the SPIN database (SPIN 2013), based on registrations in the Danish Product Registry, total content of carbon black in mixtures placed on the Danish market for professional purposed in 2 was as shown in the table below. It is not indicated whether the mixtures placed on the Danish market are produced in Denmark or imported.  |   |                                     |  |                             |  |
|   | The Danish Product Register includes substances and mixtures used occupationally and which contain at least one substance classified as dangerous in a concentration of at least 0.1% to 1% (depending on the classification of the substance). Carbon black is not classified and the registration will only occur if the substance is constituent of mixtures which contain other substances classified as dangerous above the indicated limits.  |   |                                     |  |                             |  |
|   | The application area "colouring agents" are probably imported agents used in the formulation of lacquers<br>and varnishes, reprographic agents (printing inks), pigments, textiles, cosmetics and adhesives, whereas<br>the other application areas are the final mixtures – either produced in Denmark or imported.  |   |                                     |  |                             |  |
|   | Raw materials f<br>the Product regi   | for manufacture of p<br>stry.                   | lastics such                        | as compounds or masterbatches are likely   | / not register in           |  |
|   | A previous survey on the use of nanomaterials in the Danish industry reports that more than 1 t/y carbon black was used for the manufacture of paints and printing inks, more than 10 t/y was used for textiles. Tønning <i>et al.</i> (2014) reports that carbon black is used in the manufacture of cosmetics (mascara, eyeliner and nail polish).  |   |                                     |  |                             |  |
|   | For the current s   | survey a use of more                            | e than 100 t                        | /y for manufactures of paint and varnishes   | s has been                  |  |
|   | Based on the av   | ailable data it is esti<br>ures while 10-50 t/y | mated that<br>is used for           | around (100-400 t/y) carbon black is used manufacture of textiles.   | for manufacture             |  |
|   | Application an  | rea   |                                     | Content in mixtures placed on the Danish market, tonnes/year *   |                             |  |
|   | Colouring age   | ents  |                                     | 201  |                             |  |
|   | Reprographic  | agents (printing ink                            | s)                                  | 156  |                             |  |
|   | Paints, lacque  | rs and varnishes                                |                                     | 119  |                             |  |
|   | Construction  | materials                                       |                                     | 14   |                             |  |
|   | Impregnating  | materials                                       |                                     | 6  |                             |  |
|   | Adhesives and   | binding agents                                  |                                     | 4  | •                           |  |
|   | Non-agricultu   | ral pesticides and pr                           | eserva-                             | 4  | ]                           |  |

| Carbon black   |  |  |  |   |   |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|
|  | tives**<br>Surface treatm<br>Others                  | nent   |  | 3 5   |   |  |  |
|  | * Production + i<br>**Assumed to b<br>For comparison | <ul> <li>* Production + import – export</li> <li>**Assumed to be antifouling paints</li> <li>For comparison with Danish figures, for the year 2006, the Canadian Chemical Production of the Canadian Chemical Prod</li></ul> |  |   |   |  |  |
|  | (now called Che<br>emissions from<br>es were produce | (now called Chemistry Industry Association of Canada) emissions inventory reported total carbon black<br>emissions from member companies of 1.1 t/y (CCPA 2006). None of the companies that reported releas-<br>es were producers of carbon black.   |  |   |   |  |  |
| Name of parameter  | Unit   | Value  | Remark,  | , data source   |   |  |  |
| Formulation 1: Production of paint   | , lacquers, pigme                                    | nts, reprographic a  | agents, adh  | esives, cosmetics   |   |  |  |
| Number of companies  | companies  | 10-50  |  |   |   |  |  |
| Quantities used  | t/year   | 100-400  | Based on<br>agents. T<br>paint and   | the registration of 201 t/y carbon black in<br>he majority is expected to be used for the r<br>varnishes.   | colouring<br>nanufacture of   |  |  |
| Ending up in final products  | %  | 97%  |  |   |   |  |  |
| Release* to municipal waste<br>water system<br>* Unless otherwise noted the re-<br>lease values were reduced/ enlarged<br>on each side by 50% for the model-<br>ing of symmetrical triangular<br>distributions around the specified<br>quantities. The symmetry may<br>possibly be by the absolute border<br>values (highest or lowest possible<br>release value, 1 and 0). In cases<br>were more values are given, the<br>mean is taken as modal value for<br>such distributions. | %  | <0,5   | The emis<br>the OECl<br>coatings i<br>the manu<br>residues i<br>spills and<br>residue m<br>facturing<br>remaining<br>washings<br>Accordin<br>originate:<br>Approxir<br>water for<br>The first<br>majority<br>sludge/fil<br>gasificati<br>The pre-t<br>water pla<br>In the latt<br>water is f<br>treatment<br>As a wor<br>treatment<br>actual rel | sion scenario document (ESD) for the pair<br>D (2009) assume for manufacture of aqueo<br>that the total fraction of raw materials lost<br>facturing process is 1.5%. This includes 19<br>in the mixing vessels and 0.5% due to resid<br>l product returns. It is in the ESD assumed<br>haterial in the mixing vessels will be re-use<br>process (recycling. For aqueous dispersion<br>g equipment residue is assumed to be remo-<br>and hence to waste water.<br>g to information from Danish manufacture<br>is from cleaning of tanks and other product<br>mately 1-2% of the total used may be releas<br>pre-treatment/treatment at the manufactur<br>step at all sites is a precipitation/flocculatio<br>of the carbon black is precipitated and end<br>lter cake which is disposed of for external i<br>on.<br>reated waste water is either directed to mu<br>nts or further treated at the manufacturing<br>ter case, the waste water is further treated.<br>Tirst treated by pre-precipitation tank, then<br>t and ultimately by a final polishing. | t industry from<br>us dispersion<br>to waste from<br>6 lost due to<br>lues in bags,<br>that half of the<br>ed in the manu-<br>n coatings the<br>oved in water<br>s waste water<br>ion equipment.<br>sed to the waste<br>ing sites.<br>on where the<br>s up in a<br>incineration or<br>nicipal waste<br>sites.<br>The waste<br>by biological<br>waste water<br><0,5%. The<br>alue. The pre-<br>waste water |  |  |

| Carbon black   |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
|  |  |  | treatment plants but a small fraction may be discharged to surface water  |
| Direct release to surface water<br>(after internal WW treatment) | %  | <0,1   | Worst case estimate – the total release is probably significantly below the $<0.1\%$ .  |
| Direct release to soil   | %  |  | The carbon black is imported as pastes in which the TiO2 is dis-<br>persed in water. The generation of dust by handling of the pastes is<br>considered insignificant.   |
| Direct release to air  | %  |  | The carbon black is imported as pastes in which the TiO2 is dis-<br>persed in water. The generation of dust by handling of the pastes is<br>considered insignificant  |
| Disposed of as solid waste for incineration                      | %  | 2  | Filtercake/sludge and carbon black remaining in packaging are disposed of for incineration or gasification.   |
| Disposed of for other waste man-<br>agement                      | %  |  | Considered insignificant  |
| Percentage of produced products exported                         | % of quantity<br>in final<br>product   | No data  |   |
| 2.9.4 Import/export and  | end-use in art   | icles and mixture  | 25  |
| Identified uses in articles and<br>mixtures                      | The total global<br>the consumption<br>in the range of 1<br>Assuming the sa<br>mixtures and art<br>tyres and other of<br>The data from the<br>ing colouring ag<br>assigned a harm<br>be registered in<br>adhesives, XX,<br>pounds and mas<br>Registry.<br>We computed n<br>values indiacted<br>mal value of 5'(<br>conditions based<br>2014). The sach<br>tion capability of<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>100000<br>Figure 13. Annu<br>Denmark. | carbon black marked<br>in the EU is availad<br>1-4 million t/y.<br>ame per capita consu-<br>ticles would be some<br>rubber products, the<br>he Product Registry<br>gents which are expe-<br>toonised classification<br>the Product Registry<br>etc. the registered to<br>sterbatches for plastic<br>ormally distributed of<br>above (globally 10<br>000 t/y was fixed and<br>d on the proportion of<br>ing Denmark Switze<br>of these two countrie<br>40000 7000<br>al use volumes cover | the is approximately 10 million t/y (Ceresana. 2013). No exact data on<br>ble (registration toannge band 1-10 million t/y), but most likely it is<br>amption in Denmark as the EU average, the annual consumption in<br>e 10,000-40,000 t/y (own expert estimate). If 90% is +imported with<br>remaining 10% would correspond to approximately 1,000-4,000 t/y.<br>indicates a total consumption of 340 t/y in various mixtures (exclud-<br>exted to be used in production processes). As the carbon black is not<br>in accordance with the CLP Regulation, the substances would only<br>y if the mixture other classified constituents. For water-based paints,<br>onnage may be significantly underestimated. Furthermore, com-<br>c manufacture may not be covered by the registration in the Product<br>values for the Danish use volume by basing our computations on<br>million t/y, 10,000 and 40,000 t/y for Denmark). However, a mini-<br>d the global estimation had to be scaled down to European and Swiss<br>of the Gross Domestic Product as suggested elsewhere (Sun <i>et al.</i> ,<br>reland occurred by using the population volume, since the consump-<br>es is similar. |

| Carbon black                     |         |             |                   |   |   |                   |  |
|----------------------------------|---------|-------------|-------------------|---|---|-------------------|--|
|                                  |         | End use     |                   |   | Percentage of total   |                   |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   | Lower, modal, upper value                                       |   |                   |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   |   | (l*,m,u*)   |                   |  |
|                                  | 1       | Tires       |                   |   | 35 ,70, 100   | -                 |  |
|                                  | 2       | Other rub   | ber components    |   | 10, 20, 30  | -                 |  |
|                                  |         | (various a  | articles)         |   |   |                   |  |
|                                  | 3       | Paint and   | varnishes         |   | 1.5, 3, 4.5   | _                 |  |
|                                  | 4       | Antifouli   | ng paints         |   | 0.05, 0.1, 0.15   |                   |  |
|                                  | 5       | Inks        |                   |   | 1.5, 3, 4.5   |                   |  |
|                                  | 6       | Plastic co  | omponents (variou | 15  | 1.5, 3, 4.5   |                   |  |
|                                  |         | articles)   |                   |   |   | -                 |  |
|                                  | 7       | Filters     |                   |   | 0.1, 0.2, 0.3   | -                 |  |
|                                  | 8       | Other       |                   |   | 0.4, 0.7, 1.1   | -                 |  |
|                                  | *50%    | 6 reduction | and augmentation  | 1   |   |                   |  |
| Name of parameter                | Unit    |             | Value             | Re  | emark, data source  |                   |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   |   |   |                   |  |
| End-use 1: Tires                 |         |             |                   |   |   |                   |  |
| Total consumption                | % of to | otal        | 70                | Mean values based on information on global consumption figures  |   |                   |  |
| ···· ·· <b>·</b> · ·             | consur  | nption      |                   | ivean values, based on mornation on global consumption rightes  |   |                   |  |
| Dalaan (                         | 0/      |             | 2                 | A   | meanimately 220/ of a tire is commoned of carbo                                 | n block and an    |  |
| Release to municipal waste water | %0      |             | 3                 | Ap  | proximately 22% of a tire is composed of carbon                                 | n black, and on   |  |
| system                           |         |             |                   | av  | regional fractional temperature $\Delta = 100000000000000000000000000000000000$ | a alastomer       |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   | co  | service life (OECD, 2006). As it is bound within the elastomer                  |                   |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   | un  | unbound particle through wear or abrasion (US EPA 1976: OECD                    |                   |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   | 2006; ChemRisk, Inc. and DIK, Inc. 2008 as cited by Environment |   |                   |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   | Ca  | Canada, 2013).  |                   |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   |   |   |                   |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   | Ac  | cording the Naturstyrelsen (2012) the paved area                                | a in areal appox- |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   | im  | imately 77.000 hectares, of this 35.500 hectares has common                     |                   |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   | sewerage system and the remaining 41.500 hectares has separate  |   |                   |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   | sto   | rm water sewerage system.   |                   |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   | Th  | is significant part of dust from the tires will be generated outside            |                   |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   | are   | eas with sewer systems and here the dust will eith                              | her be released   |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   | to  | soil or to surface water.   | 1 1 1             |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   | 1 n   | le 15% lost from the tires are roughly estimated t                              | o distributed as  |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   | 101   | iows.   |                   |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   | 8%  | 6 to surface water  |                   |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   | 3%  | 6 to municipal waste water  |                   |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   |   | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·   | a 1               |  |
| Direct release to surface water  | %       |             | 8                 | Re  | elease via separate storm water sewerage system                                 | from paved        |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   | are   | stems   | unout sewer       |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   | Sy.   | 500115  |                   |  |
| Direct release to soil           | %       |             | 4                 | Lo  | osses to soil around roads in the countryside                                   |                   |  |
| Direct release to air            | %       |             | 1                 | So  | me of the dust may be considered a release to air                               | but is expected   |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   | to  | . Value according to the one for CTNs.  |                   |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI              | %       |             | 5                 | Ev  | en the majority of tires are disposed of for recyc                              | ling a small part |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   | ma  | ay end up on MSWI. According to Dækbranchen                                     | s Miljøfond       |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   | (20   | 012), 97% of the tires collected in 2011 were rec                               | ycled. It is not  |  |
|                                  |         |             |                   | inc   | dicated what happened to the remaining 3%. In a                                 | ddition as small  |  |
г

| Carbon black   | Carbon black           |      |  |  |
|--|------------------------|------|--|--|
|  |                        |      | percentage may be disposed of directly the MSWI without collec-<br>tion  |  |
| Disposed of to landfill                              | %                      |      | Tires are not disposed of to landfills in Denmark  |  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | %                      | 80   | [we have not yet identified data showing the collection efficiency<br>of tires in Denmatk]<br>97% of the tires collected in 2011 were recycled (Dækbranchens<br>Miljøfond, 2012)   |  |
| Transformation during use into other forms           | ⁰∕₀                    | -    |  |  |
| End-use 2: Other rubber componen                     | ts (various articles   | )    |  |  |
| Total consumption                                    | % of total consumption | 20   | Mean values, based on information on global consumption figures  |  |
| Direct release to surface water                      | %                      | <0.1 | The releases to the environment and waste water of particles of<br>other rubber products to the environment is considered insignifi-<br>cant but small releases cannot be excluded |  |
| Direct release to soil                               | %                      | <0.1 | See above  |  |
| Direct release to air                                | %                      | <0.1 | See above  |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | %                      | 95   |  |  |
| Disposed of to landfill                              | %                      | 5    | Roughly estimated. Rubber parts of in vehicles (gaskets, hoses, etc.) may be disposed of to landfills in waste from shredder plants  |  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | %                      | 0    | The recycling of other rubber products is considered insignificant   |  |
| Transformation during use into other forms           | %                      | -    | No data  |  |
| End-use 3: Paint and varnishes                       |                        |      |  |  |
| Total consumption                                    | % of total consumption | 3    | Mean values, based on information on global consumption figures  |  |
| Release to municipal waste water<br>system           | %                      | 1    | Dust and flakes from maintenance of painted surfaces and from<br>abrasion of painted surfaces  |  |
| Direct release to surface water                      | %                      | 1    | Dust and flakes from maintenance of painted surfaces and from abrasion of painted surfaces   |  |
| Direct release to soil                               | %                      | 2    | Dust and flakes from maintenance of painted surfaces and from abrasion of painted surfaces   |  |
| Direct release to air                                | %                      | 1    | Dust and flakes from maintenance of painted surfaces and from abrasion of painted surfaces   |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | %                      | 50   | Paint remaining in packaging and paint on wood and other combus-<br>tible materials  |  |
| Disposed of to landfill                              | %                      | 10   | Paint on concrete and other non-combustible building materials   |  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | %                      | 35   | Paint on metals  |  |
| Transformation during use into other forms           | %                      |      | No data  |  |

other forms

| Carbon black   |                        |     |  |
|--|------------------------|-----|--|
| End-use 4: Antifouling paints                        |                        |     |  |
| Total consumption                                    | % of total consumption | 0.1 | Estimates on the basis of information on carbon black in antifoul-<br>ing paint marketed in Denmark (data from the Product Registry)<br>Antifouling paint is a complicated category as paint applied in<br>Denmark may not necessarily be applied on vessels sailing i Dan-<br>ish waters, and thus not release to Danish waters. At the same time<br>a significant part of the releases to Danish waters is from vessels<br>passing the waters og foreign vessels visiting Danish harbours.<br>A study on the use of organotin compounds for antifouling estimat-<br>ed that the total releases to the Danish waters was less than half of<br>the releases due to organotin applied in Denmark (released in<br>Denmark and elsewhere).<br>In the following for simplicity the releases from antifouling paint<br>used (applied) in Denmark is assumed to be released to Danish<br>waters. |
| Release to municipal waste water system              | %                      |     |  |
| Direct release to surface water                      | %                      | 67  | A study on the use of organotin compounds in antifouling paints in<br>Denmark estimates that 60-70% of the paint is released to the water<br>during use (Lassen <i>et al.</i> , 1999). In addition small quantities will be<br>lost by maintenance of boats and vessels.<br>The main part is released to the sea while a very small part is<br>releases to streams and lakes.  |
| Direct release to soil                               | %                      | 0.1 | A small percentage may be lost to soil by maintenance of boats   |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | %                      | 1   | Disposed of with dust from maintenance   |
| Disposed of to landfill                              | %                      |     |  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | %                      | 32  | Remaining on the metal ultimately disposed of for recycling  |
| Transformation during use into                       | %                      |     |  |

| End-use 5: Inks                                      |                        |    |   |
|--|------------------------|----|---|
| Total consumption                                    | % of total consumption | 3  | Mean values, based on information on global consumption figures                                     |
| Release to municipal waste water<br>system           | ⁰∕₀                    |    |   |
| Direct release to surface water                      | %                      |    |   |
| Direct release to soil                               | %                      |    |   |
| Direct release to air                                | %                      |    |   |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                  | %                      | 10 | In analogy with nanomaterial in paper (nano-TiO2) as estimated elswhere (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014). |
| Disposed of to landfill                              | %                      |    |   |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery) | %                      | 80 | See lines above.  |
| Export   | %                      | 10 | See lines above.  |

| Carbon black  |                        |            |  |  |
|---|------------------------|------------|--|--|
| End-use 6: Plastic components (various articles)        |                        |            |  |  |
| Total consumption                                       | % of total consumption | 3          | Mean values, based on information on global consumption figures  |  |
| Release to municipal waste water<br>system              | %                      | <0.1       | The releases to the environment and waste water of particles of<br>other rubber products to the environment is considered insignifi-<br>cant but small releases cannot be excluded                             |  |
| Direct release to surface water                         | %                      | <0.1       | See above  |  |
| Direct release to soil                                  | %                      | <0.1       | See above  |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                     | %                      | 96         | The recycling of those plastic parts that contain carbon black (see<br>description in the section on general applications) is considered<br>very small, and the majority is thus disposed of for incineration  |  |
| Disposed of to landfill                                 | %                      | 2          | Roughly estimated. Plastic parts in vehicles may be disposed of to landfills in waste from shredder plants   |  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery)    | %                      | 2          | The recycling of those plastic parts that contain carbon black (see<br>description in the section on general applications) is considered<br>very small   |  |
| Transformation during use into other forms              | %                      |            | No data  |  |
| End-use 7: Fillers                                      |                        |            |  |  |
| Total consumption                                       | % of total consumption | 0,2        | Mean values, based on information on global consumption figures  |  |
| Release to municipal waste water system                 | %                      | 25         | In analogy to application in filters of nano-TiO2 (Sun et al., 2014)   |  |
| Direct release to surface water                         | %                      |            |  |  |
| Direct release to soil                                  | %                      |            |  |  |
| Direct release to air                                   | %                      | 5          | See lines above.   |  |
| Disposed of to MSWI                                     | %                      | 70         | See lines above.   |  |
| Disposed of to landfill                                 | %                      |            |  |  |
| Disposed of for recycling (excl.<br>energy recovery)    | %                      |            |  |  |
| Transformation during use into other forms              | %                      |            |  |  |
| End-use 8: Other uses – not further considered          |                        |            |  |  |
| 2.9.5 Waste water treatment                             |                        |            |  |  |
| Name of parameter                                       | Unit                   | Value      | Remark, data source  |  |
| Transformation during STP<br>treatment into other forms | %                      |            | no data – not expected to be significant   |  |
| Percentage ending up in sludge                          | % (l, m, u)            | 0, 50, 100 | Environment Canada (2013) conservatively estimate the carbon<br>black removal efficiency from influent resulting from the<br>wastewater treatment process at 50% where lagoons or primary<br>treatments exist. |  |
| Percentage discharges                                   | % (l, m, u)            | 0, 50, 100 | See above.   |  |

| Carbon black   |  |             |  |
|--|--|-------------|--|
| 2.9.6 Solid waste treatment (incineration and landfill)                            |  |             |  |
| Name of parameter  | Unit   | Value       | Remark, data source  |
| Transformation during incinera-<br>tion into other forms (average<br>Danish MSWIs) | %  | 75, 98, 100 | The degradation temperature of carbon black is in principle 3652–<br>3697°C and it is not expected that carbon black will be degraded<br>during incineration under non-oxidative conditions (Environment<br>Canada, 2013).<br>In this work carbon-based materials /CNT and CB) are assumed to<br>almost completely burn under standard oxidative conditions in the<br>furnace (Mueller <i>et al.</i> , 2013).<br>Complete combustion is expected for carbon black with low air<br>release and almost no residual ash (ICBA, 2014). |
| Percentage emitted to the air<br>(average Danish MSWIs)                            | %  | <1          | Despite the presence of pollution control devices, some dust con-<br>taining carbon black may escape into air. (Environment Canada,<br>2013). With the filters used in Danish waste incinerators it is<br>expected that less than one percent of the carbon black will be<br>released to the air.  |
| Percentage ending up in residues<br>(average Danish MSWIs)                         | %  | ~99         | It is expected that the majority of the carbon black ends up in the<br>ashes from the flue gas cleaning which as disposed of for land-<br>filling.<br>A minor part is expected to end up in the bottom ashes which to<br>some extent are used for construction works.<br>Mass allocation to diferent ashes according to others and as done<br>for CNT: 18 % reaching fly ashes and 81% ending up in bottom<br>ashes (Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2014)   |
| Release from landfills to munici-<br>pal waste water treatment                     | kg/year  | 0           | For landfill, no leachate out is assumed.  |
| Direct release from landfills to surface water                                     | kg/year  | 0           | See line above.  |
| Transformation during land-<br>filling into other forms                            | %  | No data     | At this point we stopped our modelling. Nanomaterial fate and<br>behaviour during landfilling was not considered. See also general<br>comments on landfilling.   |
| 2.9.7 Recycling  |  |             |  |
| Type of recycling activities   | Recycling processes include recycling of tires and recycling of printed paper.<br>[to be elaborated] |             |  |
| Name of parameter  | Unit   | Value       | Remark, data source  |
| Transformation during recycling into other forms                                   | %  | No data     | No data available. We did not track the material fate and mass<br>flows of the studied nanoparticles during and after the recycling<br>process.  |
| Ending up in recycled products   | %  | No data     | See lines above.   |
| Release from recycling process   | % of recycled  | 0           | See lines above.   |

## 3. References

Al-Salim N, Barraclough E, Burgess E, Clothier B, Deurer M, Green S, Malone L, Weir G. 2011. Quantum dot transport in soil, plants, and insects. Science of the Total Environment; 409: 3237–3248.

Anastasio C, Martin ST. 2001. Atmospheric Nanoparticles, in: Banfield JF, Navrotsky A. (Eds.), Reviews in Mineralogy and Geochemistry, Washington, D.C., pp. 293-349.

ANEC/BEUC, 2010. ANEC/BEUC Inventory of Products Claiming to Contain Nanoparticles Available on the EU Market.

Angelidis T, Sklavounos S. 1995. A SEM-EDS study of new and used automotive catalysts, Thessaloniki, Greece: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.

AliExpress. [Online] Available at: http://www.aliexpress.com/store/product/Universal-Rounded-shape-TWC-Three-way-catalytic-Converter/119696\_835915919.html

Aschberger, K., Micheletti, C., Sokull-Kluettgen, B., Christensen, F.M., 2011. Analysis of currently available data for characterising the risk of engineered nanomaterials to the environment and human health - Lessons learned from four case studies. Environment International 37, 1143-1156.

Azonanano. 2006. Copper Oxide - NanoArc® Copper Oxide Nanomaterials from Nanophase Technologies Corporation. Azonanano.com. Sep 13, 2006.

AZoNano, 2013. http://www.azonano.com/article.aspx?ArticleID=3348.

Batley GE, Halliburton B, Kirby JK, Doolette CL, Navarro D, McLaughlin MJ, Veitch C. 2013. Characterization and ecological risk assessment of nanoparticulate CeO2 as a diesel fuel catalyst. Environ Toxicol Chem;32: 1896-1905.

Belcastro EL. 2012. Life Cycle Analysis of a Ceramic Three-Way Catalytic Converter. Thesis submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Binnemans K, Jones P T, Blanpain B, Van Gerven T, Yang Y, Walton A, Buchert M. 2013. Recycling of rare earths: a critical review. Journal of Cleaner Production, 51: 1-22.

Blaser SA, Scheringer M, Macleod M, Hungerbühler K. 2008. Estimation of cumulative aquatic exposure and risk due to silver: Contribution of nano-functionalized plastics and textiles. Science of the Total Environment 390, 396-409.

Blickley T M. 2010. The Toxicological Effects of Engineered Nanoparticles, Quantum Dots, in Estuarine Fish, s.l.: Department of Environment Duke University.

Bornhöft NK, Nowack B, Hilty LM. 2013. Material Flow Modelling for Environmental Exposure Assessment – A Critical Review of Four Approaches Using the Comparative Implementation of an Idealized Example. Proceedings of the 27<sup>th</sup> EnviroInfo 2013 Conference, Hamburg, Germany, September 2–4, 2013.

BUND, 2011. Nanoproduct Database.

Burtscher H, Zürcher M, Kasper A, Brunner M. 2002. Efficiency of flue gas cleaning in waste incineration for submicron particles. In: Mayer A, editor. Proc. Int. ETH Conf. on Nanoparticle Measurement. 52. BUWAL.

Burtscher H, Zürcher M, Kasper A, Brunner M. 2001. Efficiency of flue gas cleaning in waste incineration for submicron particles. Proc. Int. ETH Conf. on Nanoparticle Measurement, Zurich.

Central, D., 2013. Time to Buy a Quantum Dot TV. [Online] Available at: <u>http://www.display-central.com/free-news/display-daily/time-to-buy-a-quantum-dot-tv/</u>

Ceresana. 2013. Market Study: Carbon Black (UC-5605). Ceresana Market Intelligence Consulting. http://www.ceresana.com/en/market-studies/chemicals/carbon-black/

Chen Y-C, Lee KH, Jeng FT. 2011. Aging-induced changes in properties of motorcycle catalytic converterS, Taipei, Taiwan: National Taiwan University.

Civiello M, Wouters P. 2003. Combination of Diesel fuel system architectures and Ceria-based fuel-borne catalysts for improvement and simplification of the Diesel Particulate Filter System in serial applications. Presentation.

Clausen PA, Jacobsen NR, Jensen KA (Eds.) (2012). NANOPLAST Nanoteknologiske materialer og produkter i plastindustrien: Eksponeringsvurdering og toksiske egenskaber. Det Nationale Forskningscenter for Arbejdsmiljø (NFA). (in Danish)

Cornelis G, Ryan B, McLaughlin MJ, Kirby JK, Beak D, Chittleborough D. 2011. Solubility and Batch Retention of CeO2 Nanoparticles in Soils. Environmental Science & Technology 45: 2777-2782.

Dækbranchens Miljøfond. 2012. Nyhedsbrev 12. June 2012.

Danish Nature Agency. 2012. Punktkilder 2011 [Point Sources 2011](in Danish). www.nst.dk.

Danish Nature Agency. 2014. Pers.comm., Anna Gade Holm, Centre for information on point sources, March 2014.

DANVA, 2009b. Vand i tal [Water in figures. Danish Water and Wastewater Association (in Danish).

DANVA. 2009a. Håndtering af spildevandslam. Katalog over metoder til behandling og deponering. [Handling of sewage sludge. Catalogue of methods for treatment and disposal]. Danish Water and Wastewater Association (in Danish)

DEPA. 2009. Affaldsstatistik 2007 and 2008 [Waste Statistics] (in Danish). Danish Environmental Protection Agency.

DEPA. 2010. Deponeringskapacitet I Denmark [Disposal capacity in Denmark] (in Danish). Danish Environmental Protection Agency.

DEPA. 2013. Affaldsstatistik 2011 [Waste Statistics 2011] (in Danish). Danish Environmental Protection Agency.

DEPA. 2012. Bekæmpelsesmiddelstatistik 2011 [Pesticide statistics 2011]. Danish Environmental Protection Agency. http://www2.mst.dk/Udgiv/publikationer/2012/10/978-87-92903-58-7.pdf.

DMU. 2000. Afstrømningsforhold i danske vandløb [catchment and flow conditions of Danish streams] (in Danish). Faglig rapport fra DMU nr 340, 2000.

DuPont. 2010. Titanium dioxide. A brief overview of TiO2 pigments compared with TiO2 nanomaterials, March 2010.

EC21. 2008. Global B2B Marketplace, 2008.

EEA. 2013. Municipal Waste Management in Denmark. European Environment Agency.

Environment Canada. 2013. Screening Assessment for the Challenge. Carbon Black. Chemical Abstracts Service Registry Number 1333-86-4. Environment Canada, Health Canada.

US EPA. 2010. Nanomaterial Case Study: Nanoscale Silver in Disinfectant Spray, External Review Draft. US Environmental Protection Agency. EPA report EPA/600/R-10/081.

EPRUI. 2013. CuO Nanoparticle Features. EPRUI Nanoparticles & Microspheres Co. Ltd. At: http://www.nanoparticlesmicrospheres.com/ European Commission. 2011. Commission Recommendation of 18 October 2011 on the definition of nanomaterial. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32011H0696:EN:NOT

Statistics Denmark 2013. Familiernes bilrådighed [the families' access to cars], s.l.: Statistics Denmark.

forbrug.dk. 2012. Typer af batterier[types of batteries][Online] Available at: <u>http://www.forbrug.dk/Artikler/Test-og-</u> <u>raad/Elektronik/Batterier/typerafbatterier?tc=1080018F3D034546B1C4980619759B26</u> [Senest hentet eller vist den 2013].

Freeman MH, McIntyre CR. 2008. A comprehensive review of copper-based wood preservatives - With a focus on new micronized or dispersed copper systems. Forest Prod Jour, 58 (11): 6-27.

Future Markets. 2011. Future Markets, 2011. The World Market for Carbon Nanotubes, Nanofibers, Fullerenes and POSS. Future Markets, Inc.

Future Markets. 2011a. The world market for nanoparticle titanium dioxide. Future Markets Inc. Abstract available at: <a href="http://www.futuremarketsinc.com/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=38&Itemid=75">http://www.futuremarketsinc.com/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=38&Itemid=75</a>

Future Markets. 2011b. The World Market for Carbon Nanotubes, Nanofibers, Fullerenes and POSS. Future Markets, Inc.

Geosyntec Consultants, Inc., and FRx Inc. 2012. Jet injection pilot test summary report. Taastrup, Denmark. Jet Injection Report – 05142012.

Geranio L, Heuberger M, Nowack B. 2009. Behavior of silver nano-textiles during washing. Environ. Sci. Technol. 43: 8113-8118.

GEUS. 2001. Teglværksler i Danmark. GEUS Report no. 2001/92.

Gómez-Rivera F, Field JA, Brown D, Sierra-Alvarez R. 2012. Fate of cerium dioxide (CeO2) nanoparticles in municipal wastewater during activated sludge treatment. Bioresource Technology, 108: 300–304.

Goonan TG. 2011. Rare Earth Elements-End Use and Recyclability, Reston, Virginia: s.n.

Gottschalk F, Scholz RW, Nowack B. 2010a. Probabilistic material flow modeling for assessing the environmental exposure to compounds: Methodology and an application to engineered nano- TiO2 particles. Environmental Modelling & Software; 25: 320-332.

Gottschalk F, Sonderer T, Scholz RW, Nowack B. 2009. Modeled environmental concentrations of engineered nanomaterials (TiO2, ZnO, Ag, CNT, fullerenes) for different regions. Environmental Science and Technololgy; 43: 9216-9222.

Gottschalk F, Sonderer T, Scholz RW, Nowack B. 2010b. Possibilities and Limitations of Modeling Environmental Exposure to Engineered Nanomaterials by Probabilistic Material Flow Analysis. Environ. Toxicol. Chem. 29: 1036-1048.

Gottschalk, F., Ort, C., Scholz, R.W., Nowack, B. 2011. Engineered nanomaterials in rivers – exposure scenarios for Switzerland at high spatial and temporal resolution Environmental Pollution 159: 3439-3445.

Graasbøll S, Toudal JK, Andersen J, Stentsøe S. 2010. Deponeringskapacitet i Danmark – i perioderne 2009 12 og 2013 – 20. Disposal capacity i Denmark - in 2009 -12 and 2013-20. Miljøprojekt 1318. Danish Environment Agency (in Danish).

Guidechem. 2013. http://www.guidechem.com/cas-133/1333-86-4.html.

Gyldendal. 2013. Den Store Danske (Encyklopædi) [The Comprehensive Danish Encyclopedia]. www.denstoredanske.dk.

Hansen OC, Færgemamm H, Møller S, Andersen LK, Poll C. 1997. Træbeskyttelsesmidler og imprægneret træ. Massestrømsanalyse, miljø- og sundhedsvurdering. Working Report from the Danish EPA 57/1997. The Danish Environmental Protection Agency.

Hansen E, Olsen S.2004. Livscyklusvurdering af deponeret affald [Life cycle assessment of landfilled waste]. Environmental Project No. 971. Miljøstyrelsen, 2004. The Danish Environmental Protection Agency.

Healy ML, Dahlben LJ, Isaacs, JA. 2008. Environmental assessment of single-walled carbon nanotube processes. Journal of Industrial Ecology 12: 376-393.

Hefei. 2013. Applications of nano-copper powder. Hefei Quantum Quelle Nano Science & Technology Co.,. At: Ltd. http://www.quantum-nano.com

Hendren CO, Mesnard X, Dröge J, Wiesner MR. 2011. Estimating Production Data for Five Engineered Nanomaterials As a Basis for Exposure Assessment. Environ. Sci. Technol.; 45: 2562-2569.

Hou L, Li K, Ding Y, Li Y, Chen J, Wu X, Li X, 2012. Removal of silver nanoparticles in simulated wastewater treatment processes and its impact on COD and NH4 reduction. Chemosphere 87: 248-252.

Hwang S, Martinez D, Perez P, Rinaldi C. 2011. Effect of surfactant-coated iron oxide nanoparticles on the effluent water quality from a simulated sequencing batch reactor treating domestic wastewater. Environmental Pollution 159: 3411-3415.

ICBA, 2014. Carbon Black User's Guide. Safety, Health, & Environmental Information, International Carbon Black Association. http://www.carbon-black.org/files/carbonblackuserguide.pdf.

ICBA. 2013. Overview of Uses. International Carbon Black Association. http://www.carbon-black.org/index.php/carbon-black-uses

Information, O. N. a., 2013. Sony's new A58 DSLR uses an SVGA OLED viewfinder, maker unknown. [Online] . Available at: http://www.oled-info.com/sonys-new-a58-dslr-uses-svga-oled-viewfinder-maker-unknown. [Senest hentet eller vist den 2013].

Institute MR. 1993. Locating and Estimating Air Emissions From Sources of Cadmium and Cadmium Compounds, North Carolina, USA.

Jafar G, Hamzeh G. 2013. Ecotoxicity of Nanomaterials in Soil. Annals of Biological Research; 4: 86-92.

Johnson AC, Bowes MJ, Crossley A, Jarvie HP, Jurkschat K, Jürgens MD, Lawlor AJ, Park B, Rowland P, Spurgeon D, Svendsen C, Thompson IP, Barnes RJ, Williams RJ, Xu N., 2011. An assessment of the fate, behaviour and environmental risk associated with sunscreen TiO(2) nanoparticles in UK field scenarios. Science of the Total Environment 409: 2503-2510.

Johnson AC, Park B. 2012. Predicting contamination by the fuel additive cerium oxide engineered nanoparticles within the United Kingdom and the associated risks, Wallingford, Oxfordshire, United Kingdom: Centre for Ecology and Hydrology.

Jung H, Kittelson DB, Zachariah MR. 2005. The influence of a cerium additive on ultrafine diesel particle emissions and kinetics of oxidation, Minneapolis, USA: Departments of Mechanical Engineering and Chemistry, University of Minnesota.

Kaegi R, Sinnet B, Zuleeg S, Hagendorfer H, Mueller E, Vonbank R, Boller M, Burkhardt M. 2010. Release of silver nanoparticles from outdoor facades. Environmental Pollution; 158: 2900-2905.

Kaegi R, Ulrich A, Sinnet B, Vonbank R, Wichser A, Zuleeg S, Simmler H, Brunner S, Vonmont H, Burkhardt M, Boller M. 2008. Synthetic TiO2 nanoparticle emission from exterior facades into the aquatic environment. Environ. Pollut.; 156: 233-239.

Kaegi R, Voegelin A, Sinnet B, Zuleeg S, Hagendorfer H, Burkhardt M, Siegrist H. 2011. Behavior of Metallic Silver Nanoparticles in a Pilot Wastewater Treatment Plant. Environmental Science & Technology; 45: 3902-3908.

Kannan N, White SM, Whelan MJ, 2007. Predicting diffuse-source transfers of surfactants to surface waters using SWAT. *Chemosphere*; 66: 1336-1345.

Kiaune L, Singhasemanon N. 2011. Pesticidal Copper (I) Oxide: Environmental fate and aquatic toxicity. Reviews of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 213: 1-26.

Kirkeby J, Gabriel S, Christensen TH. 2005. Miljøvurdering af genanvendelse og slutdisponering af spildevandsslam - en livscyklus screening af fire scenarier [Environmental assessment of recycling and disposal of sewage sludge - a lifecycle screening of four scenarios] (in Danish); Institute of Environment & Resources, DTU.

Kiser MA, Ladner DA, Hristovski KD, Westerhoff PK. 2012. Nanomaterial Transformation and Association with Fresh and Freeze-Dried Wastewater Activated Sludge: Implications for Testing Protocol and Environmental Fate. Environmental Science & Technology 46: 7046-7053.

Kiser MA, Ryu H, Jang H, Hristovski K, Westerhoff P. 2010. Biosorption of nanoparticles to heterotrophic wastewater biomass. Water Research 44: 4105-4114.

Kiser MA, Westerhoff P, Benn T, Wang Y, Perez-Rivera J, Hristovski K. 2009. Titanium Nanomaterial Removal and Release from Wastewater Treatment Plants. Environmental Science & Technology; 43: 6757–6763.

KL & Ministry of the Environment (2010). Rapportering fra arbejdsgruppe om spildevandsindsats i forhøring af vandplaner/indsatsprogrammer [Report from a working group regarding the performance related to sewage treatment as part of the consultations in connection with the planning in the water sector]. Organisation of the Municipalities (KL) & Ministry of the Environment.(in Danish)

Lassen C, Drivsholm T, Hansen E, Rasmussen B, Christensen K. 1996. Miljøprojekt 323. Danish Environmental Protection Agency.

Lassen C, Vaaben S and Hansen E. 1999. Massestrømsanalyse for tin med særligt fokus på organotinforbindelser. Arbejdsrapport fra Miljøstyrelsen nr. 7/1997.

Lem KW, Choudhury A, Lakhani, AA, Kuyate, P, Haw, JR, Lee, DS, Iqbal Z, Brumlik CJ. 2012. Use of Nanosilver in Consumer Products. Recent Patents on Nanotechnology 6: 60-72.

Limbach LK, Bereiter R, Müller E, Krebs R, Gälli R, Stark WJ. 2008. Removal of oxide nanoparticles in a model wastewater treatment plant: Influence of agglomeration and surfactants on clearing efficiency. Environmental Science & Technology 42: 5828-5833.

LLC, B. R., 2011. Quantum Dots: Global Market Growth and Future Commercial Prospects. [Online] Available at: http://www.bccresearch.com/market-research/nanotechnology/quantum-dots-market-prospects-nan027c.html .

Lombi E, Donner E, Tavakkoli E, Turney TW, Naidu R, Miller BW, Scheckel KG. (2012). Fate of Zinc Oxide Nanoparticles during Anaerobic Digestion of Wastewater and Post-Treatment Processing of Sewage Sludge. Environmental Science & Technology; 46: 9089-9096.

Lorenz C, Windler L, von Goetz N, Lehmann RP, Schuppler M, Hungerbühler K, Heuberger M, Nowack B. 2012. Characterization of silver release from commercially available functional (nano)textiles. Chemosphere; 89: 817-824.

Lowry MS, Hubble DR, Wressell AL, Vratsanos MS, Pepe FR, Hegedus CR. 2008. Assessment of UV-permeability in nano-ZnO filled coatings via high throughput experimentation. Journal of Coatings Technology and Research 5, 233-239.

Mahendra DS. 2009. Finding a home in Los Angeles and at UCLA. Civil & Environmental Engineering.

Majestic BJ, Erdakos GB, Lewandowski M, Oliver KD, Willis RD, Kleindienst TE, Bhave PV. 2010. A review of selected engineered nanoparticles in the atmosphere: sources, transformations, and techniques for sampling and analysis. Int J Occup Environ Health; 16:488-507.

Mayer U B E A (ed.). 2008. Particle Filter Retrofit for all Diesel Engines With 319 Illustrations and 40 tables. Expert Verlag.

Mikkelsen S, Hansen E, Baun A, Hansen SF, Binderup M-L. 2011. Survey on basic knowledge about exposure and potential environmental and health risks for selected nanomaterials. Environmental Project No. 1370. Danish EPA, Copenhagen.

Miljøstyrelsen, 2003. Indsamlingssystemer for batterier. [Online] Available at: http://www2.mst.dk/common/Udgivramme/Frame.asp?http://www2.mst.dk/udgiv/Publikationer/2003/87-7972-510-4/html/helepubl.htm.

Miljøstyrelsen, 2005. Status for batteriområdet i Danmark. [Online] Available at: <u>http://www2.mst.dk/common/Udgivramme/Frame.asp?http://www2.mst.dk/udgiv/publikationer/2005/87-7614-630-8/html/kap03.htm</u>.

Miljøstyrelsen, 2009. ISAG Udtræksmodul. [Online] . Available at: http://www2.mst.dk/databaser/isag/Default.asp.

Mudgal S, Le Guern Y, Tinetti B, Chanoine A, Pahal S, Witte F. 2011. Comparative Life-Cycle Assessment of nickel-cadmium (NiCd) batteries used in Cordless Power Tools (CPTs) vs. their alternatives nickel-metal hydride (NiMH) and lithium-ion (Li-ion) batteries, Paris, France: BIO Intelligence Service.

Mueller NC, Buha J, Wang J, Ulrich A, Nowack, B. 2013. Modeling the flows of engineered nanomaterials during waste handling. Environmental Science-Processes & Impacts 15: 251-259.

Müller NC, Nowack B. 2010. Nano zero valent iron – THE solution for water and soil remediation? ObservatoryNANO focus report 2010.

NanoIron. (2013). http://www.nanoiron.cz/. Accessed 17 June 2013.

Naturstyrelsen. 2012. Punktkilder 2011.

Navarro DA, Banerjee S, Watson DF, Aga DS, 2011. Differences in Soil Mobility and Degradability between Water-Dispersible CdSe and CdSe/ZnS Quantum Dots. Environmental Science & Technology, 45: 6343-6349.

Nightingale P, Morgan M, Rafols I, van Zwanenberg P, 2008. Nanomaterials Innovation Systems: Their Structure, Dynamics and Regulation. Report for the Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution (RCEP). SPRU, Science and Technology Policy Research Freeman Centre, University of Sussex, UK, Sussex.

O'Brien NJ, Cummins EJ. 2010. A Risk Assessment Framework for Assessing Metallic Nanomaterials of Environmental Concern: Aquatic Exposure and Behavior. *Risk Analysis* 31: 706-726.

OECD. 2006. Carbon black. SIDS initial assessment report for carbon black; CAS No. 1333-86-4. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris.

OECD. 2009. Emission scenario documents on coating industry (Paints, Laquers and Varnishes). OECD series on emission scenario documents. Number 22. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris.

Osmose. 2013. Personal communication with Lars Nyborg, Osmose Danmark A/S, March 2008.

Park B, Donaldson K, Duffin R, Tran L, Kelly F, Mudway I, Morin JP, Guest R, Jenkinson P, Samaras Z, Giannouli M, Kouridis H, Martin P. 2008. Hazard and Risk Assessment of a Nanoparticulate Cerium Oxide-Based Diesel Fuel Additive—A Case Study. Inhal Toxicol;20(6):547-566.

Piccinno F, Gottschalk F, Seeger S, Nowack B. 2012. Industrial Production Quantities and Uses of Ten Engineered Nanomaterials in Europe and the World. Journal of Nanoparticle Research; 14: 1109.

Pira (2010). The future of carbon black to 2015 - global market forecasts. Pira International Ltd, Leatherhead, Surrey,

Praetorius A, Scheringer M, Hungerbühler K. 2012. Development of Environmental Fate Models for Engineered Nanoparticles—A Case Study of TiO2 Nanoparticles in the Rhine River. Environmental Science & Technology; 46: 6705-6713.

Praetorius A, Gottschalk F, Scheringer M, Sani-Kast N, Nowack B, Hungerbuehler K., *in rev.* Modelling the fate of titanium dioxide, silver and zinc oxide nanoparticles in Swiss rivers at high spatial resolution<sup>†</sup>. *Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts*.

Preston A, Jin L, Nicholas D, Zahora A, Walcheski P, Archer K, Schultz T. 2008. Field Stake Tests with Copper-based Preservatives. Paper prepared for the IRG 39<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting, Istanbul, Turkey, 25-29 May 2008.

QDVision, u.d. Product Safety. [Online]. Available at: http://www.qdvision.com/content1583- [Senest hentet eller vist den 2013].

Ray PC, Yu HT, Fu PP. 2009. Toxicity and Environmental Risks of Nanomaterials: Challenges and Future Needs. *Journal of Environmental Science and Health Part C-Environmental Carcinogenesis & Ecotoxicology Reviews* 27: 1-35.

READE, 2013. http://www.reade.com.

Reijnders L. 2005. Disposal, uses and treatments of combustion ashes: a review. Resources Conservation and Recycling 43: 313-336.

Ren G, Hu D, Cheng EW, Vargas-Reus MA, Reip P, Allaker RP. 2009. Characterisation of copper oxide nanoparticles for antimicrobial applications. Int J Antimicrob Agents, 33:587-590.

RenoDjurs I/S. 2013. Redegørelse om miljø, arbejdsmiljø og kvalitet for 2012 [Report on environment, occupational health and quality 2012] (in Danish). RenoDjurs I/S.

Robichaud CO, Uyar AE, Darby MR, Zucker LG, Wiesner MR. 2009. Estimates of Upper Bounds and Trends in Nano-TiO2 Production As a Basis for Exposure Assessment. Environmental Science & Technology; 43: 4227-4233.

Sahasrabudhe N. 2010. Chemical Information Call-in Candidate: Nano Silver Department of Toxic Substances control; San Francisco.

Scheringer M, MacLeod M, Behra R, Sigg L, Hungerbuehler K. 2010. Environmental risks associated with nanoparticulate silver used as biocide. Household & Personal Care Today 1: 34-37.

Schmid K, Riediker M. 2008. Use of nanoparticles in Swiss industry: A targeted survey. Environ. Sci. Technol.; 42: 2253-2260.

Sengül H, Theis TL. 2009. Life Cycle Inventory of Semiconductor Cadmium Selenide Quantum Dots for Environmental Applications. Nanotechnology Applications for Clean Water, p. 561–582.

Siddique SN. 2013. Simulation of mobility and retention of selected engineered nanoparticles beneath landfills, London, Ontario, Canada: The University of Western Ontario.

SIGMA, 2013. http://www.sigmaaldrich.com/catalog/product/aldrich/704121?lang=de&region=CH.

Slaveykova V I, Startchev K. 2009. Effect of natural organic matter and green microalga on carboxyl-polyethylene glycol coated CdSe/ZnS quantum dots stability and transformations under freshwater conditions. Environmental Pollution; 157: 3445–3450.

Sørensen G et al. In press 2014. Prevalence and effects of nano-sized anatase titanium dioxide. Environmental Projects, Danish Environmental Protection Agency.

Statestik D, 2012. Danmark i tal 2012, København: Rosendahls-Schultz.

Statistics Denmark (2013). [Danmarks Statistik]. www.statistikbanken.dk

Steinfeldt M, Gottschalk F, Wigger H, von Gleicha A. 2013. Environmental exposure to engineered nanomaterial from four applications: nanoTiO2 in paint, nanoZnO in glass coatings, MWCNT in epoxy plates, and nanocellulose as a paper additive, Project report of the work package 4 of the NanoSustain project. Bremen.

Stirling R, Drummond J, Zhang Z, Ziobro RJ. 2008. Micro-Distribution of Micronized Copper in Southern Pine. Paper prepared for the IRG 39<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting, Istanbul, Turkey, 25-29 May 2008.

Sun TY, Gottschalk F, Hungerbühler K, Nowack B. 2014. Comprehensive probabilistic modelling of environmental emissions of engineered nanomaterials. Environmental Pollution 185: 69-76.

Tardif F, Gaultier V, Shuster F. 2012. International conference on safe production and use of nanomaterials, Minatec, Grenoble, France: www.nanosafe.org.

Tiede K, Boxall ABA, Wang X, Gore D, Tiede D, Baxter M, David H, Tear SP, Lewis J. 2010. Application of hydrodynamic chromatography-ICP-MS to investigate the fate of silver nanoparticles in activated sludge. Journal of Analytical Atomic Spectrometry 25: 1149-1154.

Tønning K, Poulsen M. 2007. Nanotechnology in the Danish industry – Survey on production and application. Environmental Project No. 1206 2007. Danish Environmental Protection Agency.

## Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2015, 12

U.S. Research Nanomaterials, 2013. Copper (Cu) Nanopowder / Nanoparticles (Cu, 99.9%, 70nm, metal basis. U.S. Research Nanomaterials, Inc., 2013. Web site: http://www.us-nano.com/inc/sdetail/160

US EPA 2009. Nano-Enabled Environmental Applications for Radionuclides. Office of Radiation and Indoor Air Radiation Protection Division (6608J). EPA 402-R-09-002.

US EPA. 2010a. Nanomaterial Case Studies: Nanoscale Titanium Dioxide in Water Treatment and in Topical Sunscreen.Federal Register.US Environmental Protection Agency.Report EPA/600/R-09/057F., pp. 38188-38190.

US EPA. 2010b. Nanomaterial Case Study: Nanoscale Silver in Disinfectant Spray, External Review Draft. US Environmental Protection Agency. US EPA report EPA/600/R-10/081.

US EPA. 2012. Nanomaterial Case Studies: Nanoscale Titanium Dioxide in Water Treatment and in Topical Sunscreen. US Environmental Protection Agency.

Virksomhedernes Miljøguide (Environmental guide for entreprises) (2013): Slagger fra affaldsforbrændingsanlæg (Bottom ash from waste incinerators).

Walser T, Limbach LK, Brogioli R, Erismann E, Flamigni L, Hattendorf B, Juchli M, Krumeich F, Ludwig C, Prikopsky K, Rossier M, Saner D, Sigg A, Hellweg S, Günther D, Stark WJ. 2012a. Persistence of engineered nanoparticles in a municipal solid-waste incineration plant. Nat Nano; 7: 520-524.

Walser T, Limbach LK, Brogioli R, Erismann E, Flamigni L, Hattendorf B, Juchli M, Krumeich F, Ludwig C, Prikopsky K, Rossier M, Saner D, Sigg A, Hellweg S, Guenther D, Stark WJ. 2012. Persistence of engineered nanoparticles in a municipal solid-waste incineration plant. Nature Nanotechnology 7: 520-524.

Walser, T., Gottschalk, F., 2014. Stochastic fate analyis of engineered nanoparticles in incineration plants. Journal of Cleaner Production. 80, 241-251.

Wang Y, Westerhoff P, Hristovski KD. 2012. Fate and biological effects of silver, titanium dioxide, and C-60 (fullerene) nanomaterials during simulated wastewater treatment processes. Journal of Hazardous Materials 201: 16-22.

Wang ZL. 2004. Zinc oxide nanostructures: growth, properties and applications. Journal of Physics-Condensed Matter 16, R829-R858.

Weir A, Westerhoff P, Fabricius L, Hristovski K, von Goetz N. 2012. Titanium dioxide nanoparticles in food and personal care products. Environ Sci Technol; 46(4):2242-2250.

Westerhoff P, Song GX, Hristovski K, Kiser MA. 2011. Occurrence and removal of titanium at full scale wastewater treatment plants: implications for TiO(2) nanomaterials. Journal of Environmental Monitoring; 13: 1195-1203.

Westerhoff PK, Kiser MA, Hristovsk K. 2013. Nanomaterial Removal and Transformation During Biological Wastewater Treatment. Environmental Engineering Science; 30(3): 109-117.

Wijnhoven S, Dekkers S, Hagens WI, de Jong WH. 2009. Exposure to nanomaterials in consumer products, Bilthoven: National Institute for Public Health and the Environment.

Wikimedia, 2013. http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/1/13/Zinc\_oxide.jpg.

Wikipedia, 2013. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Mutr-nanotubes1.jpg.

Windler L, Height M, Nowack, B. 2013. Comparative evaluation of antimicrobials for textile applications. Environment International 53: 62-73.

Woodrow Wilson Institute. 2008. An inventory of nanotechnology-based consumer products currently on the market.

## Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2015, 12

Woodrow Wilson Institute. 2012. The Project on Emerging Nanotechnology Inventory.

WWI, 2012. The Project on Emerging Nanotechnology Inventory.

Zhang Y, Chen YS, Westerhoff P, Hristovski K, Crittenden JC. 2008. Stability of commercial metal oxide nanoparticles in water. Water Research 42: 2204-2212.

Zhang, S., Saebfar, H., 2010. Chemical Information Call-in Candidate: Nano Zinc Oxide, Department of Toxic Substances Control, California, San Francisco.

Zhao D, Chan A, Ljungström E. 2005. Performance study of 48 road-aged commercial threeway catalytic converters, Göteborg, Sweden: Department of Chemistry, Göteborg University.