

ANAVE – Circular de Régimen Interior

Madrid, 7 de marzo de 2019
Ref. SMA 6/2019/MC

Asunto: Japón publica un estudio y no prohibirá el uso de scrubbers de ciclo abierto en sus aguas y puertos

Muy Srs. nuestros:

El ministerio de Transporte, Territorio, Infraestructuras y Turismo de Japón ha anunciado recientemente que no prohibirá el uso de los depuradores de gases de escape (*scrubbers*) de ciclo abierto en sus puertos ni en sus aguas.

Este anuncio tuvo lugar en la primera conferencia técnica organizada *Clean Shipping Association* (CSA2020) en Londres, en paralelo con una reunión del subcomité PPR6 de la OMI. En la misma se presentaron dos estudios, uno de la propia administración japonesa y otro elaborado por CSA2020 y Carnival, y verificado por DNV GL, cuyos análisis han dado como resultado contenidos de sustancias contaminantes muy por debajo de los admitidos por la OMI y otras normas reglamentarias de diferentes ámbitos.

El estudio japonés analizó el impacto de las descargas de agua de lavado de los *scrubbers* en la calidad del agua a lo largo de 10 años y evaluó la toxicidad total de los efluentes en algas, crustáceos y peces, analizando en particular las concentraciones de Hidrocarburos Aromáticos Policíclicos (HAP) y los resultados confirmaron que no se producía una concentración suficiente como para afectar a los organismos marinos a corto o largo plazo.

Respecto de las descargas de metales pesados, sobre la cual había hasta ahora muy poca información, a falta de un criterio establecido para el medio marino, ya que la OMI no establece ninguno en sus Directrices de 2015, el informe utilizó la norma japonesa para las descargas desde tierra y determinó que “la cantidad de metales pesados medida en el agua de descarga de los scrubbers fue del orden de la centésima parte de la admisible por la norma aplicable en Japón a descargas desde tierra”.

La decisión del ministerio japonés, además del resultado del estudio de que el agua de lavado de estos dispositivos no supone una “amenaza significativa” para el medio marino, tiene en cuenta varias razones por las que considera que el uso de fueloil pesado combinado con *scrubbers* es una solución preferible a los combustibles de menos de 0,5% de azufre.

En primer lugar, porque el uso de los scrubbers disminuye las emisiones a la atmósfera de los HAP, que son, junto con la materia particulada (PM) y los óxidos de azufre (SOx), las más dañinas para la salud pública. Los combustibles con bajo contenido de azufre reducen las emisiones de PM y SOx, pero mantienen las emisiones de HAP al mismo nivel que los convencionales.

Hay razones económicas también importantes: los *scrubbers* contribuirán a reducir el impacto del aumento de demanda de productos destilados y a sostener la de fueloil pesado, facilitando así una transición menos brusca a las nuevas normas.

El segundo estudio, presentado por CSA2020 y Carnival, obtiene conclusiones similares. Éste analizó un total de 281 muestras de agua de lavado procedentes de 53 buques de cruceros equipados con scrubbers. El análisis de estas muestras determinó que sus parámetros estaban por debajo de los límites de las normas de la UE y Alemania para emisiones de aguas residuales de fuentes industriales basadas en tierra. Para el director general de CSA2020 este estudio proporciona una evaluación objetiva sobre el agua de lavado de los scrubbers de ciclo abierto y los resultados obtenidos “confirman que esta tecnología es eficaz y segura para el medio ambiente marino”.

Aunque aún no disponemos del informe completo, adjuntamos como **Anexo** una serie de diapositivas (en inglés) que resumen los resultados del informe del ministerio de Transporte japonés y que se utilizaron para su presentación en Londres, que esperamos sean de su interés.

Muy cordialmente

Manuel Carlier
Director General

-----<<<
Confidencialidad: La información contenida en esta circular es confidencial y va dirigida exclusivamente a las empresas navieras asociadas a ANAVE para su uso interno. La copia o distribución pública, incluso por parte de las propias empresas asociadas, está en principio prohibida, salvo autorización expresa de ANAVE. En particular, queda expresamente prohibida la difusión de esta información por medios de comunicación pública escritos o electrónicos. Si por error recibe este e-mail se ruega su comunicación al remitente y su inmediata destrucción, no debiéndose enviar a otro destinatario.

Confidentiality: *The information contained in this message is confidential and addressed to ANAVE's member companies for their internal use only. Any dissemination or copying of this information, even by the member companies is in principle prohibited, unless expressly authorised by ANAVE. In particular, it is strictly forbidden the publication of this information by public media, either written or electronic. If you receive this message by error then you may not copy or deliver this message to anyone, but please destroy this message and notify us immediately.*

Advertencia de seguridad: Este mensaje ha sido comprobado por un sistema antivirus interno y externo regularmente actualizado. En todo caso, compruebe que todos los mensajes que recibe son filtrados por su propio sistema de seguridad antes de su apertura.

Security warning: *This email has been scanned for viruses by our regularly updated email security systems but, in accordance with good computer practice, please ensure that all messages received are checked by your own security systems before opening.*

>>>-----

Washwater discharge from open-looped SO_x scrubber system


19/2/2019

Ministry of Land, Infrastructure,
Transport and Tourism (MLIT),
JAPAN

1. Introduction
2. Basic understandings of the risks to human health and marine environment by SO_x emission
3. Investigation on the effects of discharged water from scrubber
4. Conclusion

1. Introduction

% Sulphur Cap by Region



MARPOL Annex VI Regulation 14
Sulphur Oxides and Particulate Matter (SOx & PM)

3.5% High-Sulphur Fuel Oil (HSFO)



Low sulfur fuel oil




- 0.5% bunker fuel oil
- Marine Gasoil (MGO)

LNG-fuelled ship






PM, NOx and CO2 can also be reduced

Scrubber (EGCS)




Enable to use 3.5% HSFO


	Open-Looped	Closed-Looped	Hybrid
Diagram			
Wash water	Sea water	Dedicated water (usually fresh water)	Sea water or dedicated water
Characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple device • Discharge water 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More complicated system than open type • Few discharge water 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable to switch between open and closed mode

2. Basic understandings of the risks to human health and marine environment by SO_x emission

Before Sulphur reduction


Secondary production of Particles Matter 2.5 of sulphates in the atmospheric conditions





After Sulphur reduction with **Low sulphur fuel oil**


Reduced SO_x -----> Reduced PM_{2.5}



Risks by PM_{2.5} will be mitigated **but** there is still potential risk to human health exposed by **PAHs**

SO_x, PM (and others) emission reduction by **Open-looped scrubber**

Reduced SO_x -----> Reduced PM_{2.5}



Concentration in the receiving sea

1. Na⁺ 19.35 g/kg
2. Cl⁻ 10.76 g/kg
3. SO₄²⁻ 2.71 g/kg

• NO detectable changes in pH or in sulphate.

• How about risks of PAHs?



3. Investigation on the effects of discharged water from scrubber

Simulation for Dilution of discharged water from stern

- Using CFD model, the strength of the turbulent flow with vortex (swirls) behind the hull of Panamax (82,000 DWT) was estimated, and then theoretical dilution rate was calculated.
- The worst cased discharge water flow from scrubber (main engines operated at MCR) is assumed for this simulation.

Result . The calculated dilution rate, according to the duration time after discharge

Duration time(sec)	0.1	0.2	0.3	2.6	5.3	7.4	59.5	108.1	129
dilution rate	40	60	80	500	800	1,000	5,000	8,500	9,661

- The time to reach **500 folds dilution** is estimated around **3 seconds** after its discharge.
- The time to reach **5,000 folds dilution** is estimated about **1 minute** after its discharge.

The result of Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)

	Algae (micro algae)	Invertebrates (crustacean)	Vertebrate (fish)
	diatom (Skeletonema costatum) 	Ptilohyale (Hyalé barbicornis) 	Adrianichthyidae (Oryzias javanicus) 
Acute endpoint	49% (EC 50)	<u>20%</u> (5 folds dilution) (LC 50)	35% (LC 50)
Exposure time	72 hours	96 hours	96 hours

LC: Lethal Concentration
 EC: Effect Concentration

Assignment of Assessment Factors(AF) used for deriving PNEC values (Methodology for information gathering and conduct of work of the GESAMP-BWWG)

Data-set	Assessment Factor	
	PNEC general	PNEC near ship
Lowest short-term LC50 from freshwater or marine species representing one or two trophic levels	10,000	1,000
Lowest short-term LC50 from three freshwater or marine species representing three trophic levels	1,000	100
Lowest short-term LC50 from three freshwater or marine species representing three trophic levels + at least two short term LC50 from additional marine taxonomic groups	100	10
Lowest chronic NOEC from one freshwater or marine species representing one trophic level, but not including micro-algae	100	
Lowest chronic NOEC from two freshwater or marine species representing two trophic levels, which may include micro-algae	50	
Lowest chronic NOEC from three freshwater or marine species representing one trophic level, but not including micro-algae	10	

The reasons for the assessment factor of 1000 are;
 10 for conversion from acute to chronic
 10 for cancelling the differed sensitivity among species
 10 for conversion from LC50 to PNEC

PNEC general: long-term PNEC
 PNEC near ship: short-term PNEC
 LC50: Lethal Concentration 50%

<u>LC 50 dilution rate</u>		<u>PNEC near ship (short term)</u>		<u>Safety dilution rate (short-term)</u>
		1/100	=	1/500
20% (1/5)	×	<u>PNEC general (long-term)</u>		<u>Safety dilution rate (long-term)</u>
		1/1000	=	1/5000

- The time to reach the dilution rate of **500 folds dilution** is estimated around **3 seconds (see slide 12)** after its discharge.

➡ Any-short term adverse effects could not be expected because possible exposure time is significantly shorter than that of WET (ie. 96 hours, as shown in slide 12).

- The time to reach the dilution rate of **5,000 folds dilution** is estimated about **1 minute (see slide 12)** after its discharge.

➡ Any-long term adverse effects could not be expected because the dilution and diffusion will be continued.

➡ Japan concluded that either any short- or long-term effects on marine organisms cannot be caused by the use of open-looped scrubber.

1. Targeted substances for the prediction of long-term concentration

pH, Nitrate, and Chemical oxygen demand (COD) are selected by the screening process for the simulations

Substances analyzed		Unit	Discharge water
PAH	Naphthalene	µg/L	0.006
	2-methylnaphthalene	µg/L	0.006
	1-methylnaphthalene	µg/L	<0.01
	Biphenyl	µg/L	<0.005
	Acenaphthylene	µg/L	<0.005
	Acenaphthene	µg/L	<0.005
	Fluorene	µg/L	<0.005
	Dibenzothiophene	µg/L	<0.005
	Phenanthrene	µg/L	0.006
	Anthracene	µg/L	<0.005
	Fluoranthene	µg/L	<0.005
	Pyrene	µg/L	0.007
	Benz[a]anthracene	µg/L	0.006
	Chrysene	µg/L	<0.005
	Benzo[b]fluoranthene	µg/L	0.012
	Benzo[k]fluoranthene	µg/L	<0.005
	Benzo[a]pyrene	µg/L	0.014
	Perylene	µg/L	<0.005
	Indeno[1,2,3-cd]pyrene	µg/L	<0.005
	Dibenz[a,h]anthracene	µg/L	0.006
Benzo[ghi]perylene	µg/L	0.014	

The amount of detected PAHs respectively was only slightly above their detection limits

Substance	unit	Actual Concentration of heavy metal	Discharge criteria for onland sources
Vanadium	µg/L	58	No criterion
Nickel	µg/L	17.9	No criterion
Iron	µg/L	997	10000
Zink	µg/L	48.3	2000
Lead	µg/L	1.755	100
Cupper	µg/L	8.12	3000
Cadmium	µg/L	0.035	30
Chrome	µg/L	22.8	2000
Arsenic	µg/L	1.02	100

The actual amount of heavy metals in the discharge water from scrubber were substantially less than the emission standard for on land sources in Japan, by order on 100.

2. Selected sea areas for prediction of long-term concentration

Seto sea, Ise sea and Tokyo Bay were selected in terms of their enclosed conditions and ship congestion



3. Condition for the prediction

10 years accumulated concentration of the substances under the worst-cased scenario(※) were estimated.

(※) All ships in these areas will be equipped with open-looped scrubber and will discharge the wash water

Results of the calculation of the concentration for 10 years and comparison with the actual concentration as of 2015


Item	Additional Accumulated concentration after 10 years		
	Tokyo Bay	Ise Bay	Seto Inland Sea
pH	NO changes (※) (current rage pH 8.3)	NO changes (※) (current rage pH 8.2)	NO changes (※) (current rage pH 8.1)
Nitrate-nitrogen (mg/L)	7.34×10^{-4} (current rage 0.27-0.74)	5.30×10^{-5} (current rage 0.29-0.54)	2.01×10^{-3} (current rage 0.14-0.71)
COD(mg/L)	3.85×10^{-4} (current rage 2.2-2.9)	8.11×10^{-7} (current rage 2.4-3.5)	9.62×10^{-4} (current rage 1.8-2.7)

※ The pH changes caused by the accumulated concentration of sulphates ion and nitrates ion is less than 0.0035.


The accumulated concentration by the concerned substances in wash water is less than the current concentration in the respective target areas, by order of 100. (In case only 5% of the ships are installed with scrubbers, the accumulated concentration is less by order of 2000.)

- Scrubbers enable to mitigate potential risks to **human health** by reducing harmful substances; **not only SOx and PM, but also PAHs and other materials** that would otherwise be emitted into the atmospheric air.
- Japanese government assessed the potential risks to **marine environment** by discharged water from scrubber.
- Japan concluded that **the discharge water with chemical substances such as SOx, PAHs and heavy metals can NOT cause unacceptable effects either on the marine organisms or on the seawater quality around Japan.**
- Therefore, Japan is of the position that there would **NOT be a scientific justification to prohibit the use of open-looped scrubber**, as long as the IMO's discharge criteria were met.

Which is better?



Sulphur 0.5% Fuel Oil
WITHOUT Scrubber



Sulphur 3.5% Fuel Oil
WITH Scrubber

H⁺
SO₄²⁻
PAHs?

etc