



Department for  
Business, Energy  
& Industrial Strategy

# The United Kingdom Risk-Based Approach Programme

A risk-based approach to the management of produced water discharges from offshore installations.

Version 3.1

December 2020



© Crown copyright 2020

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit [nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3](https://nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3) or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

Where we have identified any third-party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at: [bst@beis.gov.uk](mailto:bst@beis.gov.uk)

## Contents

1.	Introduction .....	6
2.	Implementation of the Risk Based Approach.....	9
2.1	Step 1, Sampling and Analysis of Produced Water .....	9
2.2	Step 2, Tier 1: Screening based on PBT (Optional assessment).....	10
2.3	Step 3, Tier 2: Determination of Whole Effluent PEC:PNEC Ratio at 500 metres using an Average Dilution Factor.....	10
2.4	Step 4, Tier 3: Determination of Whole Effluent PEC:PNEC Ratio using Dispersion Modelling .....	12
2.5	Step 5, Tier 4: Determination of PEC:PNEC Ratio based on naturally occurring substances and added chemicals .....	14
2.6	Step 6, Produced Water Management .....	15
2.7	Demonstration of Best Available Technique and Best Environmental Practice.....	17
2.8	Repeat assessments .....	17
3.	References .....	18
	Annex 1 OSPAR Recommendation 2012/5.....	19
	Annex 2 OSPAR Agreement 2012/7 .....	30
	Annex 3 RBA Implementation Schedule .....	51
	Annex 4 Modelling, DREAM, PECs, PNECs and PEC:PNEC Ratios .....	54

## Figures and Tables

### Figures

Figure 1-1	UK methodology for RBA (Chemical permit holder requirements).....	8
------------	---	---

### Tables

Table 2-1	Criteria for identification of PBT and vPvB substances .....	10
Table 2-2	Derivation of dilution factors .....	11
Table 2-3	Tier 2 outputs required in RBA report .....	12
Table 2-4	Modelling data inputs summary table .....	13

## Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Definitions
°C	Degrees Celsius
BAT	Best available technique
BEIS	Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy
BCF	Bio-concentration factor
BEP	Best environmental practice
Cefas	Centre for Environment, Fisheries & Aquaculture Science
CHARM	Chemical hazard assessment and risk management
CMR	Carcinogenic, mutagenic or reprotoxic
DECC	Department of Energy and Climate Change
DF	Dilution Factor
DREAM	Dose related risks and effects assessment model
d	Day
ECB	European Chemicals Bureau
ECHA	European Chemicals Agency
EIF	Environmental impact factor
EQS	Environmental Quality Standard
km	Kilometre
LOD	Limit of detection
m	Metre
m <sup>3</sup> /day	Cubic metres per day
m <sup>3</sup> /yr	Cubic meters per year
MEG	Monoethylene glycol
mg/l	Milligrammes per litre
NCIMB	National Collection of Industrial Food and Marine Bacteria
NOEC	No Observed Effect Concentration
NOS	Naturally Occurring Substance
O&GUK	Oil and Gas UK
OIC	OSPAR Offshore Industry Committee
OSPAR	Oslo and Paris Commission
PBT	Persistent, bioaccumulative or toxic
PEC	Predicted environmental concentration
PLONOR	Poses little or no risk
PNEC	Predicted no effect concentration
ppb	Parts per billion

<b>Abbreviations</b>	<b>Definitions</b>
Ppt	Parts Per thousand
RBA	Risk based approach
REACH	Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemical Substances
TGD	Technical Guidance Document
t/m <sup>3</sup>	Tonnes per metre cubed
UK	United Kingdom
UKCS	United Kingdom Continental Shelf
vPvB	Very persistent and/or very bioaccumulative
WEA	Whole effluent assessment
WET	Whole effluent toxicity

## 1. Introduction

The Oslo and Paris Commission (OSPAR) Recommendation 2012/5 required Contracting Parties to implement a risk-based approach (RBA) for the management of produced water discharges from offshore installations. Guidance related to the Recommendation can be found in OSPAR Agreement 2012/7. It was up to individual Contracting Parties to develop an implementation programme within the framework described in the Recommendation and Agreement. Copies of the Recommendation and the Agreement are appended at Annex 1 and 2, respectively. OSPAR contracting parties are expected to report on the effectiveness of the implementation of a risk-based approach for the management of produced water discharge from offshore installations by 2023. One of the requirements of the Recommendation is to determine the effectiveness of the approach every five years, and therefore offshore installations with a produced water discharge may be required to take part in future RBA assessment programmes.

The RBA is based on the use of a standard method to calculate the predicted environmental concentration (PEC) and the predicted no effect concentration (PNEC) of the discharge, or components of the discharge, with an acceptance criterion of a PEC:PNEC ratio of  $\leq 1$  within a specified volume or area of water, which is taken to indicate there will be no adverse effects to the marine environment from the discharge. This mirrors the current approach used to implement the OSPAR Harmonised Mandatory Control System for the use and discharge of offshore chemicals, using the Chemical Hazard Assessment and Risk Management (CHARM) model, the Dose Related Risks and Effects Assessment Model (DREAM) or any other approved dispersion model, and it is generally accepted that this approach is a good indicator of whether chemical discharges are likely to result in adverse effects to the marine environment.

This guidance provides an update to the UK RBA implementation programme approach, which is summarised in Figure 1-1. The programme still involves six steps, covering four assessment tiers. The update to the guidance now means that an installation with a permit to discharge produced water will not need to complete all four assessment tiers, if certain criteria are met, which could allow a permit holder to screen out an installation from further assessment tiers (further details regarding screening are provided under the relevant sections). If during the RBA programme an installation meets the RBA cut off criteria at Tier 3 or less (Figure 1-1) then that installation can be removed from the next RBA programme, unless there is a change in operations that may increase the risk associated with the produced water discharge.

Installations on the UK Continental Shelf (UKCS) that have not previously undertaken an RBA assessment and have a permit to discharge produced water or have a permit for the contingency discharge of produced water in the event of produced water re-injection downtime are included in the RBA programme for 2021.

Installations selected for inclusion in the RBA programme commencing in 2023 has been based on the results from the RBA implementation phase. Only those installations with implementation phase results that would not allow the installation to be screened out at Tier 3 or below are included in the programme commencing in 2023. If the risk associated with a produced water discharge for an installation not currently included on programme commencing in 2023 is likely to have increased, then that installation may be added to the timetable for the programme, but only following discussions with the permit holder.


A requirement of the UK RBA implementation phase programme, under Step 6, was for the permit holder to identify any measures that could reduce the risk associated with the produced water discharges from their installations. For the installations included in programme commencing in 2023 the permit holder therefore needs to identify risk reduction measures, in accordance with Step 6 of this guidance, that could be implemented to reduce the risk associated with the produced water discharge from the installation. Risk reduction measures can include measures taken to reduce the risk as well as efforts to refine the risk assessment to reduce uncertainty. A report outlining the risk reduction measures must be submitted to the Department by the 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021 via email to [bst@beis.gov.uk](mailto:bst@beis.gov.uk). Any risk reduction measures identified in the RBA implementation phase report and already implemented should be included in the report. The RBA programme commencing in 2023 will therefore help to evaluate the effectiveness of any risk management measures undertaken to reduce the environmental risk associated with a produced water discharge and any effort to refine the risk assessment of a produced water discharge.

Installations that demonstrated during the RBA implementation phase that the risk associated with the produce water discharge was unlikely to have an adverse effect to the marine environment have not been included in the RBA programme commencing in 2023, unless the risk associated with the produced water discharge is likely to have increased due to change in operations.

A request can be submitted via e-mail to [bst@beis.gov.uk](mailto:bst@beis.gov.uk), to remove an installation from the RBA programme if the installation no longer discharges produced water or if it has a confirmed cessation of production (CoP) date during or before the next assessment period (2023-2025). Installations that re-inject all their produced water and halt production in the event of re-injection downtime (i.e. an installation that does not have a permit for the contingency discharge of produced water) will not be required to undertake an RBA assessment.

Lists of the Installations included in the RBA Programme commencing in 2021 and in 2023 and the installations not included in the programme are provided in Annex 3:

- a) A list of installations included in the RBA Programme commencing in 2021, see Table A3-1;
- b) A list of installations included in the RBA programme commencing in 2023 and required to complete Step 6 of the RBA assessment by 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021, see Table A3-2;
- c) A list of installations not included in the RBA programme commencing in 2023, see Table A3-3.



Note: \* Installations should only be screened out if the ratio derived using the guidance look up table and the site specific (if used) dilution factor (DF) are  $\leq 1$  (see Section 2.3).

\*\* Care is needed to ensure that the WET sample is representative of the discharge and additional consideration may be required for installations with more than one treatment or discharge stream (see Section 2.1).

Figure 1-1 UK methodology for RBA (Chemical permit holder requirements)



## 2. The UK Risk-Based Approach

### 2.1 Step 1, Sampling and Analysis of Produced Water

Offshore sampling of the produced water stream must be undertaken to collect samples for the determination of the concentrations of naturally occurring substances (NOS) in the produced water and the determination of the toxicity of the whole effluent. Chemical analysis of NOSs is an existing requirement, as part of the bi-annual testing programme, but the toxicity testing is only required when undertaking RBA assessments. The samples for both testing programmes must be collected at the same time and the chemical permit holder must ensure the samples are taken when conditions are representative of the discharge: i.e. when routine chemicals are in use as well as batch chemicals which are in regular use (regular use is taken as being in use at least once a month, see Section A4.7).

If the installation has more than one treatment stream with separate post-treatment discharge facilities, sampling must be replicated for the separate discharge streams. The separate streams should be modelled individually and in combination, to ensure it is possible to identify which produced water process stream is the biggest contributor to the risk. This is particularly important given the option to proceed directly from Step 4 (Tier 3 modelling) to Step 6 (Risk management) (see Figure 1-1).

Marine toxicity testing must be undertaken for at least three trophic levels. The use of vertebrate testing should be avoided as it is not required as one of the three trophic levels for an RBA assessment. BEIS does not specify which species should be used for the toxicity tests but would recommend the whole effluent testing to be undertaken using, at least, bacteria (such as MARA and LumiMARA), algae (such as *Skeletonema costatum*) and crustacea (such as *Acartia tonsa*), to mirror the testing regime used for the RBA trial undertaken in 2011 (NCIMB, 2011). A meeting of the O&GUK RBA Working Group on the UK RBA implementation confirmed that the participants supported a standardised approach to toxicity testing. MARA and LumiMARA are recommended in preference to the more conventional Microtox<sup>®</sup> bacterial test, as the trial study indicated that MARA and LumiMARA offered significant advantages over the single species Microtox<sup>®</sup> test. There are a number of commercial laboratories that are able to offer toxicity testing for three trophic levels, and the MARA and LumiMARA tests are available as standard kits that could be used by most laboratories.

The Whole Effluent Testing (WET) testing laboratory protocol for sampling and storage must be followed. The collected samples must be shipped to shore as quickly as possible and transferred to the relevant laboratory or laboratories for chemical analysis and marine toxicity testing. Work done during the UK RBA trial (NCMIB, 2011) indicated that there were slight increases in toxicity for the MARA/LumiMARA tests for aged samples (stored at 15°C for three weeks) compared to samples analysed within five days of sampling. As a minimum, representative samples must be analysed for the chemical determinands detailed in Section 9 of the BEIS guidance notes for sampling and analysis of produced water (BEIS, 2018).

When selecting a laboratory for chemical analysis the chemical permit holder must ensure that the proposed analysis method has suitable limits of detection (LODs). Ideally the LOD should be less than the PNEC for that determinand. However, it is acknowledged that in many cases this is not possible given the very low PNECs of some of the determinands. The OSPAR RBA group has established a list of PNEC values for the most common NOS in the produced water based on already existing environmental quality standards (EQSs) and PNECs, where available.

It is unnecessary to analyse the samples for any added offshore chemicals, but general information relating to the produced water discharge including volumes and details of the offshore chemicals being added to the produced water stream and their relevant dosage rates at the time of the sampling (including any batch treatments) should be recorded, as this information is required for subsequent steps in the process.

Samples can also be collected for persistence and bioaccumulation testing if chemical permit holders wish to investigate using the Tier 1 screening process detailed in Section 2.2.

Guidance in relation to sampling and analyses can be found in ECHA (2008), Roex *et al.* (2012) and NCIMB (2011).

## 2.2 Step 2, Tier 1: Screening based on PBT (Optional assessment)

This step is optional and there is no requirement for any permit holder to undertake part of the Tier 1 assessment. If full sampling to determine whether discharges are Persistent, Bio-accumulative and Toxic (PBT) has not been undertaken, then the RBA assessment process will continue at Step 3.

Tier 1 involves screening out produced water discharges that are not PBT. The Technical Guidance Document (TGD) on Risk Assessment (ECB, 2003) provides a methodology for deciding whether substances are PBT, or very Persistent and very Bio-accumulative (vPvB), and the criteria are summarised in Table 2-1.

**Table 2-1 Criteria for identification of PBT and vPvB substances**

Criterion	PBT criteria	vPvB-criteria
P	Half-life >60 days (d) in marine water or >40 d in freshwater*, or half-life >180 d in marine sediment or >120 d in freshwater sediment*	Half-life >60 d in marine water or freshwater, or >180 d in marine sediment or freshwater sediment
B	Bio-Concentration Factor (BCF) >2,000	BCF >5,000
T	Chronic No Observed Effect Concentration (NOEC) <0.01 mg/l or carcinogenic, mutagenic or reprotoxic (CMR) or endocrine disrupting effects	Not applicable
* For the purpose of marine environmental risk assessment, where marine half-life data are available it is used in preference to freshwater data.		

To be screened out at Tier 1, Whole Effluent Assessment (WEA) conforming to OSPAR Practical Guidance on Whole Effluent Assessment (2007) is required to assess all the PBT parameters, to demonstrate that the produced water is not PBT or vPvB. If WEA is undertaken to investigate the Tier 1 approach, the results must be included in the assessment report.

## 2.3 Step 3, Tier 2: Determination of Whole Effluent PEC:PNEC Ratio at 500 metres using an Average Dilution Factor (DF)

Tier 2 involves screening out produced water discharges if the whole effluent PEC:PNEC ratio at 500 m from the discharge point is  $\leq 1$ , using either generic DFs (as shown in Table 2-2) or average DFs derived for specific installations using site specific data. There are a number of ways the average DF for an installation could be determined, and the UK methodology will allow the chemical permit holder to select and justify the method used for their assessments.

The generic DFs shown in Table 2-2 are based on a range of produced water discharges, at varying depths, and were derived from a combination of:

- Operational assets – the 13 assets that were part of the original RBA trial (NCIMB, 2011) were modelled and DFs derived as described in the first version of the RBA guidance;
- Two theoretical locations – modelling was undertaken at three discharge rates and three depths for each theoretical location (Genesis, 2020). An average discharge density of 84.8 g/kg was used for all model runs. This has allowed the original DF look up table to be extended to include lower discharge rates.

In both cases Sintef's Dose-related Risk and Effects Assessment Model (DREAM) model was used to simulate the dispersion of an inert tracer. The minimum dilution was derived from the maximum concentration over depth and time around the 500 m perimeter from the release location (output from the DREAM model).

Dilution at 500 m is primarily dependent on the discharge rate. Water depth in itself does not greatly influence dilution, but the distance of the discharge from the seabed is significant, as this impacts the volume of water column available below the discharge to dilute the discharge before it extends out to 500 m. This applies to discharges that are denser than seawater. Conversely, for discharges that are

less dense than seawater (this only applies to a limited number of discharges) the volume of water column available for dilution above the discharge depth is significant.

Varying the density of the discharge would also have a significant impact on dilution and has not been considered in the DFs presented in the Table 2-2. Therefore, if the discharge being considered has a very different density to that used to derive the DFs, and particularly if the discharge is less dense than seawater, BEIS recommends deriving site-specific data.

Overall, the use of minimum DFs is conservative as the equivalent maximum concentrations may only be present in the water column for a brief period of time in each simulation.

**Table 2-2 Look up table for DFs**

Water depth below discharge (m)	Annual PW discharge volume (m <sup>3</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )					
	< 25,000	25,000–75,000	75,000–125,000	125,000–1,000,000	1,000,000–8,000,000	> 8,000,000
< 50	14,000	5,000	3,000	1,000	400	100
50–125	23,000	15,000	10,000	4,000	400	100
> 125	23,000	15,000	10,000	8,000	400	100

An assessment factor is necessary to take into account uncertainties in relation to the representative nature of laboratory toxicity tests undertaken using a limited number of test species. The lower the number of test species, the higher the assessment factor. Where test results for three test species from three trophic levels are available (bacteria, algae, crustacea) an assessment factor of 1,000 should be applied. Where additional tests have been undertaken on more species/trophic levels an appropriate assessment factor should be selected and justified based on relevant guidance (ECB 2003 and ECHA 2008). The lowest toxicity value is divided by the appropriate assessment factor to derive the PNEC.

The RBA trial compared assessment factors of 1,000 and 10,000, to strengthen the procedure currently used for CHARM risk assessments, which involves the use of an assessment factor of 100, and to compare the strengthened procedure with the maximum assessment factor that would result from applying the REACH (Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemical Substances) guidelines (ECHA 2008). It was concluded that an assessment factor of 10,000 would have a profound effect on the modelling results, and that it was likely that most produced water discharges would be identified as posing an unacceptable risk, which is not supported by the results of monitoring studies. Following discussions at the OSPAR Offshore Industry Committee (OIC), it was therefore agreed that a maximum assessment factor of 1,000 in combination with data on three trophic levels should be used, as the ECHA guidance was developed for near-coastal waters and it was considered that a factor of 10,000 was too conservative for offshore waters and the RBA.

If the PEC:PNEC ratio at Tier 2 is  $\leq 1$  then the assessment can proceed directly to Step 6 (Produced Water Management) omitting Step 4 (Tier 3) and Step 5 (Tier 4). However, it should be noted that if only a site specific DF has been used to calculate the PEC:PNEC ratio, then the chemical permit holder should consider doing Tier 3 modelling to confirm that the discharge of produced water from the installation poses a low risk to the environment. This is to avoid installations screening themselves out of the higher tiers based on erroneous site-specific DFs which are likely to be less conservative than the DFs presented in Table 2-2.

If the PEC:PNEC ratio at 500 m is  $> 1$ , chemical permit holders will still be able to confirm that a PEC:PNEC ratio of  $\leq 1$  would be achieved at a specified distance greater than 500 m, and to seek confirmation whether BEIS considers this to be a reasonable and acceptable distance.

Further information in relation to DREAM or other models, PECs, PNECs and PEC:PNEC ratios is appended at Annex 4.

Key outputs of Tier 2 must be summarised as listed in Table 2-3. It should be noted that MARA and LumiMARA minimums are calculated as the lowest toxicity value (average of three replicates) of the 11 individual species evaluated, not the average value of toxicity across all 11 species.

The EC50 and LC50 values should be used for *S. costatum* and *A. tonsa* assays as they are the lowest toxicity value.

**Table 2-3 Tier 2 outputs required in RBA report**

Parameter	Variable	Value
PEC calculation	Annual discharge volume (m <sup>3</sup> )	
	Depth	
	Generic DF	
	Site-specific DF	
	Generic DF PEC	
	Site-specific DF PEC	
PNEC calculation	MARA minimum MTC	
	LumiMARA minimum MTC	
	<i>S. costatum</i> (lowest of EC50 or LC50)	
	<i>A. tonsa</i> (lowest of EC50 or LC50)	
	Add other species tests as applicable	
	Assessment Factor	
	PNEC	
PEC:PNEC calculation	Generic DF PEC:PNEC ratio	
	Site-specific DF PEC:PNEC ratio	

## 2.4 Step 4, Tier 3: Determination of Whole Effluent PEC:PNEC Ratio using Dispersion Modelling

Tier 3 involves modelling produced water discharges using whole effluent toxicity data. This approach is more rigorous than the Tier 2 assessment, and identifies whether the PEC:PNEC ratio is >1 within the modelled volume and/or area. Whereas the Tier 2 assessment derives a single PEC:PNEC ratio based on a generic or site-specific DF at 500 m, the Tier 3 modelling indicates whether the time averaged PEC:PNEC ratio for the whole effluent is >1 within the selected volume and/or area during the modelling period. The results therefore reflect the worst-case scenario.

There are a number of suitable models that could be used for the Tier 3 assessment, and the UK methodology allows the permit holder to select and justify the model used. Further information in relation to dispersion modelling is shown in Annex 4.

The permit holder will be able to confirm whether a PEC:PNEC ratio of ≤1 would be achieved within a specified volume and/or area, and to seek confirmation whether BEIS considers this to be acceptable.

In order to make the Tier 3 modelling results reproducible and verifiable, permit holders are required to provide a detailed account of the input data used. This must cover modelling parameters as well as characteristics of the produced water stream. Table 2-4 must be included in the RBA report to confirm model data input. Please note the table can be adapted to reflect the input requirements of the specific model used for a particular installation. Not all parameters shown in Table 2-4 will be required by all models.

Density of the discharge plume is not a required model input parameter but if available, is useful data to present within the RBA as it influences the behaviour of the discharge plume.

**Table 2-4 Suggested modelling data inputs summary table**

Inputs	Variable	Value	Source
<b>Discharge geometry</b>	Location (latitude, longitude and map projection)		
	Depth (m) Specify whether above or below sea level.		
	Outlet angle from vertical (°)		
	Outlet bearing from north (°)		
	Diameter of outlet pipe (m)		
<b>Produced water composition</b>	Whole effluent PNEC (from Tier 2) (ppb)		
	Salinity (ppt)		
	Temperature (°C)		
	Daily discharge rate (m <sup>3</sup> /day) (see A 4.4)		
	Annual discharge rate (m <sup>3</sup> /year)		
	Oxygen content (mg/l) <sup>1</sup>		
<b>Environmental parameters</b>	Water depth at discharge location (m)		
	Air temperature (°C) <sup>1</sup>		
	Surface water temperature (°C)		
	Bottom water temperature (°C)		
	Surface water salinity (ppt)		
	Bottom water salinity (ppt)		
	Oxygen content in seawater (mg/l)		
	Winds - data source and configuration (e.g. daily, 3 hourly etc.)		
	Currents - data source and configuration (e.g. daily, 3 hourly etc.)		
	Date range selected for metocean data		
<b>Modelling parameters</b>	Discharge duration (days)		
	Simulation duration (days) <sup>2</sup>		
	Number of liquid/solid particles <sup>1</sup>		
	Number of dissolved particles <sup>1</sup>		
	Number of gas particles <sup>1</sup>		
	Cell size x direction (m)		
	Cell size y direction (m)		
	Cell size z direction (m)		
	Domain size x direction (km) (overall grid dimension)		
	Domain size y direction (km) (overall grid dimension)		
	Domain size z direction (m) (depth of grid)		
	Model time-step duration		
	Output time step duration		

1 If applicable, may not be required by all models.

2 See Annex 4 for suggested minimum time period to allow discharge to stabilise.

As a minimum, results to be reported from the Tier 3 assessment must include:

- A map showing the area exposed to risk >5% (based on the Environmental Impact Factor (EIF) see Annex 4, Section A4.14);
- A cross-section showing the area exposed to risk >5%; and
- A time-averaged EIF value for the simulation.

Produced water discharges where  $EIF \leq 10$  are considered low risk (Smit *et al.*, 2011), but care should be taken to ensure that the WET sampling undertaken was representative of discharge conditions (see Section 2.1) and justification should be provided before moving to Step 6 Risk management. If the discharge conditions at the time of WET sampling are not considered representative then Tier 4 may need to be undertaken, even where  $EIF \leq 10$  at Tier 3.

## **2.5 Step 5, Tier 4: Determination of PEC:PNEC Ratio based on naturally occurring substances and added offshore chemicals**

For any discharges where  $EIF > 10$  at Tier 3, Tier 4 modelling must be carried out (see Figure 1-1), as the information determined by each Tier has been shown to be complementary.

Tier 4 involves dispersion modelling to determine the PEC:PNEC ratio within a specific volume and/or area of water for the individual NOS in the produced water, and for the added offshore chemicals discharged with the produced water. The results should be presented with and without the offshore chemicals, as the management options for NOSs and added offshore chemicals will normally be very different. The purpose of this approach is to identify the change in the total risk following inclusion of the offshore chemicals.

Tier 4 involves modelling individual components of the produced water discharge to determine the fate and contribution to the total risk of specific components in the produced water stream. Although the use and discharge of offshore chemicals is separately assessed within the OSPAR framework, the inclusion of added offshore chemicals in a Tier 4 assessment is important from the point of view of identifying the dominant contributors to the risk in cases where the risk is not adequately controlled.

Information on NOSs must be obtained from biannual sampling results. A table showing the list of NOSs, their concentrations and their corresponding PNECs must be included in the RBA report. Further information is presented in Annex 4, Section A4.6. Laboratory reports for the analysis of NOSs should include analysis methods and associated LODs. The method used to derive an appropriate value into the model where a NOS is below the LOD should be described. For consistency, BEIS recommend using half the LOD for substances that were not detected, and it is acknowledged that it may result in an overestimate of those substances. The use of appropriate LODs should be checked prior to sampling (see Section 2.1).

Information related to the applied concentration of offshore chemicals should be based on the actual usage, and for some offshore chemicals it may be beneficial to average the applied concentration rates over a defined period of time (e.g. three to six months for offshore chemicals applied at variable concentrations). Using actual applied concentrations provides a more representative overview of the contribution of added offshore chemicals to the risk associated with a PW discharge. Basing the assessment at Tier 4 on what was assessed as the worst-case scenario in the chemical permit could result in the overestimation of the contribution of offshore chemicals to the risk associated with a PW discharge.

The UK Oil Portal chemical permit SAT number, including variation number, relevant to the installation at the time of PW sampling should be referenced within the RBA report. A list of offshore chemicals with a corresponding justification for inclusion/exclusion in Tier 4 must be included in the RBA report. PNECs and concentrations for all included offshore chemicals must also be presented along with a rationale for the various choices of discharge concentrations. PNECs for offshore chemicals can be derived from the Centre for Environment, Fisheries & Aquaculture Science (Cefas) templates using the worst case aquatic toxicity test value. Further information regarding inclusion or otherwise of offshore chemicals is presented in Annex 4, Section A4.7).

Model input data specified in Tier 3 (Table 2-4) must remain the same in Tier 4, unless an increase in the impacted area in the Tier 4 modelling requires the modelled domain to be increased (to ensure that the region in which the  $PEC:PNEC > 1$  is still contained within the model grid).

As a minimum, results to be reported from the Tier 4 assessment must include:

- For NOSs only simulation outputs:
  - A map showing the area exposed to risk >5% (based on EIF);
  - A cross-section showing the relevant area exposed to risk >5%;
  - A time-averaged EIF value for the simulation; and
  - A summary of percentage contribution to risk from each NOS (as a pie chart and a table).
- For NOSs and added offshore chemical simulation outputs:
  - A map indicating area exposed to risk >5% (based on EIF);
  - A cross-section of relevant area exposed to risk >5%;
  - A time-averaged EIF value for the simulation; and
  - A summary of percentage contribution to risk by each NOS and added offshore chemical (as a pie chart and a table).

Following modelling of the added offshore chemicals there may be a need for BEIS to undertake further modelling of the individual substances of the offshore chemicals. This requirement will be determined by BEIS on a case by case basis (further information provided in Section 2.6).

## 2.6 Step 6, Produced Water Management

The results obtained for every step in the assessment must be detailed in the RBA Assessment Report. In addition to detailing the results, the report should include a commentary on the risks in relation to the environmental sensitivities. This should refer to information already provided in the UK Oil Portal Production Operations MAT, or in any related and relevant SAT seeking an EIA Direction, a Chemical Permit or an Oil (hydrocarbon) Discharge Permit. The assessment report should also include details of the main uncertainties, and their potential impact on the conclusions of the report, and details of any anticipated changes to the produced water discharge that could impact the risk profile in the future. The assessment report must be submitted to BEIS as a separate document, via [bst@beis.gov.uk](mailto:bst@beis.gov.uk), within six months of completion of the produced water sampling and must not be submitted via the UK Oil Portal.

The environmental risk of a PW discharge with an EIF >10 at Tier 3 is not considered to be adequately controlled and therefore the chemical permit holder should consider risk reduction measures, including options for the refinement of the assessment. The Tier 4 assessment provides valuable risk characterisation information, helping identify the most important contributors to the overall risk of a PW discharge. Where there are concerns (EIF >10 at Tier 3) in relation to the RBA assessment, a management plan will need to be proposed and agreed with the Department and chemical permit holders may be requested to collect additional samples or to undertake additional studies to verify and refine the initial assessment, or to identify measures to reduce the risk. However, there are a number of assumptions associated with both the modelling and the data used to assess the individual substances that will need to be taken into consideration before considering options such as chemical substitution or amending the produced water treatment process. Risk reduction measures that could be considered and outlined in the Recommendation include:

- Technical measures, such as abatement at the source by redesign of the applied processes (water shut off in the well);
- Substitution of chemicals;
- Application of closed systems (e.g. re-injection of produced water);
- End-of-pipe techniques such as separation or clarification techniques to treat produced water prior to discharge; and
- Organisational measures such as management systems in place (training, instructions, procedures and reporting).

Although the OSPAR default RBA assessment factor of 1,000 is lower than the recommended ECHA value, it is still more conservative than the assessment factors of offshore chemicals using CHARM. Some chemicals that have an acceptable risk assessment using CHARM may therefore be highlighted as a potential risk, but the primary purpose of the initial RBA assessments will be to facilitate a comparison of the contributions of all the added offshore chemicals (and NOSs). BEIS does not intend to use RBA data to change the certification rankings or the risk assessments for specific offshore chemicals included in chemical permit applications. Nevertheless, if the more conservative approach identifies a particular concern, chemical permit holders may wish to encourage chemical suppliers to undertake additional toxicity tests to justify reducing the recommended assessment factor. Providing the additional tests do not significantly change the lowest toxicity value, this would reduce the uncertainty and allow the use of a lower assessment factor. Further information in relation to assessment factors is appended at Annex 4, Section A4.9.

The PNEC values are also critical to the assessment of risk. Although OSPAR has addressed this issue for NOSs, and developed a common set of PNEC values based on good evidence and expert judgement that will be used by all Contracting Parties, the PNEC values for added chemicals obtained from data on the Cefas certification templates will be very conservative for offshore chemicals that consist of a mixture of substances, because the data provided relates to the most hazardous (taking into account not only toxicity, but other properties such as ability to bioaccumulate, solubility, etc.) substance and that substance may only be present in small quantities. Whilst this conservative approach may be justified when using CHARM with an assessment factor of 100, the contribution to the total risk predicted using dispersion modelling may be significantly greater than the contribution that would be predicted if the substance were modelled separately using substance-specific toxicity data. Although the UK does not publish the formulation or toxicity data that would be needed to separately model the substances of the offshore chemical, chemical permit holders may wish to request this data from their chemical suppliers to repeat the modelling if a particular added chemical is identified as posing a significant risk in the marine environment. It should be noted that substance level data for an offshore chemical is considered commercially sensitive and it is therefore at the discretion of the chemical supplier if they would wish to share that data and it is not a requirement for that substance level data for an offshore chemical to be used in the assessment.

The modelling of the added offshore chemicals also ignores the possibility that some chemicals may be subject to a chemical reaction during the treatment process. In many cases, it is therefore likely that the assumptions relating to the discharge of offshore chemicals in the produced water are very conservative, and laboratory tests and additional produced water chemical analyses may be useful to improve the discharge data used in the model.

Finally, it is necessary to consider that the methods available for the management of NOSs and added offshore chemicals will be very different. Whereas there may be scope for replacing offshore chemicals, or reducing their dosage, many NOSs cannot currently be removed, or it would require significant expenditure with no guarantee that the benefits in terms of risk reduction would justify the cost.

The Tier 4 modelling is therefore a very useful site-specific assessment process that can be used to inform decisions on risk reduction measures, but the initial results should be treated with caution and further studies, including additional modelling, may be desirable prior to making those decisions and implementing the measures. The UK programme will continue to significantly enhance our knowledge of the risks to the environment associated with produced water discharges.



## **2.7 Demonstration of Best Available Technique and Best Environmental Practice**

In addition to implementing the RBA, the demonstration and review of Best Available Technique (BAT) and Best Environmental Practice (BEP) remains a requirement for all produced water discharges, as detailed in OSPAR Recommendation 2001/1 (as amended by OSPAR Recommendation 2006/4 and OPSAR 2011/8). Permit holders are routinely required to review the application of BAT and BEP, as part of the oil discharge permit review process, and this requirement may form part of any discussions initiated under Step 6, Produced Water Management. However, the results of a Tier 4 assessment would need to be carefully considered in the context of any current or proposed review of BAT and BEP, because of the significant assumptions associated with both the modelling and the data used to assess the offshore chemicals.

## **2.8 Repeat assessments**

The frequency of repeat assessments will depend upon a number of factors, including the outcome of the initial assessments and any management measures implemented to reduce the risk:

- Significant changes in the quality or quantity of produced water discharges (e.g. the addition of a new tie-back);
- Significant changes in the results of the biannual analyses; and
- Significant changes in the added offshore chemicals.

BEIS will review the results obtained and prepare a proposal at the end of each round of the assessment programme.

### 3. References

BEIS (Department Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy) (2018). *Methodology for the Sampling and Analysis of Produced Water and Other Hydrocarbon Discharges*.

deZwart, D., & L Posthuma (2005). *Complex mixture toxicity for single and multiple species: proposed methodologies*. Environ. Toxicol.Chem. 24(10):2665-2676.

ECB (2003). *Technical Guidance Document on Risk Assessment in Support of Commission Directive 93/67/EEC on Risk Assessment for new notified substances, Commission Regulation (EC) No 1488/94 on Risk Assessment existing substances*. Directive 98/8/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the placing of biocidal products on the market.

ECHA (2008). *Guidance on Information Requirements and Chemical Safety Assessments*.  
<https://echa.europa.eu/guidance-documents/guidance-on-information-requirements-and-chemical-safety-assessment>

Genesis (2013). *OSPAR Recommendation 2012/5, UK Implementation Plan, Summary Report of UK Practical Programme*. OIC 2013 Study Report for Department of Energy and Climate Change, Technical Note No. J72080A-A-TN-00001.

Genesis (2020). Update to dilution factors used for the produced water risk based assessment. Study Report for the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, Report No. J75078A-Y-TN-24001/D01.

NCIMB (2011). *RD0033 Whole Effluent Analyses of Offshore Discharge Waters*. Technical Report.

OSPAR Commission (2007). *Practical Guidance Document on Whole Effluent Assessment*. Hazardous Substance Series

Roex E., Henriquez L. and Karman C. (2012). *The added value of Whole Effluent Assessment for produced water discharges in the offshore industry*. <https://www.onepetro.org/conference-paper/SPE-157153-MS>.

Smit, M., Frost, T. and Johnsen S. (2011). *Achievement of Risk-Based Produced Water Management on the Norwegian Continental Shelf (2002-2008)*. Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management 7(4): 668-77.

StatoilHydro (2008). *Emissions Management - The Norwegian Operator Experience, Development and Application of Emission Control Systems in the North Sea*.

Utvik, T. R., T K Frost & S Johnsen (2003). *OLF Recommended Guidelines - A Manual for Standardised Modelling and Determination of the Environmental Impact Factor*.

## Annex 1 OSPAR Recommendation 2012/5

(Source: OSPAR 12/22/1, Annex 18)



### OSPAR Recommendation 2012/5 for a risk-based approach to the Management of Produced Water Discharges from Offshore Installations

#### Preamble

RECALLING Article 2(3) of the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic ("OSPAR Convention"), which, *inter alia*, requires Contracting Parties to take full account of the use of the latest technological developments and practices designed to prevent and eliminate pollution fully, when adopting programmes and measures; and to this end requires Contracting Parties to define with respect to programmes and measures the application of best available techniques (BAT) and best environmental practice (BEP), including, where appropriate, clean technology,

RECALLING Article 5 of the OSPAR Convention, which requires the Contracting Parties to take all possible steps to prevent and eliminate pollution from offshore sources in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, in particular as provided for in Annex III,

RECALLING Article 2(2) of Annex III which requires Contracting Parties to use the criteria in Appendix 2 of the OSPAR Convention when setting priorities and assessing the nature and extent of the programmes and measures and their time scales,

RECALLING Article 2(1) of Annex III which requires Contracting Parties when adopting programmes and measures, to use 'best available techniques' (BAT) and 'best environmental practice' (BEP) as defined in Appendix 1 of the OSPAR Convention,

### Recommandation OSPAR 2012/5 sur une approche basée sur le risque pour la gestion des rejets d'eau de production provenant des installations offshore

#### Préambule

RAPPELANT l'alinéa 3 de l'article 2 de la Convention pour la protection du milieu marin de l'Atlantique du Nord-Est (dite «Convention OSPAR»), qui, entre autres, demande que les Parties contractantes, lorsqu'elles adoptent des programmes et mesures, tiennent pleinement compte de l'utilisation des derniers progrès techniques réalisés et des méthodes conçues afin de prévenir et de supprimer intégralement la pollution; et à cette fin demande que les Parties contractantes définissent, en ce qui concerne les programmes et mesures, l'application des meilleures techniques disponibles et de la meilleure pratique environnementale y compris, si cela est approprié, des techniques propres,

RAPPELANT l'article 5 de la Convention OSPAR, qui demande que les Parties contractantes prennent toutes les mesures possibles afin de prévenir et de supprimer la pollution provenant de sources offshore, conformément aux dispositions de la Convention, en particulier aux conditions prévues à l'annexe III,

RAPPELANT l'alinéa 2 de l'article 2 de l'annexe III qui demande aux Parties contractantes d'appliquer les critères visés à l'appendice 2 à la Convention OSPAR pour fixer les priorités et évaluer la nature et l'ampleur des programmes et mesures, ainsi que les calendriers correspondants,

RAPPELANT l'Article 2(1) de l'Annexe III qui demande que les Parties contractantes, lorsqu'elles adoptent des programmes et mesures, à utiliser les « meilleures techniques disponibles » (BAT) et la « meilleure

RECALLING OSPAR Decision 2000/2 on a Harmonised Mandatory Control System for the Use and Reduction of the Discharge of Offshore Chemicals as amended by Decision 2005/1, OSPAR Recommendation 2010/4 on a Harmonised Pre-screening Scheme for Offshore Chemicals and OSPAR Recommendation 2010/3 on a Harmonised Offshore Chemical Notification Format (HOCNF),

RECALLING OSPAR Recommendation 2001/1 for the Management of Produced Water from Offshore Installations as amended,

RECALLING the strategic objective of the Offshore Oil and Gas Industry Strategy 2010-2020 and its timeframe that requires implementation of the Strategy progressively through appropriate actions and measures with the target, *inter alia*, to achieve by 2020 a reduction of oil in produced water discharged into the sea to a level which will adequately ensure that each of those discharges will present no harm to the marine environment,

RECALLING the strategic objective of the Hazardous Substances Strategy 2010-2020 and its timeframe that requires implementation of the Strategy progressively by making every endeavour through appropriate actions and measures to, *inter alia*, move towards the target of cessation of discharges, emissions and losses of hazardous substances by the year 2020,

RECALLING the conclusions of the Quality Status Report 2010 on the impacts of produced water discharges to the maritime area and its advice that OSPAR Contracting Parties should continue to cooperate in their efforts to reduce discharges of oil through the application of a risk-based approach to management of produced water,

RECOGNISING that measures to prevent or mitigate risks to the marine environment by produced water discharges should not lead to unacceptable risk in other areas and/or other environmental compartments,

NOTING the OSPAR agreement on Further Guidance on the Role of Marine Risk Assessment within the Framework of the OSPAR Strategy with

pratique environnementale» (BEP) telles que définies à l'appendice 1 à la Convention OSPAR,

RAPPELANT la Décision OSPAR 2000/2 relative à un système obligatoire et harmonisé de contrôle de l'utilisation des produits chimiques en offshore et de réduction de leurs rejets, telle qu'amendée par la Décision 2005/1, la Recommandation OSPAR 2010/4 relative à un système harmonisé de présélection des produits chimiques d'offshore et la Recommandation OSPAR 2010/3 relative à un système harmonisé de notification des produits chimiques offshore (HOCNF),

RAPPELANT la Recommandation OSPAR 2001/1 relative à la gestion de l'eau de production des installations offshore, telle qu'amendée,

RAPPELANT l'objectif stratégique de la Stratégie industrie pétrolière et gazière offshore 2010-2020 et son calendrier qui exige la mise en œuvre progressive de la stratégie, grâce à des mesures et actions appropriées ayant pour cible, entre autres, de parvenir, en 2020, à une réduction des hydrocarbures dans l'eau de production rejetée à la mer pour les ramener à des niveaux permettant d'assurer qu'aucun de ces rejets ne porte atteinte au milieu marin,

RAPPELANT l'objectif stratégique de la Stratégie substances dangereuses 2010-2020 et son calendrier qui exige la mise en œuvre progressive de la Stratégie en s'efforçant au mieux, grâce à des mesures et actions appropriées, entre autres, de se rapprocher des cibles de cessation des rejets, émissions et pertes de substances dangereuses, en 2020,

RAPPELANT les conclusions du Bilan de Santé 2010 sur les impacts des rejets d'eau de production dans la zone maritime et ses conseils, à savoir que les Parties contractantes OSPAR devraient continuer à coopérer dans leurs efforts de réduire les rejets d'hydrocarbures grâce à l'application d'une approche basée sur le risque pour la gestion de l'eau de production,

RECONNAISSANT que les mesures de prévention et d'atténuation des risques que présentent pour le milieu marin les rejets d'eau de production ne devraient pas entraîner un danger intolérable dans d'autres zones et/ou d'autres compartiments environnementaux,

NOTANT l'Accord OSPAR sur d'autres indications relatives au rôle des évaluations des risques pour le milieu marin dans le cadre de la Stratégie OSPAR

regard to Hazardous Substances (Agreement 2002/19) which contains provisions relating to the identification of the most appropriate measures, the urgency of these measures and who is best placed to carry them out,

NOTING the relevant legislation within the European Union, in particular Regulation EC 1907/2006 on the Registration, Evaluation, Authorization and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH) and corresponding legislation of other Contracting Parties,

## **The Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic RECOMMEND:**

### **1. Definitions**

#### **1.1 For the purpose of this Recommendation:**

“offshore installation” means any offshore installation as defined in the OSPAR Convention

“PEC” PEC means Predicted Environmental Concentration; the concentration of a chemical or an effluent in the environment based on model calculations. PEC is expressed as concentration for individual substances or as dilution for the whole effluent,

“PNEC” means Predicted No Effect Concentration; the concentration of a chemical or effluent below which adverse effects on the aquatic ecosystem and its organisms will most likely not occur during long-term or short term exposure,

“produced water” means water which is produced in oil and/or gas production operations and includes formation water, condensation water and re-produced injection water; it also includes water used for desalting oil,

“risk-based approach” means an approach to managing produced water discharges

- based on a characterization of the risk to the environment of a produced water discharge by examining both the exposure resulting from discharge of the produced water effluent and the sensitivity of the receiving environment to this exposure,

visant les substances dangereuses (Accord 2002/19), qui contient des dispositions relatives à l'identification des mesures les plus appropriées, leur urgence et qui peut les réaliser au mieux,

NOTANT la législation pertinente, au sein de l'Union européenne, en particulier le Règlement CE 1907/2006 concernant l'enregistrement, l'évaluation et l'autorisation des substances chimiques, ainsi que les restrictions applicables à ces substances (REACH) et la réglementation correspondante des autres Parties contractantes,

## **Les Parties contractantes à la Convention pour la protection du milieu marin de l'Atlantique du Nord-Est RECOMMANDENT:**

### **1. Définitions**

#### **1.1 Aux fins de la présente recommandation :**

«installation offshore» désigne toute installation offshore telle que définie dans la Convention OSPAR.

«PEC» PEC désigne la concentration environnementale prévue ; la concentration dans l'environnement d'un produit chimique ou d'un effluent, se fondant sur des calculs de modélisation. La PEC s'exprime sous forme de concentration de substances individuelles ou de dilution pour l'effluent entier,

“PNEC” désigne la concentration prévue sans effet; la concentration d'un produit chimique ou d'un effluent au-dessous de laquelle il est fort peu probable que des effets préjudiciables sur les écosystèmes aquatiques et leurs organismes se produisent durant une exposition à long ou court terme,

“eau de production” désigne l'eau produite pendant les opérations de production de pétrole et/ou de gaz, et comprenant l'eau du gisement, l'eau de condensation et l'eau injectée et reproduite. Elle comprend aussi l'eau utilisée pour dessaler les hydrocarbures,

«approche basée sur le risque les rejets dans l'eau de production,

- basée sur la caractérisation du risque pour l'environnement d'un rejet d'eau de production en examinant aussi bien l'exposition résultant du rejet de l'effluent de l'eau de production que la sensibilité du milieu récepteur à cette exposition,
- en prenant des mesures appropriées permettant d'éviter des niveaux d'exposition supérieurs à la PNEC,

	- by taking appropriate measures to avoid or minimise exposure levels above the PNEC,	« substances » dans le contexte de la gestion des rejets d'eau de production	désigne des substances présentes à l'état naturel (notamment les métaux lourds, les HAP, etc.) et des composants des produits chimiques ajoutés présents dans l'eau de production,
"substances" in the context of managing produced chemicals water discharges	means naturally occurring (including heavy metals, PAHs etc) and components of added present in the produced water,	«risque»	signifie la probabilité de la présence d'effets préjudiciables, exprimée par le rapport PEC:PNEC ou la fraction des espèces potentiellement affectées,
"risk"	means the likelihood that adverse effects may occur, expressed as the PEC: PNEC ratio or the fraction of species potentially affected,	«WEA»	désigne l'évaluation de l'effluent entier. C'est la caractérisation de la persistance, du potentiel de bioaccumulation et de la toxicité de l'effluent entier en utilisant diverses méthodes physiques, chimiques et biologiques,
"WEA"	means Whole Effluent Assessment and is the characterisation of the persistence, bio-accumulative potential and toxicity of the entire effluent using a variety of physical, chemical and biological methods,		
"WET"	means Whole Effluent Toxicity and is the characterisation of the toxicity of the entire effluent using biological methods.	«WET»	désigne la toxicité de l'effluent entier. C'est la caractérisation de la toxicité de l'effluent entier en utilisant des méthodes biologiques.

## 2. Purpose and Scope

### 2.1 The purpose of this Recommendation is to:

- guide Contracting Parties in the application of a risk-based approach to assess the environmental risk posed by produced water discharges including naturally occurring substances,
- describe methods to characterise the risks and;
- guide Contracting Parties in the application of BAT and BEP to reduce those risks which are not adequately controlled.

2.2 The application of the risk-based approach will assist Contracting Parties in identifying, prioritising and adopting measures that will reduce risks to the environment from discharges of produced water.

2.3 This Recommendation should be applied in addition to OSPAR Recommendation 2001/1 for the Management of Produced Water from Offshore Installations as amended, OSPAR Decision 2000/2 on a Harmonised Mandatory Control System for the Use and Reduction of the Discharge of Offshore Chemicals, OSPAR Recommendation 2010/4 on a

## 2. Objectif et champ d'application

### 2.1 La présente Recommandation a pour objectif:

- a. d'orienter les Parties contractantes dans l'application d'une approche basée sur le risque pour évaluer le risque environnemental que posent les rejets d'eau de production, y compris les substances présentes à l'état naturel
- b. de décrire des méthodes permettant de caractériser les risques; et
- c. d'orienter les Parties contractantes dans l'application des BAT et BEP afin de réduire les risques qui ne sont pas contrôlés de manière adéquate.

2.2 L'application de l'approche basée sur le risque aidera les Parties contractantes à déterminer les mesures de réduction des risques pour l'environnement provenant des rejets de l'eau de production, de classer ces mesures selon les priorités et de les adopter.

2.3 On devra appliquer la présente Recommandation de même que la Recommandation OSPAR 2001/1 relative à la gestion de l'eau de production, telle qu'amendée, la Décision OSPAR 2000/2 relative à un système obligatoire et harmonisé de contrôle de l'utilisation des produits chimiques en offshore et de réduction de leurs rejets, la

Harmonised Pre-screening Scheme for Offshore Chemicals and OSPAR Recommendation 2010/3 on a Harmonised Offshore Chemical Notification Format (HOCNF).

2.4 This Recommendation only applies to offshore installations that discharge produced water in the OSPAR maritime area. For the purpose of this Recommendation the term discharge does not include injection into the subsoil. Radioactive substances in produced water are excluded from the scope of this Recommendation.

### **3. Programmes and Measures**

#### **3.1 General Principles**

3.1.1 Contracting Parties should periodically conduct an environmental risk assessment for all produced water discharges from offshore installations into the marine environment.

3.1.2 The method used to undertake the risk-based approach should be based on the determination of PEC:PNEC ratios or the fraction of species potentially affected as described in the OSPAR Guidelines in support of draft OSPAR Recommendation 2012/5 for a Risk-based Approach to the Management of Produced Water Discharges from Offshore Installations (OSPAR Agreement 2012-7) [add exact title when adopted by OSPAR 2012] (hereafter referred to as "the Guidelines").

3.1.3 Contracting Parties should apply the Guidelines and the harmonised, structured procedure established therein. All the steps should be carried out as part of the procedure. The different steps are shown in Appendix 1 and are described in sections 3.2-3.7 below.

3.1.4 Contracting Parties may elect to use a substance based approach or a whole effluent approach, or a combination of these approaches

#### **3.2 Data Collection**

3.2.1 Contracting Parties should undertake a collection of all data that are relevant for the chosen risk assessment process. Depending on which

Recommandation OSPAR 2010/4 relative à un système harmonisé de présélection des produits chimiques d'offshore et la Recommandation OSPAR 2010/3 relative à un système harmonisé de notification des produits chimiques offshore (HOCNF).

2.4 La présente Recommandation ne s'applique qu'aux installations offshore qui rejettent de l'eau de production dans la zone maritime d'OSPAR. Dans le cadre de cette recommandation, le terme « rejet » n'inclut pas l'injection dans le sous-sol. Les substances radioactives dans l'eau de production sont exclues du champ d'application de la présente recommandation.

### **3. Programmes et mesures**

#### **3.1 Principes généraux**

3.1.1 Les Parties contractantes devraient entreprendre périodiquement une évaluation du risque environnemental pour tous les rejets d'eau de production, dans le milieu marin, provenant des installations offshore.

3.1.2 La méthode utilisée pour l'approche basée sur le risque devrait se fonder sur la détermination des rapports PEC/PNEC ou de la fraction des espèces potentiellement affectée comme le décrivent les Lignes directrices étayant la Recommandation OSPAR 2012/5 sur une approche basée sur le risque appliquée à la gestion des rejets d'eau de production provenant des installations offshore (Accord OSPAR 2012-7) [citer le titre exact une fois les lignes directrices adoptées par OSPAR] (appelées ci-après « les Lignes directrices »).

3.1.3 Les Parties contractantes devraient appliquer les Lignes directrices et la procédure harmonisée et structurée, élaborée dans les Lignes directrices. Toutes les étapes devraient être réalisées en tant qu'éléments constitutifs de la procédure. Les diverses étapes sont illustrées à l'appendice 1 et sont décrites dans les sections 3.2-3.7 ci-après.

3.1.4 Les parties contractantes peuvent décider d'utiliser une approche basée sur les substances ou une approche basée sur l'effluent entier, ou une combinaison de ces deux approches.

#### **3.2 Collecte des données**

3.2.1 Les Parties contractantes devraient réaliser un recueil de toutes les données pertinentes pour le processus d'évaluation du risque sélectionné. En

approach is used (substance based or whole effluent based), this typically includes data from a combination of sources including, but not limited to:

- a. bioassays of produced water effluents e.g. whole effluent toxicity (WET), whole effluent assessment (WEA);
- b. naturally occurring substances: chemical analysis and substance based ecotoxicological information;
- c. added chemicals discharged with produced water: including ecotoxicological information and other information;
- d. substance physical and chemical properties;
- e. produced water discharge information (volume, depth, temperature etc.); and
- f. site/field-specific conditions e.g. hydrographic, oceanographic and meteorological data and vulnerability of the area where the discharges are taking place

### **3.3 Hazard Assessment**

3.3.1 Contracting Parties should assess the hazard related to the produced water discharge, i.e, the inherent properties of the discharge that may cause adverse effects.

3.3.2 The hazard assessment should be based on data relating to the whole effluent or specific substances, or a combination of approaches, and should include the determination of Predicted No Effect Concentrations (PNECs).

### **3.4 Exposure Assessment**

3.4.1 In order to estimate the exposure of the ecosystem to substances, expressed as the PEC, Contracting Parties should assess the exposure in the receiving environment, taking account of the fate of the produced water discharges (e.g. dispersion, dilution, degradation, volatilization etc.).

3.4.2 The assessment should be based on data relating to the whole effluent or the specific substances, or a combination of these approaches,

fonction de l'approche choisie (basée sur une substance ou sur un effluent entier), il s'agit typiquement des données provenant d'un certain nombre de sources incluant (liste non limitative) :

- a. des analyses biologiques des effluents de l'eau de production, par exemple toxicité de l'effluent entier (WET), évaluation de l'effluent entier (WEA) ;
- b. substances présentes à l'état naturel : analyses chimiques et informations écotoxicologiques relatives aux substances ;
- c. produits chimiques ajoutés rejetés avec l'eau de production, il s'agit notamment d'informations écotoxicologiques et autres ;
- d. des propriétés physiques et chimiques des substances ;
- e. d'informations sur le rejet d'eau de production (volume, profondeur, température, etc.) ; et
- f. des conditions propres à un site/domaine, par exemple données hydrographiques océanographiques et météorologiques et vulnérabilité de la zone où ont lieu les rejets

### **3.3 Evaluation du danger**

3.3.1 Les Parties contractantes devraient évaluer le danger lié au rejet d'eau de production, c'est-à-dire, les propriétés inhérentes du rejet risquant de provoquer des effets préjudiciables.

3.3.2 L'évaluation du danger devrait se fonder sur les données portant sur l'effluent entier ou des substances spécifiques, ou sur la combinaison des deux approches et devrait inclure la détermination de la concentration prévue sans effet (PNEC).

### **3.4 Evaluation de l'exposition**

3.4.1 Afin d'estimer l'exposition des écosystèmes aux substances, exprimée par la PEC, les Parties contractantes devraient évaluer l'exposition dans le milieu récepteur, en prenant en compte le devenir des rejets d'eau de production (par exemple dispersion, dilution, dégradation, volatilisation, etc.).

3.4.2 L'évaluation devrait se fonder sur les données portant sur l'effluent entier ou des substances spécifiques, ou sur la combinaison des deux



and should include the determination of Predicted Environmental Concentrations (PECs).

### **3.5 Risk Characterisation**

3.5.1 Contracting Parties should use the information gathered in the hazard and exposure assessments to estimate the potential of adverse effects that may occur in the marine environment based on the predicted exposure of the ecosystem to the produced water effluent and/or its specific substances.

3.5.2 The risk characterisation for produced water discharges in the receiving environment should be based on the PEC:PNEC ratio and/or the fraction of species potentially affected.

### **3.6 Risk Management**

3.6.1 If the exposure level does not exceed the PNEC outside a column of water surrounding the installation, the radius of which is defined by a distance from the installation specified by the Contracting Party, or outside the volume of water directly impacted by the discharge (as determined by hydrographic modelling of dispersion of the discharge) that is specified by the Contracting Party, the risk should be considered to be adequately controlled.

3.6.2 Based on the risk characterisation, Contracting Parties should continue to review the produced water management options and the application of BAT and BEP, as detailed in OSPAR Recommendation 2001/1 as amended, and implement site-specific actions as necessary to further reduce the risk. This may involve further data collection and input into the risk-based approach as shown in Appendix 1.

### **3.7 Monitoring**

3.7.1 Analysis of the effluent should be used to detect changes in the discharge and verify the effectiveness of the risk management measures.

3.7.2 Environmental monitoring should be carried out in order to detect changes in the receiving environment and to verify the impact hypothesis.

approches et devrait inclure la détermination de la concentration prévue sans effet (PNEC).

### **3.5 Caractérisation des risques**

3.5.1 Les Parties contractantes devraient utiliser les informations recueillies lors des évaluations du danger et de l'exposition afin d'évaluer le potentiel d'effets préjudiciables susceptibles de se produire dans le milieu marin en se fondant sur l'exposition prédite des écosystèmes à l'effluent d'eau de production et/ou de ses substances spécifiques.

3.5.2 La caractérisation des risques que posent les rejets d'eau de production pour l'environnement récepteur devrait se fonder sur le rapport PEC/PNEC et/ou la fraction des espèces potentiellement affectées.

### **3.6 Gestion des risques**

3.6.1 On pourra considérer que le risque est contrôlé de manière adéquate si le niveau d'exposition ne dépasse pas la PNEC à l'extérieur d'une colonne d'eau entourant l'installation, dont le rayon correspond à la distance par rapport à l'installation déterminée par la Partie contractante, ou à l'extérieur du volume d'eau subissant directement l'impact du rejet (tel que déterminé par la modélisation hydrographique de la dispersion du rejet) déterminé par la Partie contractante.

3.6.2 Les Parties contractantes devraient continuer à revoir, en se fondant sur la caractérisation du risque, les options de gestion de l'eau de production et l'application de BAT et de BEP, comme l'explique dans le détail la Recommandation OSPAR 2001/1 telle qu'amendée, et mettre en œuvre des actions propres à des sites, en tant que de besoin, afin de réduire encore plus les risques. Cela peut impliquer de recueillir des données supplémentaires et de les appliquer à l'approche basée sur le risque comme le montre l'appendice 1.

### **3.7 Surveillance**

3.7.1 L'analyse de l'effluent devrait servir à détecter les modifications des rejets et/ou vérifier l'efficacité des mesures de gestion des risques.

3.7.2 La surveillance environnementale devrait être réalisée afin de détecter les modifications du milieu récepteur et/ou de vérifier l'hypothèse de l'impact.

#### **4. Exchange of Information**

4.1 Contracting Parties should regularly exchange information regarding, for example:

- a. produced water sampling, analysis, and monitoring programmes;
- b. whole effluent based risk assessment methodologies and results e.g. WEA, WET;
- c. substance based risk assessment methodologies and modelling results;
- d. substances identified in produced water likely to pose a risk to the marine environment;
- e. field monitoring techniques;
- f. the use of BAT and BEP in the context of risk-based approach as described in the Guidelines; and
- g. the criteria used to assess whether risk is adequately controlled (e.g. distance and/or volume).

4.2 The information referred to in paragraph 4.1 above should be submitted to OIC annually.

#### **5. Entry into Force**

5.1 This Recommendation has effect from 29 June 2012

#### **6. Review and Periodic Evaluation**

6.1 An implementation plan should be submitted by Contracting Parties to OIC 2013 with the aim of achieving full implementation by 31 December 2018.

6.2 Progress against the implementation plan should be submitted to OIC on an annual basis starting in 2014.

6.3 Contracting Parties should review and evaluate the effectiveness of the risk-based approach that they have adopted every five years as

#### **4. Echange d'information**

4.1 Les Parties contractantes devraient échanger régulièrement des informations sur, par exemple:

- a. l'échantillonnage de l'eau de production, leur analyse, et les programmes de surveillance ;
- b. les méthodologies et les résultats de l'évaluation des risques basés sur l'effluent entier, par exemple, WEA, WET ;
- c. les méthodologies d'évaluation du risque basée sur une substance et les résultats de la modélisation ;
- d. les substances déterminées dans l'eau de production susceptibles de présenter un risque pour le milieu marin;
- e. des techniques de surveillance sur le terrain ;
- f. l'utilisation des BAT et BEP dans le contexte de l'approche basée sur le risque, telle que décrite dans les Lignes directrices ; et
- g. les critères utilisés pour évaluer si le risque est contrôlé de manière adéquate (par exemple distance et/ou volume).

4.2 Les informations indiquées au paragraphe 4.1 ci-dessus devraient être communiquées à l'OIC tous les ans.

#### **5. Entrée en vigueur**

5.1 La présente Recommandation prend effet à partir du 29 juin 2012.

#### **6. Revue et évaluation périodique**

6.1 Un plan de mise en œuvre devrait être soumis par les Parties contractantes à l'OIC en 2013 dans le but d'une mise en application complète pour le 31 décembre 2018.

6.2 Les progrès réalisés par rapport au plan de mise en œuvre devraient être notifiés à l'OIC tous les ans à partir de 2014.

6.3 Tous les cinq ans à partir de 2018, les Parties contractantes devraient passer en revue et évaluer l'efficacité de l'approche basée sur le risque qu'elles ont

from 2018, in order to determine whether the purpose of this Recommendation is being achieved.

## **7. Implementation Reports**

7.1 Reports on the implementation of this Recommendation should be submitted by Contracting Parties with offshore installations that discharge produced water in the OSPAR maritime area, using as far as possible the format set out in Appendix 2. The reports should be submitted to the appropriate OSPAR subsidiary body in accordance with OSPAR's Standard Implementation and Assessment Procedure.


adoptée afin de déterminer si l'objectif et la portée de la présente Recommandation ont été atteints.

## **7. Rapports de mise en œuvre**

7.1 Les Parties contractantes ayant des installations offshore qui rejettent de l'eau de production dans la zone maritime d'OSPAR, devraient rendre compte de la mise en œuvre de la présente Recommandation, ceci en ayant recours, dans toute la mesure du possible, au formulaire figurant en appendice 2. Les rapports devraient être remis à l'organe subsidiaire OSPAR compétent, conformément à la Procédure normalisée OSPAR de notification et d'évaluation de la mise en œuvre.

Figure 1: Diagram for the Risk-based Approach

All steps in the diagram should be carried out.



## Appendix 2/Appendice 2

Format for implementation reports concerning OSPAR Recommendation 2012/5 for a Risk Based Approach to the Management of Produced Water Discharges from Offshore Installations.

*(Note: In accordance with paragraph 6.1 of this Recommendation, this format should be used as far as possible in implementation reports)*

I. Implementation Report on Compliance

Country:

Date submitted:

Contact person:

Reservation applies: Yes/No

Is measure applicable in your country: Yes/No

If not applicable, then state why not (e.g. no relevant installation):

.....  
 ....  
 .....  
 ....

Means of Implementation (delete whichever is not appropriate):

By legislation: Yes/No

Administrative agreement: Yes/No

By negotiated agreement: Yes/No

Please provide information on:

a. specific measures taken to give effect to this measure;

b. any special difficulties encountered, such as practical or legal problems, in the implementation of this measure;

c. the reasons for not having fully implemented this measure should be spelt out clearly and plans for full implementation should be reported;

d. if appropriate, progress towards being able to lift the reservation

Formulaire de mise en œuvre de la Recommandation OSPAR 2012/5 sur une approche basée sur le risque pour la gestion des rejets d'eau de production provenant des installations offshore

*(Note: Conformément au paragraphe 6.1 de la présente recommandation, ce formulaire sera utilisé dans la mesure du possible pour rendre compte de la mise en œuvre)*

I. Rapport de mise en œuvre

Pays :

Date de communication :

Point de contact :

Une réserve s'applique: Oui/non

La mesure est-elle applicable dans votre pays ?

Oui/non

Dans le cas contraire, en indiquer les raisons (p.ex. il n'y a pas d'installation concernée):

.....  
 ....  
 .....  
 ....

Moyens de mise en œuvre (biffer la mention inutile)

Législation : Oui/non

Accord administratif : Oui/non

Accord négocié :

Oui/non

Bien vouloir donner les renseignements suivants :

a. mesures prises spécifiquement afin de rendre la présente mesure effective ;

b. difficultés particulières qui se sont présentées, telles que problèmes pratiques ou juridiques, dans la mise en œuvre de la présente mesure ;

c. les raisons pour lesquelles la présente mesure n'a pas été pleinement appliquée doivent être clairement indiquées, de même que ce qui est prévu pour la mettre pleinement en œuvre.

d. si opportun, les progrès réalisés dans le sens de la levée de la réserve.

## Annex 2 OSPAR Agreement 2012/7



**OSPAR  
COMMISSION**

*Protecting and conserving the  
North-East Atlantic and its resources*

(Source: OSPAR 12/22/1, Annex 19)

# OSPAR Guidelines in support of Recommendation 2012/5 for a Risk-based Approach to the Management of Produced Water Discharges from Offshore Installations

(OSPAR Agreement: 2012-7)

## 1. Scope of the guidelines

1. These OSPAR Guidelines relate to the provisions and requirements set out in §3 of OSPAR 2012/5 Recommendation for a Risk -based Approach to the Management of Produced Water Discharges from Offshore Installations. These Guidelines provide general guidance for Contracting Parties, when undertaking periodic environmental risk assessment for all produced water discharges offshore. They provide a description of each of the stages of the Risk -based Approach, as included in Appendix 1 to the *Recommendation 2012/5 for a Risk -based Approach to the Management of Produced Water Discharges from Offshore Installations*. For discharges in or in the vicinity of vulnerable areas, Contracting Parties may decide to deviate from the approach described in the Guidelines.

2. The basis for risk assessment is a PEC:PNEC and/or msPAF approach, which is valid only for substances causing direct effects. Substances that are both bioaccumulative and persistent might cause postponed effects after accumulation of a certain body burden (due to uptake of food), sometimes at great distance from the discharge point. The potential long-term effects of such substances will not be determined within the scope of the RBA, but need to be assessed separately.

## 1 Overview of the Risk Based Approach


3. The RBA towards Produced Water Management is developed following a harmonised, structured procedure presented below (in Figure A2-1). This framework follows principles of environmental risk assessment already in use in, e.g. the EU (ECHA - Technical Guidance documents) and US (US-EPA Guidance on risk assessment). ECHA has published a series of guidance documents for environmental risk assessment of single substances; the RBA approach has as far as possible been aligned with these guidelines. The assessment of mixtures was developed according to the best scientific practice.

4. To allow for a consistent approach these OSPAR Guidelines refer to published documents, of which the ECHA Guidance on implementation of REACH (May 2008) is one of the key (series of) documents. This minimises the need for updating the Guidelines following a change in external documents.

5. The first step in the RBA process is data collation, in which information on the discharge is collected. The risk is determined using combined information from Hazard Assessment and Exposure Assessment. Contracting Parties should review management options, evaluate measures and develop and implement site-specific actions to reduce those risks which are not adequately controlled. This can involve further data collection and input into the risk-based approach as shown in Figure 1. Monitoring

is used in order to verify the effectiveness of any risk management measures. It may also be used to detect changes in the discharge and in the receiving environment.

**Figure 1**



## 1.1 Data Collection – Step 1

6. Data collection involves the collation of relevant information for the level of assessment to be carried out, on the hazardous properties of individual substances and/or the produced water effluent, information on discharge characteristics and information on the local conditions in the receiving environment. This may include information from a combination of sources such as, but not limited to:

- bioassays of produced water effluents e.g. WET, WEA;
- naturally occurring substances: chemical analysis and substance based ecotoxicological information;
- added chemicals discharged with produced water: including ecotoxicological information and other information;
- substance physical and chemical properties;
- produced water discharge information (volume, depth, temperature etc.); and
- site/field-specific conditions e.g. hydrographic, oceanographic and meteorological data and vulnerability of the area where the discharges are taking place.

### **Bioassays of produced water effluents**

7. The WET approach can be used to assess the toxicity of produced water. This approach assesses the combined toxicity from all substances in the produced water, including unknown substances. WET can be undertaken in its own right or at a more detailed level of assessment in conjunction with the substance-based approach. For this latter approach, produced water samples for bioassays and for chemical analysis should be collected in parallel. WET also determines the possible residual toxicity of substances already addressed by current BAT/BEP OSPAR measures, like dispersed oil (OSPAR Recommendation 2001/1 for the management of produced water from offshore installations, as amended) and offshore chemicals (OSPAR Decision 2000/2 on a Harmonised Mandatory Control System for the Use and Reduction of the Discharge of Offshore Chemicals, as amended).

8. When carrying out WET testing, it is recommended to follow the Practical Guidance Document on Whole Effluent Assessment for offshore Discharges (Roex 2010) or similar guidance. At least a minimum of three *in vivo* bioassays in line with standardized protocols (ECHA Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment, R10.3.2) should be performed, representing three different trophic levels e.g. bacteria, algae and crustacean.

9. Immediate measurements of selected physical-chemical parameters (pH, ammonium, salinity, etc.), is recommended upon arrival of the bioassay samples in the laboratory. This is to allow for adjustment of the samples if considered necessary for performance of the bioassays.

10. WEA consists of a combination of tests for determining of the potential for bioaccumulation (B), persistency (P) and toxicity (T). Tests are available for detecting adverse effects of substances with specific mode of action. Practical guidance on tests and parameters regarding P and B are described in OSPAR Commission (2007) Practical Guidance Document on Whole Effluent Assessment and the Practical Guidance Document on Whole Effluent Assessment for offshore Discharges (Roex 2010)

### **Naturally occurring substances: chemical analysis and substance based ecotoxicological information**

11. Samples of produced water should be collected for chemical analysis of naturally occurring substances. The produced water should be analysed on a minimum set consisting of at least the following groups of substances: heavy metals, BTEX, dispersed oil, 16 EPA PAHs, other PAHs and alkylphenols. Appendix 4 provides an example of substances for chemical analysis and analyses methods.

12. Examples of procedures for the sampling and analysis of substances in produced water are provided in the following documents (note: Available chemical analysis protocols for produced water in general do not include analysis of added chemicals):

- OSPAR Agreement 2006-06. Oil in produced water analysis. Guideline on criteria for alternative method acceptance and general guidelines on sample taking and handling;
- the 'Methodology for the Sampling and Analysis of Produced Water and Other Hydrocarbon Discharges' from the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC 2014) in the United Kingdom.

13. Substance based ecotoxicological information is an important source of data for input to the RBA process. This information is used to estimate PNECs and is described in the "Hazard assessment" step. For the most common substances in the produced water OSPAR will establish and maintain a harmonised set of PNEC values (see Appendix 5).

### **Added chemicals discharged with produced water: including ecotoxicological information and other information**

14. Information on added chemicals discharged with produced water is contained in Contracting Party databases generated through the application of the HMCS.

15. The minimum ecotoxicological information that should be collected includes short-term (acute) toxicity data for three trophic levels; invertebrates (e.g. crustacean, molluscs, echinoderms), algae (growth inhibition) and fish. For added chemicals short-term toxicity data are derived from the HOCNF. If data on the individual substances are not available, one could use the worst case toxicity values for the product.



16. Identification of potential hazardous substances in chemical products should be included and can be derived from regulatory submissions (such as REACH and OSPAR Decision 2000/2 on a Harmonised Mandatory Control System for the Use and Reduction of the Discharge of Offshore Chemicals, as amended), available for all non-PLONOR chemicals. Similar information on PLONOR chemicals discharged in large amounts (e.g. MEG, methanol) should also be included when available.

17. Since chemical analysis normally does not include analysis of added chemicals, an estimate of concentrations of added chemicals (preferably on substance level) must be determined. The most common practical method for the estimation of the quantity of added chemicals (except for surfactants) in produced water discharges is based on the octanol/water partition coefficients (log Pow) available on substance level from the HOCNF for all non-PLONOR production chemicals. For surfactants default values for the fraction released are provided in Thatcher *et al.* (2005).

#### **Substance physical chemical properties**

18. Physical-chemical properties may need to be collected for individual substances, such as state (liquid, solid, etc.), molecular weight, density, boiling point, solubility, melting point, vapour pressure and degradation rates. A list of useful sources of physico-chemical data is provided in ECHA Chapter R.7a: Endpoint specific guidance (Table R.7.1-2.). Relevant data is provided in the database of EU registered substances<sup>1</sup>.

#### **Produced water discharge information**

19. The model selected for estimation of the dilution potential (described in step 3) will determine which discharge characteristic information and physicochemical information is necessary. The following information may typically be required to enable assessment of the dispersion of the produced water plume in the surrounding water:

- geographical position of discharge location;
- discharge volume/discharge rate;
- discharge depth;
- discharge arrangement (e.g. diameter and orientation of discharge pipe);
- salinity;
- temperature; and
- information regarding other discharges at the location (e.g. cooling water, ballast water discharge from the platform or discharges from neighbouring platforms).

#### **Site/field specific conditions**

20. In the exposure assessment (step 3) the predicted fate of produced water in the receiving environment is determined. For the purpose of modelling the dilution/dispersion in the receiving environment, information regarding the environmental parameters at the location/area is useful.

This could include:

- local/ ocean current data;
- hydrographical data;
- wind data;
- air temperature;
- water depth; and
- information on vulnerable areas (e.g. OSPAR Marine Protected Areas; OSPAR List of Threatened and or Declining Species and Habitats; Special Protection Areas (SPA's), and Special Areas of Conservation (SACs).

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://apps.echa.europa.eu/registered/registered-sub.aspx>

## 1.2 Hazard Assessment – Step 2

21. Hazard Assessment is the first evaluation step in the process, in which the hazard (i.e., the inherent capacity to cause adverse effects) of the discharge is evaluated, either on the basis of properties of the effluent or of the individual substances (both added and naturally occurring).

### **PNEC based on substance data**

22. The hazard assessment requires derivation of PNECs derived from single species laboratory toxicity tests (preferably NOEC). Using already established PNEC values and following ECHA R10 (Characterisation of dose-response for the environment) where necessary, OSPAR will establish and maintain a harmonised set of PNEC values for the most common naturally occurring substances in the produced water (see Appendix 5). If other relevant substances are identified, dedicated PNEC values should be derived.

23. Since reliable PNECs are not available for all substances, some substances should be grouped. Grouping should be based on a combination of the chemical structure, toxic mode of action and toxicity. The toxicity of the group of substances will then be represented by the PNEC of selected single substance from that group (which will be available in the harmonised set of PNECs).

24. For added chemicals PNEC values should be derived from data provided in the HOCNF following ECHA R10, with a maximum assessment factor of 1000 as explained in Appendix 6. Similar approach should be followed for PLONOR chemicals discharged in large amounts (e.g. MEG, methanol).

### **PNEC based on WET data**

25. Following the procedure described in ECHA R10, a PNEC for the whole produced water effluent can be calculated on the basis of the WET data that was collected as part of the Data Collection stage. Although the ECHA procedure was developed for single substances, the procedure can be applied to effluent toxicity tests (Cf. OSPAR Commission (2000) Background document concerning the elaboration of programmes and measures relating to Whole Effluent Assessment). A maximum assessment factor of 1000 is used (see Appendix 6).

## 1.3 Exposure Assessment – Step 3

26. Exposure assessment is carried out to determine the fate of discharged produced water. Again, a difference is made between an assessment based on the effluent as a whole and an assessment based on the combination of individual substances.

### **General principles of Exposure assessment**

27. The purpose of the exposure estimation or assessment is to derive the PECs for the receiving environment around an offshore installation. The PEC can be determined by modelling the concentrations in the receiving environment. As a minimum, the PEC should be determined within the column of water the radius of which is defined by the distance from the installation (e.g. 500m zone) specified by the Contracting Party, or within the volume of water directly impacted by the discharge (as determined by hydrographic modelling of dispersion of the discharge), that is specified by the Contracting Party, taking into account local environmental conditions and sensitivities<sup>2</sup>

28. The PEC may be predicted by use of a 1-, 2- or 3-dimensional dilution/dispersion model. It should be demonstrated that dilution is not overestimated by the model by use of (peer reviewed) field validation study(s). Furthermore, the model chosen should be well documented and its users should be well trained. If available, a model that takes account of different fate processes should be used (see also paragraphs 19 and 20). This will provide a more accurate PEC.

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. ECHA-Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment Chapter R.16: Environmental Exposure Estimation

### **Exposure assessment following a substance based approach**

29. The output from the substance based exposure assessment is the concentration of substances discharged with the produced water in the receiving environment (PEC).

### **Exposure assessment following a WET based approach**

30. The output from the WET based exposure assessment is the concentration of produced water effluent (PEC) in the receiving environment, expressed as a percentage of the original effluent.

## **1.4 Risk Characterisation – Step 4**

### *General principles of Risk characterization*

31. Risk characterisation is the comparison of the predicted environmental concentration of the substance and/or the effluent (PEC) and the hazard (PNEC) at a given distance as a minimum.

32. The risk can be further characterised by identification of the contribution of the individual substances (both natural occurring and man-added substances) or groups of substances (e.g. through TIE/EDA) to the overall risk.

### **Risk characterisation following a WET based approach**

33. The PNEC value calculated in the Hazard Assessment and the PEC value calculated in the Exposure Assessment are used to determine the PEC:PNEC ratio for the whole effluent.

### **Risk characterisation following a substance based approach**

34. If risk estimates are calculated on a substance based approach, the PEC:PNEC ratios for the individual identified substances should be combined to calculate the overall risk estimate for the produced water. ECHA does not provide guidance for mixtures; therefore a combined approach based on species sensitivity distributions should be followed (msPAF, De Zwart and Posthuma 2005). Appendix 7 provides further guidance on how a combined approach may be carried out.

### **Using information from the combined WET- and Substance based approach**

35. If both the WET and substance based approach is undertaken then it will be possible to use both sets of data to inform the risk assessment.

## **1.5 Risk Management – Step 5**

### **Risk reduction**

36. If the exposure level does not exceed the PNEC outside a column of water surrounding the installation, the radius of which is defined by a distance from the installation specified by the Contracting Party, or outside the volume of water directly impacted by the discharge (as determined by hydrographic modelling of dispersion of the discharge) that is specified by the Contracting Party, the risk should be considered to be adequately controlled. If this is not the case, Contracting Parties should then review management options and the application of BAT and BEP and implement site-specific actions to reduce the risks.

37. For effective risk reduction it is useful to have insight into the most important contributors to the risk. The intermediate results of the substance based risk characterisation may provide insight into those substances contributing most to the overall risk. Also TIE or equivalent methods may provide insight into those substances contributing most to the overall risk of the effluent (Sauer *et al.*, 1997, Balaam *et al.* 2009, Thomas *et al.* 2009). The results may assist in identifying BAT and BEP.

### **Refinement of the risk characterisation**

38. The risk characterisation can be dominated by uncertainty leading to high assessment factors in the derivation of the PNEC. Therefore, before looking at physical measures it may be prudent to address uncertainty as reductions here can reduce the resultant PEC: PNEC ratio by factors of 10-100 (assessment factors generally drive the risk up as uncertainty increases). This may be achieved by, for instance, the collection of additional data and/or undertaking additional toxicity testing to obtain more reliable PNECs, more advanced dilution/fate modelling, review/additional of chemical analysis etc. to obtain more reliable PECs.

## Measures

39. Risk reduction measures (OSPAR Commission publication on the Background Document concerning Techniques for the Management of Produced Water from Offshore Installations) may comprise some or all of the following:

- technical measures, such as abatement at the source by redesign of the applied processes (water shut off in the well);
- substitution of chemicals;
- application of closed systems (e.g. injection of produced water);
- end-of-pipe techniques such as separation or clarification techniques to treat produced water prior to discharge, and;
- organisational measures such as management systems in place (training, instructions, procedures and reporting).

40. The application of BAT and BEP should be demonstrated as described in Appendix 1 of the OSPAR Convention.

41. When setting priorities and in assessing the nature and extent of the measures and their time scales, Contracting Parties should use the criteria as mentioned in Appendix 2 of the OSPAR Convention.

42. Further explanation on the evaluation and implementation of Risk Management Measures is provided by ECHA (Chapter R13: Risk management measures and operational conditions)

### Review and update of the environmental risk assessment

43. Each Contracting Party should determine how often the environmental risk assessment process should be undertaken. Typically, a review and update takes place when there is a significant change in the produced water discharge (characteristics) due to implementation of risk reduction measures or other modifications, such as:

- Implementation of new end-of-pipe technique;
- Substitution of added chemicals or new chemicals taken into use;
- Significant change in the discharge of added chemicals; and
- Tie-in of new produced water streams (satellites) and/or new wells.

44. An update of the environmental risk assessment would imply that the process should be restarted at step 1 (data collection) as shown in the flow diagram (Figure A2-1), and that the risk assessment process should be repeated with new and updated information.

## 1.6 Monitoring -Step 6

45. Monitoring is a key element in the verification of the effectiveness of measures adopted for the reduction of the risk. Monitoring refers to the monitoring of produced water effluents (effluent monitoring), the monitoring of the receiving environment (field monitoring) and the monitoring of changes which may require additional assessment (system monitoring). Monitoring is an on-going, iterative process, that is performed on a periodical basis, or when significant changes have been made to the installation that might affect the discharge. The outcome of the monitoring process is used as additional information in the risk management process.

### Effluent Monitoring

46. Effluent monitoring may include the gathering of information from chemical analysis and / or WET/WEA tests on produced water samples taken periodically.

### Field monitoring

47. Field monitoring may be used to validate the risk characterized in the RBA process. It may include chemical analysis of seawater and chemical and biological analysis of biota samples (biological effect monitoring) collected from the vicinity of offshore installations. Relevant international standards,

and OSPAR Agreement 2004-11 on “Guidelines for Monitoring the Environmental Impact of Offshore Oil and Gas Activities” should be taken into account before field monitoring of the water column is carried out.

48. The monitoring program needs to be designed to be fit for the purpose and to take account of specific field conditions, future field activities and discharges and existing knowledge of previous monitoring in similar or nearby area (Cf. OSPAR Guidelines for Monitoring the Environmental Impact of Offshore Oil and Gas Activities (OSPAR Agreement 2004-11)).

## 2. Documenting the risk assessment

49. With the objective of documenting the risk assessment process the following information may be reported in order to provide an audit trail of the assessment:

- produced water sampling and analysis monitoring programmes, techniques and results;
- whole effluent based risk assessment methodologies and results e.g. WEA, WET;
- substance based risk assessment methodologies and modelling results; together with any derived PNEC values which are not listed in Appendix 5
- substances identified in produced water likely to pose a risk to the marine environment;
- the criteria used to assess whether risk is adequately controlled (e.g., distance and/or volume); and
- field monitoring techniques;

## List of Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Full text	Explanation / definition/reference
BAT	Best Available Techniques	OSPAR Convention, Appendix 1
BEP	Best Environmental Practice	OSPAR Convention, Appendix. 1
BTEX	Benzene, Toluene, Ethyl Benzene and Xylene	Collection of the aforementioned substances
CP	Contracting Parties	Countries being a part of OSPAR
DECC	UK Department of Energy and Climate Change	<a href="http://www.decc.gov.uk/">http://www.decc.gov.uk/</a>
EC	European Commission	<a href="http://ec.europa.eu/index_en.htm">http://ec.europa.eu/index_en.htm</a>
EC50	Median effect concentration	Explained under Glossary, Appendix 2
ECHA	European Chemicals Agency	<a href="http://echa.europa.eu/">http://echa.europa.eu/</a>
EPA	US Environmental Protection Agency	<a href="http://www.epa.gov/">http://www.epa.gov/</a>
EPA PAH	List of 16 PAHs with high priority assigned by the EPA	
GC/FID	Gas Chromatography with Flame Ionization Detection	Analytical device for separation and detection of chemicals
GC/MS	Gas Chromatography with Mass Spectrometry	Analytical device for separation and detection of chemicals
HC5	5% Hazardous concentration	Explained under Glossary, Appendix 2
HMCS	Harmonised Mandatory Control System	OSPAR Decision 2000/2
HOCNF	Harmonised Offshore Chemical Notification Format	OSPAR Guidelines 2010-5
IUCLID	International Uniform Chemical Information Database	<a href="http://iuclid.echa.europa.eu/">http://iuclid.echa.europa.eu/</a>
LC50	Median lethal concentration	Explained under Glossary, Appendix 2
MEG	Monoethylenglycol	Production chemical listed as PLONOR
msPAF	Multi-substance Potentially Affected Fraction	Explained under Glossary, Appendix 2
NOEC	No Observed Effect Concentration	Explained under Definitions
OIC	Offshore Industry Committee	<a href="http://www.ospar.org/html_documents/ospar/html/01-04e_terms_of_reference.pdf#nameddest=OIC">http://www.ospar.org/html_documents/ospar/html/01-04e_terms_of_reference.pdf#nameddest=OIC</a>
OLF	The Norwegian Oil Industry Association	<a href="http://www.olf.no/">http://www.olf.no/</a>
OSPAR	OSlo-PARis Convention	<a href="http://www.ospar.org">http://www.ospar.org</a>
PAF	Potentially Affected Fraction	Explained under Glossary, Appendix 2
PAH	Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons	A chemical class of substances that are present in produced water, some of which are carcinogenic
PBT	Persistence Bioaccumulation Toxicity	Explained under Glossary, Appendix 2
PEC	Predicted Environmental Concentration	Calculated or estimated concentration in the environment used in environmental risk assessment
PLONOR	Pose Little Or NO Risk	OSPAR list of substances / preparations used and discharged offshore which are considered to pose little or no risk to the environment
PNEC	Predicted No Effect Concentration	the concentration of a chemical or effluent below which adverse effects on the aquatic ecosystem and its organisms will most likely not occur during long-term or short term exposure
PW	Produced Water	By-product of oil and gas extraction
RBA	Risk -based Approach	Approach for the management of PW as proposed by the OIC (08/13/1-E)

UK Risk Based Approach (RBA)

REACH	Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemical substances	EC regulation for chemicals (EC 1907/2006)
SDS	Safety Data Sheet	Annex II of REACH
TIE	Toxicity Identification and Evaluation	Explained under Glossary, Appendix 2
TMA	Toxic Mode of Action	Explained under Glossary, Appendix 2
US-EPA	See EPA	
WEA	Whole Effluent Assessment	Explained under Glossary, Appendix 2
WET	Whole Effluent Toxicity	Explained under Glossary, Appendix 2

## Glossary

**HC5:** The 5% Hazardous Concentration (HC5) is the exposure concentration of a substance at which 5% of biota are exposed above their effect concentration (usually NOECs). In general, the HC5 level is extrapolated from a limited, but representative, set of NOECs by fitting a cumulative statistical distribution (log-normal in these guidelines) to the NOEC data.

**LC50/EC50:** The toxicity data are typically reported as the concentrations at which x % (e.g. 50%) mortality or inhibition of a function (e.g. growth) is observed and are expressed as the lethal concentration (LCx) or the effect concentration (ECx), e.g. LC50 or EC50. L/EC50-values are usually obtained from short term tests (duration in the range of hours to a few days, depending on the test organism).

**msPAF:** For a more detailed explanation of the single-substance Potentially Affected Fraction, see 'PAF'. The multi-substance PAF (msPAF) is the fraction or percentage of biota that are potentially affected when exposed to a specific mixture of substances.

**NOEC:** Results of long term tests exposed to a substance for a prolonged period in relation to the length of the life-cycle of the organism are most frequently reported as L/ECx (x being very often equal to 10) or as the NOEC (No Observed Effect Concentration) which corresponds to the highest tested concentration for which there are no statistical significant effect when compared to the control group. The endpoints most frequently used are growth inhibition and reproduction.

**PAF:** The Potentially Affected Fraction (PAF) is the fraction or percentage of biota that is exposed above their effect level (usually the NOEC level) at a specific exposure concentration of a substance. This fraction is extrapolated from a limited, but representative, set of NOECs for the substance, by fitting a cumulative statistical distribution (log-normal in these guidelines) to the NOEC data.

**PBT:** Three intrinsic properties of chemicals called Persistence, Bioaccumulation potential and Toxicity (PBT). Persistent substances are substances that are not readily (bio)degradable in the environment. Bioaccumulative substances are substances that have a potency to concentrate in biota along the food-chain. Toxic substances are substances with low effect concentrations (e.g. NOECs).

**TIE:** Toxicity Identification and Evaluation (TIE) is a cycle of procedures relying on combinations of physical/chemical manipulations and toxicity tests to characterize, identify, and confirm the causes of measured toxicity in a sample (for instance an effluent).

**TMA:** Toxic Mode of Action are classes of (molecular) mechanisms by which chemicals exert their adverse effect. These classes are used in the calculation of the msPAF. For chemicals with a similar mode of action, exposure levels should be summed, while for substances with different modes of actions, effect levels should be summed.

**WEA:** Whole Effluent Assessment is the assessment of the whole effluent in terms of all three PBT properties (or even more generic).

**WET:** Whole Effluent Toxicity is the toxicity of the whole effluent. For this purpose, the effect level of a biota to a dilution series of the effluent is tested in the laboratory and is expressed, for instance, a NOEC or LC50/EC50.



## List of References

### Key References

DECC (Department of Energy and Climate Change) (2014). *Methodology for the Sampling and Analysis of Produced Water and Other Hydrocarbon Discharges*. Version 2.1

ECHA Technical Guidance Documents, to be found on the ECHA website:  
<http://guidance.echa.europa.eu>

ECHA Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment Chapter R.16:  
*Environmental Exposure Estimation*  
[http://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/17224/information\\_requirements\\_r16\\_en.pdf](http://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/17224/information_requirements_r16_en.pdf)

OSPAR Commission (2000). *OSPAR Background document concerning the elaboration of programmes and measures relating to Whole Effluent Assessment*. ISBN 0 949655 98 0.

OSPAR Commission (2006). *Oil in produced water analysis – guideline on criteria for alternative method acceptance and general guidelines on sample taking and handling*. OSPAR agreement 2006-06.

OSPAR Commission (2007). *Practical Guidance Document on Whole Effluent Assessment*. Hazardous Substance Series

Roex, E. (2009). *Practical Guidance Document on Whole Effluent Assessment for offshore discharges*. Deltares report.

Roex, E. (2010). *A practical program for Whole Effluent Assessment for discharges from the offshore industry*. OIC 10/04/07

### References for further reading

Aas, N., B Knudsen, J O Sæten & E Nordstad (2002). SPE paper 74083. International Conference on Health, Safety and Environment in Oil and Gas Exploration and Production, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 20-22 March 2002.

Balaam, J. L., Y Chan-Man, P H Roberts & K V Thomas (2009). *Identification of non-regulated pollutants in north sea produced water discharges*. Environ. Toxicol, Chem. 28, pp. 1159-1167

De Zwart D., & L Posthuma (2005). Complex mixture toxicity for single and multiple species: Proposed methodologies. Environ. Toxicol. Chem. 24, pp 2665-2676.

Van Leeuwen, C.J., & J L M Hermens (Editors) (1995). *Risk Assessment of Chemicals: An Introduction*. ISBN 0-7923-3740-9

Sauer, T.C., H J Costa, J S Brown & T J Wards (1997). *Toxicity identification evaluations of produced-water effluents*. Environ. Toxicol.Chem. 16, pp 2020-2028.

Smit M.G.D., K I E Holthaus, J E Tamis & C C Karman (2005). *From PEC:PNEC ratio to quantitative risk level using Species Sensitivity Distributions; methodology applied in the Environmental Impact Factor*. TNO report B&O-DH - R2005/181, TNO, Den Helder, The Netherlands.

Smit M.G.D., R G Jak, H Rye, T K Frost, I Singsaas & C C Karman (2008). *Assessment of environmental risks from toxic and nontoxic stressors; a proposed concept for a risk-based management tool for offshore drilling discharges*. Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management 4m pp 177-183.

Smit M.G.D., T K Frost & S Johnsen (2011). *Achievements of risk-based produced water management on the Norwegian continental shelf (2002–2008)*. Integr. Environ. Assess. Manag. 7, pp 668-677

Straalen, N.M. & C A J Denneman (1989). *Ecotoxicological Evaluation of Soil Quality Criteria*. Ecotox. Environ. Safety 18, pp 241-251

Thatcher, M., M Robson, L R Henriquez, C C Karman & G Payne (2004). *A CIN revised CHARM III Report - A user guide for the evaluation of chemicals used and discharged offshore*. Version 4.

Thomas, K.V., K Langford, K Petersen, A J Smith & K E Tollefsen (2009). *Effect-directed identification of naphthenic acids as important in vitro xeno-estrogens and anti-androgens in North Sea offshore produced water discharges*. Environmental Science Technology, 43, pp. 8066-8701.

US-EPA Guidance on Risk Assessment, to be found on the US-EPA website: [http://www.epa.gov/risk\\_assessment/](http://www.epa.gov/risk_assessment/)

**Example of a Norwegian Chemical analysis program of produced water***Table 1: Overview of produced water substances (naturally occurring) included in the analysis program, recommended analysis, methods and limits of quantification.*

<b>Main group</b>	<b>Substances</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Standards of analysis</b>	<b>Detection limit</b>
<b>Metals and metalloids</b>	Arsenic	AAS/ICP-MS /DRC-ICP-MS /HR-ICP-MS	EPA 200.7/200.8	1 – 5
	Cadmium	AAS/ICP-MS /DRC-ICP-MS /HR-ICP-MS	EPA 200.7/200.8	0,05 – 6
	Chromium	AAS/ICP-MS /DRC-ICP-MS /HR-ICP-MS	EPA 200.7/200.8	0,1 - 1,5
	Copper	AAS/ICP-MS /DRC-ICP-MS /HR-ICP-MS	EPA 200.7/200.8	0,5 – 6
	Mercury	CV-AAS/ICP-MS/DRC-ICP-MS	EPA 200.7/200.8	0,002 - 0,1
	Lead	AAS/ICP-MS /DRC-ICP-MS /HR-ICP-MS	EPA 200.7/200.8	0,3 - 1,5
	Nickel	AAS/ICP-MS /DRC-ICP-MS /HR-ICP-MS	EPA 200.7/200.8	0,5 – 9
	Zinc	AAS/ICP-MS /DRC-ICP-MS /HR-ICP-MS	EPA 200.7/200.8	2 – 15
	(Iron)	AAS/ICP-MS/DRC-ICP-MS/ICP-AES	EPA 200.7/200.8	1 – 4
	(Barium)	AAS/ICP-MS/DRC-ICP-MS/ICP-AES	EPA 200.7/200.8	0,1 – 10
<b>Mono Aromatic Hydrocarbons</b>	Benzene	GC-MS or GC-FID Headspace or purge-and-trap	Internal method M-036	1 – 10
	Toluene	GC-MS or GC-FID Headspace or purge-and-trap	Internal method M-047	1 – 20
	Ethylbenzene	GC-MS or GC-FID Headspace or purge-and-trap		1 – 50

	Xylene (p, m, o)	GC-MS or GC-FID Headspace or purge-and- trap		1 – 30
<b>Dispersed oil</b>	C7-C40	GC/FID	Mod. NS-EN ISO 9377-2/OSPAR 2005-15	0,2
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (16 EPA)	Naphthalene, acenaphthylene, acenaphthene, fluorine, phenanthrene, anthracene, fluoranthene, pyrene, benzo(a)anthracene, chrysene, benzo(b)fluoranthene, benzo(k)fluoranthene, benzo(a)pyrene, dibenzo(a)anthracene, benzo (ghi)perylene, indeno(123cd)pyrene,	GC/MS	Internal method M- 036	0,01 – 0,1
<b>Other PAHs:</b>	Dibenzothiophene1- methylnaphthalene, 2- methylnaphthalene, 9- methylnaphthalene, 4-methyldibenzo- thiophene, 2,6 dimethyl naphthalene, 9-ethyl- phenanthrene, 4-ethyl- dibenzothiophene, trimethylphenanthrene, 2-isopropylnaphtalene, 1,2,6 trimethyl- phenantrene	GC/MS	Internal method M- 036	0,01 – 0,1
Alkylphenols	Sum C1-C3, C4-C5 and C6-C9 alkylphenols	GC-MS 2285	Method established by Battelle (US)	0,01 – 0,1

### Grouping and establishment of a list of PNECs for naturally occurring substances

If a substance based risk approach is followed, the hazard assessment (step 2) in the Risk Based Approach (RBA) requires derivation of Predicted No Effects Concentrations (PNECs) for all substances identified in the produced water. During the last decade Environmental Quality Standards (EQSs) and PNECs have been established for a number of substances under the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and the EU following the guidance of the ECHA documents (formerly Technical Guidance Document). Since reliable PNECs are not available for all substances identified, grouping of substances is an option. The toxicity of the group of substances will then be represented by the PNEC of a selected single substance, from that group.

Produced water contains many naturally occurring substances that vary in composition from field to field. In order to chemically and toxicologically characterise the complex mixture of produced water, this may be simplified by grouping of substances.

Grouping should be based on a combination of a substance's chemical structure, toxic mode of action, PBT properties and the concentration level in produced water.

The OSPAR RBA group has established a list of PNEC values for the most common naturally occurring substances in the produced water based on already existing EQSs and PNECs, where available. Furthermore grouping of substances has been carried out.

Harmonised use of the list of PNECs enables sharing of information and comparison of the risk assessment results among Contracting Parties. This list should be maintained by OSPAR and updated on a regular basis (e.g. every 5-10 years) or as new scientific data become available. The PNEC list does not include added chemicals. Derivation of PNECs for added chemicals is described separately in paragraph 24 and Appendix 6 of the Guidelines.

The selection of PNECs for the list was based on the following prioritisation:

1. Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) derived under the WFD established for Priority Substances
2. Reliable PNECs derived from EU RARs
3. Reliable PNECs or EQS from publicly available literature sources

More detailed information about the PNEC selection, including a list of PNECs for naturally occurring substances typically found in produced water, is contained in the background document on the 'Establishment of a list of Predicted No Effect Concentrations (PNECs) for naturally occurring substances in produced water' (OSPAR Agreement 2014-05), which was adopted by OSPAR in 2014.

### Use of marine assessment factors

The practical programme highlighted the fact that the assessment factors set out in ECHA and the 2003 Technical Guidance (TGD) for Deriving Environmental Quality Standards<sup>1,2</sup> have the potential to have a negative impact on the RBA approach by masking the overall contribution to produced water toxicity from natural components. This is a consequence of the introduction of an additional factor of 10 to the assessment factors derived for the marine environment.

The purpose of the RBA recommendation is to provide data to inform sound decisions on measures to reduce the risk from the discharge of produced water. The effect of the additional factor may be implementation of the wrong measures.

In a review of the science behind the additional factor, the Scientific Committee on Health and Environmental Risks<sup>3</sup> (SCHER) commented (Comment 15) that they did not accept the additional safety factor of 10 as a default for marine ecosystems as being generally justified. In the opinion of SCHER, the use of different approaches for both freshwater and marine ecosystems should be scientifically justified on a case-by-case basis.

Given the potential impact on their work, the ICG-RBA group notes that:

- The TGD recognises that there is a harmonised mandatory control system for the use and discharge of offshore chemicals already agreed within OSPAR (OSPAR 2000a; 2000b) and that the methodology proposed by OSPAR can be taken into consideration in determining assessment factors.
- The assessment factors proposed for the development of environmental quality standards are not directly relevant to determining whether there has been adequate dilution of offshore discharges within a specified water volume or area immediately adjacent to an offshore installation, as dispersion outside that zone ensures that acceptable water quality standards are rapidly achieved and maintained.
- The assessment factors within TGD 1993 originally proposed for risk assessment have been used to control chemical discharges from offshore installations for a number of years, and monitoring studies have indicated that they provide an appropriate level of protection to the ecosystem function.
- Discharges under OSPAR 2001/1 and 2012/5 are subject to strict control including requirements for hazard/risk assessment before discharge and regular review of BAT.

Given the existing safeguards, the aims of the ICG-RBA and the implementation of BAT and BEP, the ICG-RBA therefore proposes to continue to use the assessment factors set out in the 1996 Technical Guidance Document on Risk Assessment<sup>5</sup>.

## References

1. ECHA (2008) *Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment. Chapter R.10: Characterisation of dose [concentration] - response for environment*, May 2008.  
<http://echa.europa.eu/web/guest/guidance-documents/guidance-on-information-requirements-and-chemical-safety-assessment>
2. EC (2006). *Technical Guidance Document on Risk Assessment in support of Commission Directive 93/67/EEC on Risk Assessment for New Notified Substances*.
3. SCHER (Scientific Committee on Health and Environmental Risks) (2010). *Opinion on the Chemicals and the Water Framework Directive: Technical Guidance for Deriving Environmental Quality Standards*. October 2010.
4. Mathijs G., D Smit, T K Frost & S Johnsen. *Achievements of risk based produced water management on the Norwegian Continental Shelf (2002-2008)*. In *Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management*, 7, No. 4, pp 668-677.
5. EC (1996). *Technical Guidance Document in support of the Commission Directive 93/67/EEC on Risk Assessment for New Notified Substances and Commission Regulation (EC) No 1488/94 on Risk Assessment for Existing Substances. Parts 1-4*. Office for Official Publications of the EC, Luxembourg

### Example methods for calculating an overall risk estimate for produced water for the substance based approach

In the Risk Assessment step, for all substances and/or groups of substances a PEC:PNEC ratio is calculated. In order to arrive at single risk indicator that represents the overall risk of the produced water, these individual PEC:PNEC ratios should be combined. There are several methods available for this, ranging from straightforward summation of the PEC:PNEC ratios to more comprehensive methods that are scientifically more correct. This appendix describes two methods for calculating an overall risk estimate from individual PEC:PNEC ratios including their scientific validity. The two methods presented only serve as examples. More methods are available and new methods will be developed when science evolves.

The simplest way of calculating an indicator for the overall risk of the produced water is by summing all individual PEC:PNEC ratios. This  $\Sigma$ PEC:PNEC, for instance at a certain distance from the discharge source, can serve as an indicator for the overall risk, subject to risk reduction.

#### **Method 1.**

#### **Summation of PEC:PNEC ratios (concentration addition)**

$$\Sigma \text{PEC:PNEC} = \text{PEC:PNEC}_1 + \text{PEC:PNEC}_2 + \dots + \text{PEC:PNEC}_n$$

Backhaus *et al.* (2003) provides two mechanisms to calculate chemical mixtures, which are a concentration addition for similar acting substances and for dissimilar acting substances an independent action as a main mechanism. This defends the selection of a simple method like summing up PEC:PNEC ratios to establish a risk indicator for the produced water. However, if the mixture contains dissimilar acting chemicals, independent action is probably scientifically the better choice, since the relation between the risk (i.e. the likelihood of adverse effects to occur) and the PEC:PNEC ratio might not be equal for all substances and/or substances groups.

Species Sensitivity Distributions (SSDs) describe the relationship between the PEC and risk. For these distributions the risk (likelihood of adverse effects to occur) is expressed as the potentially affected fraction (PAF) of species, or, in other words, the likelihood of a randomly selected species to be affected above a defined effect level (e.g. NOEC or EC50 level, depending on what toxicity metric is used to establish this distribution).

When based on chronic NOECs, the 5% risk level (PAF) from an SSD corresponds to an exposure level that is equal to the PNEC (in line with the HC5 definition for PNEC, Van Straalen en Denneman, 1989). A SSD based on chronic NOECs can therefore easily be transformed into a PEC:PNEC to risk curve by dividing the measure of exposure on the x-axis by the PNEC. After this transformation the x-axis becomes unit free and the value of 1 on the x-axis (PEC:PNEC ratio) then corresponds with the 5% PAF (See figure A for an example). PEC:PNEC to risk curves can be developed for different Toxic Modes of Action and are equal for all substances and/or substance groups with the same Toxic Mode of Action.

The only parameter needed to establish a PEC:PNEC to risk curve for a specific Toxic Mode of Action is a measure of interspecies variation (the slope of the SSD describing how the risk changes on increasing exposure). When PEC:PNEC to risk curves have been established for the different Toxic Modes of Action, PEC:PNEC ratios can be calculated into PAF. Finally the different PAF values can be combined in the overall risk indicator msPAF.






Figure A. Transformation of an SSD to a PEC:PNEC to risk curve by dividing the x-axis of the SSD (PEC) by the value of the PNEC (10 in this example).

**Method 2.**

**Calculation of the multi-substance Potential Affected Fraction (msPAF) of species - independent action.**

1. Sum PEC:PNEC ratios for substances and/or groups of substances with the same Toxic Mode of Action

$$\Sigma \text{PEC:PNEC}_{\text{TMA1}} = \text{PEC:PNEC}_1 + \text{PEC:PNEC}_2 + \dots + \text{PEC:PNEC}_n$$

$$\Sigma \text{PEC:PNEC}_{\text{TMA2}} = \text{PEC:PNEC}_1 + \text{PEC:PNEC}_2 + \dots + \text{PEC:PNEC}_n$$

Etc. for all Toxic Modes of Action

2. Derive a PEC:PNEC to risk curve for each Toxic Mode of Action

A PEC:PNEC to risk curve can be described by a lognormal distribution (often with 10 as base) using two parameters.

X<sub>m</sub>: the mean of the distribution

SD: the standard deviation

The SD of the PEC:PNEC to risk curve is equal to the slope of the Species Sensitivity Distribution. Harbers *et al.* (2006) published generic SSD slope values for several Toxic Modes of Action.

If LOG10 is used as a base the X<sub>m</sub> of the PEC:PNEC to risk curve can be derived with:  
X<sub>m</sub> =

$$\text{OG}(1) + (1.6449 \times \text{SD})$$

3. Calculate PAF for each  $\Sigma \text{PEC:PNEC}_{\text{TMA}}$  by using the PEC:PNEC to risk curves
4. The overall risk value (msPAF) is calculated by combining the PAF related to each TMA, using the formula:  $\text{msPAF}_{\text{TMA1+2}} = \text{PAF}_{\text{TMA1}} + \text{PAF}_{\text{TMA2}} - \text{PAF}_{\text{TMA1}} \times \text{PAF}_{\text{TMA2}}$ .

## References

Backhaus T., R Altenburger, R, Å Arrhenius, H Blanck, M Faust, A Finizio, P Gramatica, M Grote, M Junghans, W Meyer, M Pavan, T Porsbring, M Scholze, R Todeschini, M Vighi, H Walter & L H Grimmea (2003). *The BEAM-project: Prediction and assessment of mixture toxicities in the aquatic environment*. Cont Shelf Res 23, pp 1757-1796.

Harbers J V., M A J Huijbregts, L Posthuma & D van de Meent (2006). *Estimating the Impact of High-Production-Volume Chemicals on Remote Ecosystems by Toxic Pressure Calculation*. Environ. Sci. Technol. 40, pp 1573-1580.

Smit M.G.D., K I E Holthaus, J E Tamis & C C Karman. (2005). *From PEC\_PNEC ratio to quantitative risk level using Species Sensitivity Distributions; methodology applied in the Environmental Impact Factor*. TNO report B&O-DH - R2005/181, TNO, Den Helder, The Netherlands.

van Straalen N.M. & C A J Denneman (1989). *Ecotoxicological evaluation of soil quality criteria*. Ecotoxicol. Environ. Safety 18, pp 241-251.

## Annex 3 RBA Schedule

Provided here are the RBA programme schedule for 2021 (Table A3-1), the RBA programme schedule for 2023 to 2025 (Table A3-2), and confirmation of those installations not included in this RBA programme (Table A3-3).

Please note that the RBA schedules are subject to change and an operator can request to swap installations via e-mail to [bst@beis.gov.uk](mailto:bst@beis.gov.uk). This guidance will not be updated for amendments to the RBA programme schedules. The most recent version of the RBA programme schedules can be accessed by visiting: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/oil-and-gas-environmental-policy>

Operators are reminded that a request can be submitted via e-mail to [bst@beis.gov.uk](mailto:bst@beis.gov.uk), to remove an installation from the RBA programme if the installation no longer discharges produced water or if it has a confirmed cessation of production (CoP) date during or before the next assessment period (2023-2025). Installations that re-inject all their produced water and halt production in the event of re-injection downtime (i.e. an installation that does not have a permit for the contingency discharge of produced water) will not be required to undertake an RBA assessment.

**Table A3-1 RBA Schedule for 2021:** Installations to undertake an RBA assessment in 2021.

2021	
H1	H2
Catcher	Kraken
Aoka Mizu	Trent
Western Isles	Stella
Cygnus	
Culzean	
Solan	
Clair Ridge	
Mariner	

**Table A3-2 RBA Schedule for 2023 to 2025:** Installations that are included in the RBA programme that will commence in 2023 and are required to complete Step 6 of the RBA assessment by 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021.

2023			2024	
H1	H2		H1	H2
Beryl Bravo	Auk		Alwyn North	Foinaven
Armada	Scott		Balmoral	Clyde Alpha
Piper	GPIII		Triton	Beryl Alpha
Douglas OSI	North Everest		Forties Bravo	Pierce (Haewene Brim)
Alba North	Ninian South		Lomond	Brent Charlie
Northern Producer	Nelson		Ninian Central	Heather Alpha
Tiffany	Montrose		Gannet	Anasuria
Forties Delta	Clair Phase 1		Gryphon Alpha	Andrew
Buzzard	Bruce		Kittiwake	
Harding	Thistle			
2025				
H1	H2			
Forties Charlie	Judy			
Alba FSU	Forties Alpha			
Britannia	Claymore			
Brae Alpha	Bleo Holm			
Glen Lyon	East Brae			
Cormorant Alpha	Sevan Hummingbird			
Magnus	Douglas DP			
Shearwater	Kilmar			
North Cormorant				
Tern Alpha				

**Table A3-3 Installations not included in the RBA programme commencing in 2023:** If the risk associated with the produce water discharge is likely to have increased then the installation may be added to the RBA programme commencing in 2023.

Installations not included in the RBA programme	
Apollo Spirit	Hyde
Babbage	Inde
Banff	Lancelot
Brae Bravo	Leman Alpha
Cleeton	Malory
Eider	Morecambe
Elgin	Ravenspurn North
Excalibur	Rough B
Fulmar	Tartan Alpha
Galahad	Waveney
Golden Eagle	Wingate

## Annex 4 Modelling, DREAM, PECs, PNECs and PEC:PNEC Ratios

This annex provides guidance on the minimum level of information and analysis required to undertake a risk-based approach assessment. There may be site-specific reasons why a greater level of information and analysis is appropriate.

### A4.1 Acceptable Dispersion Models

A significant component of the risk-based approach is the examination of risks in the context of the location of the installation and under relevant metocean conditions. Three-dimensional dispersion models should therefore be used that are proven for use in this field and used internationally for regulatory purposes, such as DREAM, PROTEUS and MIKE. A recognised method for the calculation of risk for multiple substances shall be used and guidance is provided in Appendix 7 of the OSPAR 2012/7 Guidelines (see Annex 2). This method may be an intrinsic part of a recognised model for which the calculation basis is stated, or it may be a separate calculation. If it is the latter, BEIS will expect to be provided with evidence that the calculation has been undertaken correctly.

The model should be capable of resolving volumes of  $10^5 \text{ m}^3$  which is typically reflected in the choice of grid size used in the model. If a particle tracking (Lagrangian) model is used, an appropriate combination of the number of particles and the time steps should be employed to simulate an unbroken produced water plume. Smoothing functions may be used for presentational purposes but not for risk calculation.

Typically, a minimum of 5,000 particles should be used in the simulation and ideally around 20,000. Failure to meet this criterion is likely to result in patchy distribution of the plume in simulations. Model time steps should be in the range of 5 minutes to 30 minutes given the short duration of produced water discharge simulations. In terms of configuring a model domain, the cell sizing should not be larger than the size of the currents grid.

Temperature and salinity of the discharge proved to be significant aspects during the exploratory modelling undertaken to support the RBA trial, and the model should therefore also be capable of modelling density/buoyancy effects due to temperature and salinity.

Model outputs should include a graphical plan showing the typical extent (i.e. at a single point in time where the extent of the maximum risk can be regarded as typical for the discharge) of the maximum risk at any depth, along with a time-series graph of the volume affected above the 5% risk, demonstrating that the 'typical' time chosen is indeed reflective of the time-average. The maximum risk at any time at any location during the modelling period should also be shown, demonstrating that the area above the 5% risk has been captured in the modelled area. Cross sections of both these outputs should also be presented, which intersect the highest area of risk and show the full depth of the water column. Risk levels down to at most 0.1% should be shown in multiple steps, to add context to the overall behaviour of the plume. A 5% risk threshold should be adopted, but risk values greater than 5% can also be used to add context to the behaviour of the plume and the areas that are most at risk. The relative contributions of individual components to the overall risk, where it is >5%, should also be quantified and shown graphically.

It is expected that chemical permit holders will apply reasonable skill and care in their use of modelling techniques and that this will include using trained and experienced personnel and robust input parameters. If BEIS is not satisfied with the account of the modelling process in the final report of the assessment, or has doubts about the process, they may reject the results and/or commission further modelling to obtain comparative data. BEIS may also request copies of input and output files for the model runs, and chemical permit holders should therefore retain these files.

### A4.2 Metocean Data

The metocean data used for the modeling must come from a reputable source and may be measured or modelled. The origins of the data must be clearly described. The current data must be 3-dimensional with a spatial and time resolution that is appropriate to the area in which the installation is situated. For example, time intervals for currents of greater than 3 hours are likely to introduce anomalies because the tidal cycle will be poorly reproduced, whereas time intervals for wind of 6 hours would normally be

considered acceptable. Chemical permit holders can use their own metocean data, particularly if this has a higher degree of validation, but an explanation of the origins of the data and the protocols used to arrive at the model inputs will be required. The data shall be depth-resolved in as many layers as reflects the nature of the water column, and the chemical permit holder shall provide evidence that the number of layers used is an appropriate representation of the dynamics of the water column. In the interest of comparability across RBA reports in the UK, chemical permit holders are invited to use freely available high-quality currents data such as the Hybrid Coordinate Ocean Model (HYCOM; <https://www.hycom.org/>) for currents data and European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF <https://www.ecmwf.int/>) for winds data where better-resolution/quality data are not available.

Thermocline and halocline can be incorporated into the model if the data are available. The data used must be appropriate to the season of the modelling period. Unless site specific data are available, chemical permit holders are invited to use freely available high-quality data.

It is recognized that the range of possible metocean conditions is very large. Whilst it is within the capability of available models to run scenarios over extended periods, the risk-based approach aims to identify significant contributors to risk that can then be considered in terms of risk reduction, and significant contributors can often be identified by modelling based on a subset of the available metocean data. It is also important to note that if a continuous discharge is being modelled it may take around two model-weeks for the discharge plume to reach a relatively stable state in the water column (for large discharges that have high EIFs it may take considerably longer than two weeks to reach a relatively stable state in the water column and therefore simulation time should be extended), and taking account of changes in tidal cycle, the minimum time for which results should be extracted is 28 days. It is therefore expected that chemical permit holders with a continuous discharge will model the discharge for a period of at least 6 weeks. When calculating an annual time-averaged value for the volume of water above a risk level of 5%, the first two weeks of outputs should therefore be disregarded. However, the full 6 weeks may be included in calculating contributions to overall risk.

When undertaking modelling for the minimum 6-week period, it is expected that chemical permit holders will choose metocean data that conservatively assesses risks to the environment, i.e. represents a minimum degree of dispersion, which is expected to be achieved in relatively calm conditions with low current velocities. In some cases, analysis of metocean data from commonly used sources may already have been undertaken and, where conservative modelling periods have been identified, these may continue to be used. Chemical permit holders using alternative datasets should provide a justification for selecting specific modelling periods.

Modelling of the discharge over multiple representative periods of metocean data is acceptable and results from multiple periods may be combined to obtain representative annual average results, thereby reducing the conservatism in the assessment. It is understood that modelling multiple time periods is readily available using batch methods in existing applications and chemical permit holders are encouraged to investigate modelling produced water over an annual range of conditions to minimize conservatism in the assessment and to identify seasonal variations.

### **A4.3 Minimum Physical Parameters**

Based on the experience of exploratory modelling undertaken during the RBA trial, the model must be capable of representing the processes of initial turbulent / momentum plume dynamics as well as regional transport and dispersion. To enable this, the model input data shall include, as a minimum:

- Discharge outlet diameter
- Discharge outlet orientation
- Discharge outlet depth
- Discharge flow rate
- Discharge temperature
- Discharge salinity

#### A4.4 Representative Flow Scenarios

Actual predicted flow rates during representative periods of normal operation should be used for the modelling rather than averaged flows. If the predicted flow rates or discharge properties will vary significantly over the modelling period, as a minimum the highest representative flow rates should be used for the modelling purposes, and it will be informative to additionally model the main alternative flow rates or properties.

Periods of different discharge conditions, including periods of zero discharge should be taken into account in the overall annual average figure for the volume of water above a 5% risk level using the following formula, with T1 being the duration of discharge period 1 in days,  $V_{1>5\%}$  being the corresponding average volume of water in m<sup>3</sup> above a risk level of 5%, etc.:

$$\text{Annual average volume above 5\% risk level} = \frac{V_{1>5\%} \times T1 + V_{2>5\%} \times T2 + [\text{etc.}]}{365.25}$$

#### A4.5 Scenarios for Contingency Discharges during Re-injection Downtime

The contingency discharge of produced water from installations that rely on re-injection should, whenever possible, be modelled using discharge scenarios based on historic performance. As a minimum, it should be modelled for a period of a single month, ignoring the first two weeks of the output, but if the duration of the downtime could be up to 6 weeks per year then it should be modelled for that period.

The overall annual average volume of water reported as being above a 5% risk level should be calculated using the following formula, with T1 being the duration of the discharge period in days,  $V_{1>5\%}$  being the average volume of water in m<sup>3</sup> above a risk level of 5%:

$$\text{Annual average volume above 5\% risk level} = \frac{V_{1>5\%} \times T1}{365.25}$$

#### A4.6 Modelling of Naturally Occurring Substances (NOS)

The NOSs listed in Appendix 5 of the OSPAR 2012/7 Guidelines must be modelled. Chemical permit holders should use the contemporary bi-annual analysis data as the inputs for the modelling. The assessment report should include details of the data and comments on whether they are representative, e.g. the extent to which the data aligns with historical analyses. Outlying data may be excluded from consideration where sufficient data exists for a statistical analysis and where the chemical permit holder justifies the exclusion on a statistical basis, e.g. a 95% confidence interval, and should be replaced by averaged historical data that are considered the most representative, providing the assumptions and method underlying the choice are clearly stated.

For consistency, BEIS recommend using half the LOD for substances that were not detected, and it is acknowledged that this may result in an overestimate of those substances. The use of appropriate LODs should be checked prior to sampling.

It should be noted that the NOSs to be modelled includes non-alkylated phenol (C0, i.e. non-alkylated C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>5</sub>OH), which is included in the BEIS bi-annual sampling guidance but is not included in the EEMS returns. The levels of C0 should be included in the modelling for the C0-C3 grouping, and chemical permit holders should therefore consult their produced water analysts to confirm that C0 is included. Where a breakdown of phenol and alkylated phenols is available to match the OSPAR 2012/7 PNEC categories, this should be used. It is also acceptable, and conservative, to use the EEMS reporting groupings as detailed below:



<b>OSPAR 2012/7 PNEC Categories</b>	<b>EEMS Reporting Categories</b>
Phenol (representing C0-C3 phenols)	'C1-C3 Alkyl Phenols' plus 'Other C1-C3 Alkyl Phenols' (check C0 is analysed and included)
Butylphenol (C4 alkyl phenols)	Included with C5 Alkyl Phenols as they have lower PNEC
Pentylphenol (C5 alkyl phenols)	'C4-C5 Alkyl Phenols' plus 'Other C4-C5 Alkyl Phenols'
Octylphenol (representing C6-C8 alkyl phenols)	'C6-C9 Alkyl Phenols' plus 'Other C6-C9 Alkyl Phenols'
Nonylphenol (C9 alkyl phenols)	Included with C6-C8 Alkyl Phenols as they have lower PNEC

Where insufficient EEMS data exist to confirm that the inputs are representative, e.g. for a new field, the chemical permit holder should discuss delaying the assessment with BEIS until stable operating conditions have been achieved and the results of at least two sampling and analysis programmes are available.

#### **A4.7 Modelling of Added Offshore Chemicals**

Added offshore chemicals that could contribute to the risk relating to the discharge must be included in the modelling, using the toxicity, biodegradation and LogPow data (if available) provided on the Cefas template or in the original HOCNF application. Where only toxicity data are available, chemical permit holders should use conservative assumptions regarding biodegradation (none), evaporation (none, or zero vapour pressure) and sediment partitioning ( $K_{oc} = 0.001$ ).

Chemical inputs to the modelling should be consistent with production chemical permit use and discharge assumptions, but should reflect actual use and discharge rather than worst case predictions (see Section 2.5). Where multiple chemicals are included in a permit for the same purpose, but only one chemical is applied at any time, the chemical presenting the highest potential risk should be included in the modelling.

Routine batch treatment chemicals, e.g. chemicals used for periodic biocide treatments, should be included if they are considered to represent a significant risk or are being administered at the time of the sampling. 'Routine' is interpreted as at least once per month. Non-routine batch treatment chemicals, e.g. chemicals used for periodic maintenance activities, do not have to be included. Non-routine operating conditions, e.g. field shutdowns and start-ups, should also be excluded from the modelling. The inclusion/exclusion of chemicals needs to be assessed carefully on a case by case basis for each installation.

PLONOR chemicals that are not expected to significantly contribute to the risk need not be included, and all excluded chemicals, and chemicals with limited data, should be described in the assessment report.

If it is found that offshore chemicals dominate the predicted risk, it will be informative to present results with and without the added offshore chemicals, as the management options for natural components and offshore chemicals will normally be very different.

#### **A4.8 Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC)**

The PEC is the three-dimensional and time variable concentration of the discharge or discharge components in the receiving environment. The PEC can be calculated for all components input to the model that are considered to have the potential to result in harmful impact in marine organisms. The selected model should, whenever possible, calculate the fate of the discharge, or each component of the discharge, taking account of:

- Currents (tidal, residual, meteorological forcing);
- Turbulent mixing (horizontal and vertical);
- Density (differences in salinity and temperature);
- Evaporation at the sea surface, and
- Reduction of the concentration due to biodegradation.

#### **A4.9 Predicted No Effect Concentration (PNEC)**

The PNEC is the estimated lower limit that could have effects on the biota, as determined for a single component or component group. The PNEC value can be derived from the median effect concentration ( $EC_{50}$ ) or the median lethal concentration ( $LC_{50}$ ) which can both be derived from short term tests on three trophic levels. The No Observed Effect Concentration (NOEC) could also be used but this requires one set of long term test results which are generally not available.

The  $EC_{50}$ ,  $LC_{50}$  (or NOEC) is divided by an assessment factor to provide an estimate of the chronic PNEC. The assessment factor is applied to take into account the uncertainty associated with extrapolation of laboratory test results to derive a measure of effects in the marine environment. Where there is limited available data, a higher assessment factor is applied, which generates a lower PNEC.

An assessment factor of 100 is currently used for most offshore oil and gas chemical risk assessments where there is a minimum level of testing to cover three trophic levels, which can include bacteria. More recent ECHA guidance (2008) recommends an assessment factor of 10,000. However, that guidance was primarily developed for near-coastal waters, and greater dispersion and dilution is expected in offshore waters. It is also relevant that the current assessment factor of 100 has been used for chemical discharges associated with offshore oil and gas activities for a number of years, and monitoring studies suggest that it provides appropriate protection. For the purpose of the RBA trial, assessment factors of 1,000 and 10,000 were compared but, following discussions at OSPAR OIC, an assessment factor of 1,000 was selected as an appropriate compromise for offshore discharges.

#### A4.10 PNECs for Natural Components

The PNECs listed in the OSPAR 2012/7 Guidelines must be used, but chemical permit holders may provide commentary on the PNECs in the assessment report if this is considered to be relevant to the results obtained. Where the PNECs are designated as a value above the background level (cadmium, chromium, mercury and zinc), the chemical permit holder should provide a reputable scientific source for any local background level. If a local level cannot be identified, risks may be assessed using the background levels included in the OSPAR Agreement on Background Concentrations for Contaminants in Seawater, Biota and Sediment (OSPAR Agreement 2005-6). The relevant table is reproduced below:

**Table A4-2 Ranges of background concentrations of dissolved trace metals[ng/kg] in specific regions of the Convention Area.**

Element	Atlantic Ocean	Northern North Sea	English Channel Southern North Sea	Celtic Sea
Cd	5-25	8-25	9-12	4-12
Cu	50-100	50-90	140-360	60-80
Co			6-24	3-5
Cr (VI)	90-120			
Fe	25-150	200-600		
Pb	5-20	10-20	10-17	10-20
Mn	10-25	60-150		
Hg	0, 1-0, 4	0.2-0.5		
Ni	160-250	200-250	180-260	120-160
Se (IV)	2-20			
V	1250-1450	1250-1450	900-1050	
U	3000-3500	3000-3500		
Zn	30-200	250-450	170-280	120

OSPAR Agreement 2014-05 contains the up to date compiled PNECs for NOSs in support of Recommendation 2012/15 and OSPAR Agreement 2012/7. This latter document contains a link direct to OSPAR 2014-15.

[\[https://www.ospar.org/documents?d=32999\]](https://www.ospar.org/documents?d=32999).

Where a known NOS is not included in the list of PNECs in the OSPAR 2012/7 Guidelines, or any replacement list, it does not have to be included in the assessment.

#### A4.11 PNECs for Added Offshore Chemicals

Worst-case aquatic toxicity data included in the Cefas template or the HOCNF application should be used to generate a PNEC using an assessment factor of 1,000.

#### A4.12 PNECs less than the Lowest Acceptable Value

Some models may have a lower limit for the PNEC threshold, e.g. 1 part per trillion. Where this is the case, it is permissible to increase the PNEC by a factor of 100 and to simultaneously increase the concentration in the discharge by a factor of 100. This will result in an acceptable risk calculation.

#### **A4.13 Use of DREAM**

DREAM was developed by Sintef in collaboration with a number of major chemical permit holders, including ConocoPhillips, Total, Eni, Statoil, Shell, Norsk Hydro, ExxonMobil and BP. The DREAM Environmental Impact Factor (EIF) concept is the accepted method for assessing produced water and chemical discharges in Norway, and the model has a strong scientific basis. It is described in more detail at [www.sintef.no/erms](http://www.sintef.no/erms) and the computational guidelines are provided in Utvik *et al.* (2003).

DREAM is a dispersion model based on wind and 3D current data that can be used for whole effluent or component-specific fate assessments, based on the physicochemical properties of the effluent or its components (components can include both NOSs and added offshore chemicals) in addition to relevant toxicity and biodegradation data. It can be used for a variety of effluents, and components such as hydrocarbons, heavy metals and added offshore chemicals, and the output includes an assessment of the overall risk to the environment.


It should be noted that the PNEC values for a number of NOSs in produced water are already built into the DREAM model, and it will therefore be necessary to check whether these align with the values included in the OSPAR 2012/7 Guidelines. If there are differences, the values included in the model should be substituted with the values included in the guidance.

#### **A4.14 Environmental Impact Factor**

The EIF is a quantified measure of the environmental risk that is most commonly used for the assessment of discharges of produced water and associated chemicals resulting from offshore oil and gas production. The EIF is based on a comparison of the modelled concentrations of the components in the receiving water column (i.e. the PEC) and the lowest theoretical concentrations of the same components that would be expected to result in harmful effects in marine organisms (i.e. the PNEC). Where the PEC is greater than the PNEC there is considered to be a risk to 5% of the most sensitive species. The model can be used to determine the specific volume and/or area of water in which the PEC is greater than the PNEC, where harmful effects might occur as a result of the produced water discharge. The methodology is described in ECB (2003), and is commonly used for the assessment of discharges of offshore chemicals under the OSPAR Harmonised Mandatory Control System.

An EIF of 1 indicates that the PEC:PNEC ratio in a 100 m × 100 m × 10 m (10<sup>5</sup> m<sup>3</sup>) volume of water is >1 (i.e. there is considered to be a risk to 5% of the most sensitive species). The risks relating to individual components in the release are summed to derive a total risk using the probability formula described by deZwart and Posthuma (2005). If the EIF is <1, it indicates that the PEC:PNEC ratio is >1 in a smaller volume of water, and if the EIF is >1, it indicates that PEC:PNEC ratio is >1 in a larger volume of water.

DREAM predicts the PEC of the release, or the components in the release, within any given area, in terms of the volume of water within that area where the PEC:PNEC ratio is >1. When assessing components, the model sums each volume of water where the PEC:PNEC ratio of individual components is >1 to derive the EIF for the release. The relative contribution of the components to the total risk, as described by the EIF, is also predicted. The principle underlying the methodology is documented in the EU Technical Guidance Document on chemical risk assessment (ECB, 2003). The EIF concept is illustrated in Figure A4-1.



**Figure A4-1 Illustration of the Environmental Impact Factor concept**

The model is typically run for a period of 30 days, using relatively quiescent conditions, as sensitivity studies indicate that equilibrium in terms of risk would be reached within this time.

Two EIFs can be derived for each discharge scenario, the maximum EIF and the time-averaged EIF. The maximum EIF is an instantaneous maximum value, i.e. the highest EIF derived during the 30 day period, and is sensitive to small changes in environmental inputs, such as wind and currents, during the 30 day period. The time-averaged EIF is more stable and is the average during the 30 day period reflecting the establishment of stable conditions.

The EIF does not define an “acceptable” limit, and comparing installations is not advisable because of the different nature and scale of the discharges and the different environmental conditions. The primary purpose is to evaluate whether further measures are justified to minimise the impact of the produced water discharge, and to compare the potential benefits of different risk reduction options. However, an  $EIF \leq 10$  is generally considered to represent a low risk.