

IV. MAPPING OF EFFECTS ON MATERIALS



Revised by J. Tidblad, 19/05/2014 after discussions at the ICP Materials Task Force 23-25/04/2014 and with minor revision 20/08/2014, from initial text by V. Kucera, Mapping Manual 2004 .

Please refer to this document as: CLRTAP, 2014. Mapping of Effects on Materials, Chapter IV of Manual on methodologies and criteria for modelling and mapping critical loads and levels and air pollution effects, risks and trends. UNECE Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution; accessed on [date of consultation] on Web at www.icpmapping.org.”

TABLE OF CONTENT

IV. MAPPING OF EFFECTS ON MATERIALS	1
IV.1 INTRODUCTION	5
<i>IV.1.1 Definition</i>	<i>5</i>
IV.2 DOSE-RESPONSE FUNCTIONS	6
<i>IV.2.1 Introduction.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>IV.2.2 Dose-response functions for the SO₂ dominating situation</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>IV.2.3 Dose-response functions for the multi-pollutant situation</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>IV.2.4 Units for corrosion attack of metals.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>IV.2.5 Direct effects of ozone</i>	<i>9</i>
IV.3 USE OF DOSE-RESPONSE FUNCTIONS FOR MAPPING "ACCEPTABLE CORROSION RATES" AND "ACCEPTABLE LEVELS" FOR POLLUTANTS ...	9
<i>IV.3.1 Recommendations regarding the selection of functions</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>IV.3.2 Recommendations regarding the use of environmental data</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>IV.3.3 Recommendations regarding selection of intervals for mapping corrosion attack</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>IV.3.4 Recommendations regarding grid size.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>IV.3.5 Recommended maps.....</i>	<i>12</i>
IV.4 USE OF DOSE RESPONSE FUNCTIONS FOR CALCULATION AND MAPPING OF COSTS RESULTING FROM CORROSION.....	12
<i>IV.4.1 Assessment of stock of materials at risk</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>IV.4.2 Sources of uncertainty</i>	<i>14</i>
IV.5 CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	14
IV.6 REFERENCES	15

Chapter I

Chapter II

Chapter III

Chapter IV

Chapter V

Chapter VI

Chapter VII

Chapter VIII

Annexes

IV.1 INTRODUCTION

Atmospheric pollution is an important factor in material deterioration including the degradation of systems used for material protection and of cultural heritage materials. Due to pollution, the lifetime of technological products is shortened. Buildings and other structures, as well as objects of cultural heritage that are exposed to the atmosphere deteriorate more rapidly. The resulting physico-chemical and economic damage can be significant - not to mention the loss of unique parts of our cultural heritage and the hazards due to compromised reliability of complicated technological devices. Also, as the result of weathering, in particular due to acidifying pollutants, a significant part of metals used in constructions and products are emitted to the biosphere with a potential hazard to the environment. This part of the Manual provides methods used to assess the impact of atmospheric pollution on materials. These methods are based on studies carried out by ICP

IV.1.1 DEFINITION

Because atmospheric deterioration of materials is a cumulative, irreversible process, which proceeds even in the absence of pollutants, "critical" values are not as easily defined as for some natural ecosystems. Some rate of deterioration must be defined which may be considered as "acceptable" or "tolerable", based on technical, economic and social considerations. This approach provides the basis for mapping "acceptable areas" for corrosion and deriving areas where the acceptable pollution level/load is exceeded, in an analogous way to the maps produced for natural ecosystems. The term "acceptable" is reserved for materials used in technical constructions while "tolerable" is used in connection with degradation of cultural heritage. Thus, in the following, "acceptable" can be replaced by "tolerable" when considering cultural heritage specifically.

Acceptable level/load. The "acceptable level or load" of pollutants for buildings and materials is the concentration or load which does not lead to an unacceptable increase in the rate of corrosion or deterioration.

Materials since 1987. The approach initially proposed was based on results obtained after an 8-year field exposure (1987-1995, Tidblad *et al.*, 2001). It was revised in 2005, following a multi-pollutant exposure programme (1997-2003, Kucera *et al.* 2007). Since then, a series of trend exposures each third year have been performed and these new results together with practical experiences in mapping areas of increased risk of corrosion has led to the present update (2014).

This chapter considers the corrosive effects of gaseous SO₂, NO_x, O₃, HNO₃, particulate matter and acid rainfall in combination with climatic parameters. The chapter also aims to define procedures for mapping values of pollutants acceptable for buildings and materials and tolerable values for cultural and historical monuments in an analogous way to the methods defined in other chapters of this Manual for critical levels and loads for ecosystems.

Acceptable rate of corrosion or deterioration may be defined as the corrosion, which is considered "acceptable" based on technical and economic considerations and is in principle material and application dependent. For the purpose of development or assessment of policies within the LRTAP Convention, the concept can, however, be simplified (see IV.3.3 below).

Dose-response function. The relationship between the corrosion or deterioration rate and the levels or loads of pollutants in combination with climatic parameters.

Using the above definitions it is possible to calculate the acceptable pollution level from the acceptable corrosion rate by using a dose-response function that relates corrosion rate to pollutant and climate exposure.

IV.2 DOSE-RESPONSE FUNCTIONS

IV.2.1 INTRODUCTION

Deterioration rates can be calculated using dose-response functions. The functions recommended have been derived from the field research programmes undertaken as part of the UN-ECE ICP Materials Exposure Programmes and are developed primarily by taking into account the need of the LRTAP Convention to quantify effects of pollution. However, if other functions of the same or of other form are considered more suitable, then they can be used as an alternative.

This could for example, be in particular areas where pollution is not considered the main cause of corrosion. In any case, the range of values over which the dose-response function is derived must be considered. Two sets of dose-response functions described in the following have been derived: functions for the SO₂ dominating situation and functions for the multi-pollutant situation.

IV.2.2 DOSE-RESPONSE FUNCTIONS FOR THE SO₂ DOMINATING SITUATION

The following equations are based on 8-year results from an exposure carried out within ICP Materials (1987-1995). They reflect the increased level of the physico-chemical understanding of the corrosion mechanisms including the synergistic effects of SO₂ and O₃ in the case of copper.

The equations are valid for unsheltered exposure of materials (Tidblad et al., 2001) and r^2 denotes the explained variability and N the number of observations used in the statistical analysis.

Structural metals

Weathering steel (C<0.12%, Mn 0.3-0.8%, Si 0.25-0.7%, P 0.07-0.15% S<0.04%, Cr 0.5-1.2%, Ni 0.3-0.6%, Cu 0.3-0.55%, Al<0.01%)

$$(IV.1) \quad ML = 34[SO_2]^{0.13} \exp\{0.020Rh + f(T)\}t^{0.3}$$

$$f(T) = 0.059(T-10) \text{ when } T \leq 10^\circ\text{C, otherwise } -0.036(T-10)$$

0.68 148

Zinc

$$(IV.2) \quad ML = 1.4[SO_2]^{0.22} \exp\{0.018Rh + f(T)\}t^{0.85} + 0.029Rain[H^+]t$$

$$f(T) = 0.062(T-10) \text{ when } T \leq 10^\circ\text{C, otherwise } -0.021(T-10)$$

0.84 98

Aluminium

$$(IV.3) \quad ML = 0.0021[SO_2]^{0.23} Rh \cdot \exp\{f(T)\}t^{1.2} + 0.000023Rain[Cl]t$$

$$f(T) = 0.031(T-10) \text{ when } T \leq 10^\circ\text{C, otherwise } -0.061(T-10)$$

0.74 106

Copper

$$(IV.4) \quad ML = 0.0027[SO_2]^{0.32}[O_3]^{0.79} Rh \cdot \exp\{f(T)\}t^{0.78} + 0.050Rain[H^+]t^{0.89}$$

$$f(T) = 0.083(T-10) \text{ when } T \leq 10^\circ\text{C, otherwise } -0.032(T-10)$$

0.73 95

Bronze (Cu Sn₆Pb₇Zn₅, ISO/R 1338 (Cu 81%, Sn 5.8%, Pb 6.7%, Zn 4.5%, Ni 1.6% + trace elements))

$$(IV.5) \quad ML = 0.026[SO_2]^{0.44} Rh \cdot \exp\{f(T)\}t^{0.86} + 0.029Rain[H^+]t^{0.76} + 0.00043Rain[Cl]t^{0.76}$$

$$f(T) = 0.060(T-11) \text{ when } T \leq 11^\circ\text{C, otherwise } -0.067(T-11)$$

0.81 144

Stone materialsLimestone

$$(IV.6) \quad R = 2.7[SO_2]0.48\exp\{-0.018T\}t^{0.96} + 0.019\text{Rain}[H^+]t^{0.96} \quad 0.88 \quad 100$$

Sandstone (White Mansfield dolomitic sandstone)

$$(IV.7) \quad R = 2.0[SO_2]^{0.52}\exp\{f(T)\}t^{0.91} + 0.028\text{Rain}[H^+]t^{0.91} \quad 0.86 \quad 101$$

$f(T) = 0$ when $T \leq 10^\circ\text{C}$, otherwise $-0.013(T-10)$

Paint coatingsCoil coated galvanised steel with alkyd melamine

$$(IV.8) \quad L = [5 / (0.084[SO_2] + 0.015Rh + f(T) + 0.00082\text{Rain})]^{1/0.43} \quad 0.73 \quad 138$$

$f(T) = 0.040(T-10)$ when $T \leq 10^\circ\text{C}$, otherwise $-0.064(T-10)$

Steel panels with alkyd

$$(IV.9) \quad L = [5 / (0.033[SO_2] + 0.013Rh + f(T) + 0.0013\text{Rain})]^{1/0.41} \quad 0.68 \quad 139$$

$f(T) = 0.015(T-11)$ when $T \leq 11^\circ\text{C}$, otherwise $-0.15(T-11)$

where

ML = mass loss, g m^{-2} , NOTE: see section IV.2.4

R = surface recession, μm

t = exposure time, years

L = maintenance interval (life time), years

Rh = relative humidity, % - annual average

T = temperature, $^\circ\text{C}$ - annual average

$[SO_2]$ = concentration, $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ - annual average

$[O_3]$ = concentration, $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ - annual average

Rain = amount of precipitation, mm year^{-1} - annual average

$[H^+]$ = concentration, mg l^{-1} - annual average

$[Cl^-]$ = concentration, mg l^{-1} - annual average

NOTE: the unit for $[H^+]$ is not the normal one (mol l^{-1}) used for this denomination and the relation between pH and $[H^+]$ is therefore here:

$$[H^+] = 1007.97 \cdot 10^{-\text{pH}}$$

$$\approx 10^{3-\text{pH}}$$

The equations are valid for regions without strong influence of sea salts with a total chloride content in precipitation $< 5 \text{ mg l}^{-1}$ approximately, regardless of the source.

The functions for paint coatings are expressed as lifetime equations. These

lifetimes can be mapped but the functions cannot at present be used for calculating acceptable levels using the concept of acceptable corrosion rates since tolerable lifetime has not yet been established for these materials.

For all these materials, and also electric contact materials and tin, data for exposure in sheltered positions are available but are of less general validity for mapping at the UN-ECE level since actual corrosion rates are highly dependent on the particular sheltering conditions.

Chapter I Chapter II Chapter III Chapter IV Chapter V Chapter VI Chapter VII Chapter VIII Annexes

IV.2.3 DOSE-RESPONSE FUNCTIONS FOR THE MULTI-POLLUTANT SITUATION

The following equations are based on 4-year results from the exposure within UNECE ICP Materials (1997-2001). These were complemented with environmental measurements of HNO₃ and particulate matter as a result from the extra effort connected to the MULTI-ASSESS project in 2002-2003. Measurements of HNO₃ and particulate matter performed in 2002-2003, 2005-2006 and 2008-2009 show no significant trend. Equations IV.10 to IV.13 reflect the increased level of the physico-chemical understanding of the corrosion mechanisms including the effect of SO₂ and acid rain for all materials, the effect of nitric acid for zinc and Portland limestone

and the effect of particulate matter for carbon steel, cast bronze and Portland limestone. The functions were first derived with an inclusion of time as an independent variable (Kucera et al., 2007).

However, discussions within the ICP Materials Task Force have concluded that the mapping of areas with increased risk of corrosion and calculation of acceptable levels of pollution should be based on one year exposure. Therefore, the functions are to be only over periods of one year. Time dependant corrosion rates are necessary for the calculation and the mapping of costs caused by atmospheric corrosion. These are described in the cost section (IV.4).

Carbon steel

$$(IV.10) \quad R = 6.5 + 0.178[\text{SO}_2]^{0.6}Rh_{60}e^{f(T)} + 0.166\text{Rain}[\text{H}^+] + 0.076\text{PM}_{10}$$

$$f(T) = 0.15(T-10) \text{ when } T < 10^\circ\text{C}, \text{ otherwise } f(T) = -0.054(T-10)$$

Zinc

$$(IV.11) \quad R = 0.49 + 0.066[\text{SO}_2]^{0.22}e^{0.018Rh+f(T)} + 0.0057\text{Rain}[\text{H}^+] + 0.192[\text{HNO}_3]$$

$$f(T) = 0.062(T-10) \text{ when } T < 10^\circ\text{C}, \text{ otherwise } f(T) = -0.021(T-10)$$

Cast Bronze

$$(IV.12) \quad R = 0.15 + 0.000985[\text{SO}_2]Rh_{60}e^{f(T)} + 0.00465\text{Rain}[\text{H}^+] + 0.00432\text{PM}_{10}$$

$$f(T) = 0.060(T-11) \text{ when } T < 11^\circ\text{C}, \text{ otherwise } f(T) = -0.067(T-11)$$

Portland limestone

$$(IV.13) \quad R = 4.0 + 0.0059[\text{SO}_2]Rh_{60} + 0.054\text{Rain}[\text{H}^+] + 0.078[\text{HNO}_3]Rh_{60} + 0.0258\text{PM}_{10}$$

where

$$Rh_{60} = Rh - 60 \text{ when } Rh > 60, 0 \text{ otherwise}$$

$$[\text{HNO}_3] = \text{annual average concentration, } \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$$

$$\text{PM}_{10} = \text{annual average concentration, } \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$$

And other symbols as in the previous section.

IV.2.4 UNITS FOR CORROSION ATTACK OF METALS

Mass loss and surface recession, the two units of corrosion attack proposed, have been denoted as ML (g m⁻²) and R (μm). It is recommended that all maps for metals are produced with the unit R (μm) with the exception of aluminium, where it is recommended to use ML (g m⁻²).

For aluminium the corrosion is localised and it would therefore be misleading to express the results in μm since this is not reflecting the depth of local attack. For the purpose of conversion from ML to R the following densities should be used: steel (7.8 g cm⁻³), zinc (7.14 g cm⁻³), copper (8.93 g cm⁻³) and bronze (8.8 g cm⁻³).

IV.2.5 DIRECT EFFECTS OF OZONE

The effect of ozone (O₃) on corrosion of materials is complex and there are still today serious gaps of knowledge to characterise it. Both O₃ and NO₂ have a direct effect on corrosion and degradation of especially some organic materials. In recent years the synergistic effect of SO₂ in combination with O₃ and NO₂ has been

shown to lead to severely increased corrosion on several inorganic materials in laboratory exposures.

In field exposures so far only the synergistic effect of SO₂ and O₃ has been shown in the UN-ECE exposure programme, and only for copper as can be inferred from the dose-response functions.

IV.3 USE OF DOSE-RESPONSE FUNCTIONS FOR MAPPING "ACCEPTABLE CORROSION RATES" AND "ACCEPTABLE LEVELS" FOR POLLUTANTS

IV.3.1 RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE SELECTION OF FUNCTIONS

For the following materials, two sets of functions have been given, one for the SO₂ dominating situation and one for the multi-pollutant situation:

- Zinc
- Cast bronze
- Portland limestone.

It is not possible to exactly define the SO₂ dominating situation and the multi-pollutant situation. However, it is possible to specify the recommended use of the functions:

- The multi-pollutant functions are the preferred choice. This is especially true when making maps of future scenarios and comparing today

situation with those in the future arising from different pollution scenarios.

- The SO₂-dominating functions may be used if it can be shown that effects of other pollutants besides SO₂ and acid rain are not contributing significantly to the general appearance of maps or to conclusions. This could for example be the case when showing the significant improvements made in the past for Europe or when mapping areas of the world where SO₂ values are very high.

IV.3.2 RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE USE OF ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

Any user who is considering producing maps on pollution effects of materials based on procedures specified in this chapter should also consult the general chapters of this manual, Chapter I Introduction, Outline and General Considerations and, especially, Chapter II Mapping Concentration Levels and Deposition Loads. In Chapter II the general methods of mapping, their underlying assumptions and data requirements are given for many of the parameters needed for mapping effects on materials. Regarding the wet deposition parameters it should be noted that the term *Rain[Cl]* given in this chapter is identical to the

chloride wet deposition parameter described in Chapter II. Deposition of protons (*Rain[H⁺]*) is not mentioned explicitly in Chapter II but it should be noted that "it is recommended to interpolate measured solute concentrations and estimate the wet deposition as a function of the mapped solute concentration and the precipitation amount, the latter provided by the meteorological service for the country" is valid also for H⁺.

Annual averages of environmental parameters shall always be used in the dose-response functions but could be based either on measured or modelled values. Data valid for longer periods may

Chapter I

also be used depending on the purpose. For example, when climatic data for a particular year is missing or when the purpose is to isolate the effect of pollutants it is possible to use long term average data for climatic parameters, for example 30-year averages, so called “climate normals”.

Climatic and pollution data can usually be obtained from national or international meteorological centres, international organisations (e.g. WMO), international research programmes (e.g. EMEP) or national organisations or authorities responsible for environmental protection.

Chapter II

Chapter III

IV.3.2.1 SUPPORTING FUNCTION FOR THE CALCULATION OF HNO₃

Nitric acid is a parameter that is not measured within dense monitoring networks very frequently. The availability of data is therefore limited. The following empirical function, which has been derived

within the MULTI-ASSESS project (MULTI-ASSESS final report, 2005), gives a good possibility of calculating the nitric acid concentrations from NO₂, O₃, relative humidity (Rh) and temperature (T).

$$(IV.14) \quad \text{HNO}_3 = 516 e^{-3400/(T+273)} ([\text{NO}_2] [\text{O}_3] \text{Rh})^{0.5}$$

Chapter IV

IV.3.3 RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING SELECTION OF INTERVALS FOR MAPPING CORROSION ATTACK

The acceptable rate of corrosion or deterioration (R_a), expressed in μm , was defined as being dependent on the technical and economic considerations for the particular material and application. In reality, it is not considered practical in the context of the LRTAP Convention policy to do this for each individual material and for each individual application separately. Instead, it is recommended that the acceptable corrosion rate is expressed as a multiple of a constant, material dependent, “background corrosion”. ICP Materials has calculated reference levels representing the background corrosion or deterioration rate (R_b) as the lower 10 percentile of observed corrosion rates in the materials exposure programme which started in 1987 and ended in 1995. Acceptable corrosion rates can then be expressed as a multiple (n) of the background corrosion rate

An appropriate n value still has to be selected based on technical/economic consideration but will then be independent of material.

Acceptable rate of corrosion can be used to produce maps. They will show where corrosion exceeds the acceptable deterioration rate (R_a) for simple samples of material. Thus, no correction is implemented for the form in which the material is used (e.g. the type of component). Practical n values 1.5, 2.0 and 2.5 are recommended following discussion at the 24th meeting of the Task Force (2008), and corresponding R_a values are given in table IV.1. Targets for protecting infrastructure materials and cultural heritage monuments for 2050 and 2020 have been given in “Indicators and targets for air pollution effects” (WGE, 2009) corresponding to $n=2.5$ (2020) and $n=2.0$ (2050).

Chapter VIII

Annexes

$$(IV.15) \quad R_a = n \cdot R_b$$

Table IV.1 Recommended class boundaries to be used for mapping corresponding to n values of 1.0 (background corrosion rate), 1.5, 2.0 and 2.5.

Material	$n = 1.0$	$n = 1.5$	$n = 2.0$	$n = 2.5$	
Limestone	3.2	5.0	6.4	8	μm , first year exposure
Sandstone	2.8	4.0	5.5	7	μm , first year exposure
Copper	0.32	0.5	0.64	0.8	μm , first year exposure
Bronze	0.25	0.4	0.5	0.6	μm , first year exposure
Zinc	0.45	0.7	0.9	1.1	μm , first year exposure
Carbon steel and weathering steel	8.5	12	16	20	μm , first year exposure
Aluminium [#]	0.09	0.14	0.18	0.22	g m^{-2} , first year exposure

[#]Aluminium undergoes localised corrosion but the corrosion rates were calculated as uniform corrosion. Maximum pit depth is a better indication of potential damage, but this characteristic can not be evaluated after the first year of exposure.

Most sites of Europe today have corrosion values in the range corresponding to those given in Table IV.1. However, intervals for higher corrosion attack also need to be specified in order to map corrosion in areas with high levels of pollution, in or outside Europe or to map situations observed in the past. The ISO standard 9223 specifies intervals of corrosion values for the following metallic materials: carbon steel, zinc, copper and aluminium, see Table

IV.2. The intervals limits set for categories C4, C5 and CX correspond roughly to n values of 5.0, 10 and 20. Therefore, it is recommended to use these n values for mapping high corrosion values for materials other than carbon steel, zinc, copper and aluminium. For carbon steel, zinc, copper and aluminium the C classes given in Table IV.2 are recommended when mapping areas with high corrosion rate.

Table IV.2 ISO 9223 corrosivity categories.

Material	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	CX	
Carbon steel	< 1.3	1.3-25	25-50	50-80	80-200	200-700	μm , first year exposure
Zinc	<0.1	0.1-0.7	0.7-2.1	2.1-4.2	4.2-8.4	8.4-25	μm , first year exposure
Copper	<0.1	0.1-0.6	0.6-1.3	1.3-2.8	2.8-5.6	5.6-10	μm , first year exposure
Aluminium [#]		<0.6	0.6-2	2-5	5-10	>10	g m^{-2} , first year exposure

[#]Aluminium undergoes localised corrosion but the corrosion rates were calculated as uniform corrosion. Maximum pit depth is a better indication of potential damage, but this characteristic can not be evaluated after the first year of exposure due to passivation effects and decreasing corrosion rates.

IV.3.4 RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING GRID SIZE

It is recommended that countries make use of best available data and generate information at appropriate national scales. It is advisable to produce maps with high resolution (small grid size), preferably 1 km² or smaller, especially for mapping of effects in urban areas. Such resolution enables taking into account differences between urban and rural conditions in levels of pollution, in relevant climatic characteristics (such as temperature and

relative humidity) and may include both long-range transported pollutants and local emissions.

However, for regional European assessments, pollutant effects on materials may be mapped using EMEP grid areas (about 28 km x 28 km currently, see Chapter 8). It is thus advisable to use a grid network that coincides with the EMEP network or, preferably, a smaller network that is a fraction of the EMEP size.

IV.3.5 RECOMMENDED MAPS

Several maps may be used to illustrate the effects of air pollution on materials:

- Maps showing the geographical distribution of some of the most important environmental parameters and their combinations used in the dose-response functions: [SO₂], [O₃], T, Rh, Rain, pH, Cl⁻, Rain[H⁺].
- Maps showing combinations of important parameters illustrating important effects related to materials damage but not possible to express in terms of a specific material. This could for example be time of wetness (TOW), calculated as a combination of temperature and relative humidity parameters (Tidblad et al, 2000) or other "heritage climatology" parameters such as the number of freeze-thaw cycles (Brimblecombe, 2010).
- Materials damage maps for selected materials should preferably be produced using the recommendations in IV.3.3. These maps will enable the identification of areas exceeding acceptable/tolerable corrosion rates.

- Maps can also be made showing the contribution of wet deposition to the total corrosion effect or ratio between corrosion effect of wet and dry deposition.

Maps showing acceptable/tolerable pollution levels/loads of individual pollutants (SO₂, O₃, HNO₃, PM10, H⁺) can be made but levels of other pollutants need to be specified. A common approach is to assume that these are unchanged.

Another possibility is to use target values. These inform on the pollutant deposition that would lead to a given (chosen) acceptable level of corrosion or soiling for a given year (the target).

For example, if we assume that PM10 levels are below 20 µg m⁻³ annual mean (as recommended by WHO Air quality guidelines, global update 2005) and that pH levels are equal to those in 2000, it is possible to calculate acceptable SO₂ levels for carbon steel using equation IV.11 for 2020 (R=20 µm) and 2050 (R=16 µm). Assisting maps of temperature, relative humidity and precipitation (long-term averages) and pH (for the year 2000) would be needed.

IV.4 USE OF DOSE RESPONSE FUNCTIONS FOR CALCULATION AND MAPPING OF COSTS RESULTING FROM CORROSION

One additional important goal of the mapping activities in the field of materials is the calculation of cost of damage caused by air pollutants to materials. While it is not recommended to assess the absolute cost, it is possible to estimate the difference in cost between two alternative scenarios using the equation

$$(IV.16) \quad \Delta C = C S (L_{s1}^{-1} - L_{s2}^{-1})$$

where ΔC is the cost difference, C is the cost per surface area of material for maintenance/replacement, S is the surface area of material, L_{s1} is the maintenance interval (life time) for scenario 1 and L_{s2} is the maintenance interval for scenario 2. If

Equation IV.16 is to be used for estimating the cost of corrosion due to pollutants in the present situation it is recommended to use the present pollution situation as scenario 1 and the background corrosion as scenario 2. When calculating the lifetime from the background scenario it is recommended to use the time dependence from the dry deposition term given in Equations IV.1 - IV.7, which means $t^{0.85}$ for zinc and $t^{0.86}$ for bronze in the multi-pollutant situation. For carbon steel a time dependence of $t^{0.54}$ is recommended. For the paint coatings it is not recommended to use Equations IV.8 - IV.9 for cost calculations since the evaluation are based on damage from an intentionally made scratch, which may be regarded as a form of accelerated testing. Instead the practical functions described in Kucera et al. 1993 are the only ones available today but these have not been verified by ICP Materials. A UN-ECE Workshop on economic evaluation of air pollution abatement and damage to buildings including cultural heritage took place in Stockholm on 23-25 January 1996 (Proceedings of UN-ECE Economic Workshop, 2007). The proceedings of the workshop summarised the state of the art, and is given in the reference list together with a selection of other important publications: Kucera et al, 1993, Ecotec, 1986, Tolstoy et al., 1989 and Cowell and ApSimon, 1996. In the ECOTEC study of 1986, building identikit

IV.4.1 ASSESSMENT OF STOCK OF MATERIALS AT RISK

Air pollution effects on materials have so far not been included in integrated assessment modelling and are not included in the multi-pollutant protocol. Part of the explanation for this may be the lack of stock at risk data. Several stock at risk studies have, however, been performed during the years, the most intensive period being from 1990 to 1996 with several important studies in individual countries that in the end enabled the estimate of

for Birmingham (UK), Dortmund and Cologne (Germany) were compiled. For Stockholm (Sweden), Sarpsborg (Norway), and Prague (Czech Republic) statistically based inventories of outdoor material surfaces were compiled by Kucera et al. (1993). These studies include percentage values of the most common construction materials and their distribution, which in absence of stock at risk data may provisionally be used as default values. Later, Tidblad et al (2010) made an updated review on economic assessment of corrosion and soiling of materials including cultural heritage including references to several national studies and also the EU projects REACH, ExternE and ExternE Transport, and CULT-STRAT. The CULT-STRAT project resulted in a book "The effects of air pollution on cultural heritage" with a chapter on economic evaluation (Watt et al, 2009a).

Mapping of cost of damage will be similar to mapping of acceptable levels/loads but will include data on the stock of material in each mapping unit and the economic costs associated with deterioration of these materials (e.g. replacement or repair costs). The change in the rate of deterioration can be used to estimate the cost associated with the deterioration and furthermore to undertake a cost benefit analysis of pollutant emission reduction scenarios in the mapping area.

Cowell and ApSimon (1996) on the cost of damage to buildings by atmospheric pollution in Europe. These studies, many others and an overview of methodologies for assessing stock at risk were recently presented in the ICP Materials report 61 "Assessment of stock of materials at risk including cultural heritage" (Tidblad et al., 2010). Furthermore, the CULT-STRAT book mentioned above also included a chapter on stock at risk (Watt et al, 2009b).

Chapter I

IV.4.2 SOURCES OF UNCERTAINTY

The main sources of uncertainty for estimation of corrosion costs will result from

- assessment of the stock of materials at risk;
- translation of dose-response functions obtained by exposure of test specimens to damage functions taking into account the exposure situation on a construction and rational maintenance practice;
- characterisation of reduced service lifetime and quantification of costs associated with reduced service lifetime;

Chapter II

Chapter III

Chapter IV

Chapter V

Chapter VI

Chapter VII

Chapter VIII

Annexes

- assessment of environmental data and their extrapolation to each mapping square taking into account the importance of the difference in local environment in populated and rural areas; and
- use of yearly mean values of pollution parameters which do not take into account the effect of fluctuations of pollutant levels.

IV.5 CONCLUDING REMARKS

Mapping atmospheric corrosivity was first done in the past to identify effect of emission on metals in the vicinity of industrial emission sources. These maps could be done simply by plotting SO₂ isolines, which would be almost identical to corrosion isolines. With more knowledge and changing pollution situation more parameters have successively been added to dose-response functions including the effect of climate (time of wetness, temperature, relative humidity), precipitation (acid rain), other gaseous pollutants (O₃, HNO₃) and particulate pollution. Corrosivity maps are useful for material selection and for appropriate selection of protection methods in industrial

applications for bare as well as coated metals. Furthermore, the use of indicator materials can show potential effects on cultural heritage as is illustrated in the “Guidance document on health and environmental improvements using new knowledge, methods and data” (WGE, 2013) giving materials corrosion and soiling risks for individual countries in the ECE region.

It is our hope that this document will stimulate further mapping of corrosion by using a standardised methodology also outside Europe to facilitate comparison of maps produced at different geographical resolution, geographical scales and time scales.

IV.6 REFERENCES

- Brimblecombe P., 2010: "Heritage Climatology", in Climate change and cultural heritage, Proc. Ravello Int. Workshop, ISBN 978-88-7228-601-2, Edipuglia, Italy.
- Cowell and Apsimon H., 1996: "Estimating the cost of damage to buildings by acidifying atmospheric pollution in Europe", *Atmos. Env.*, Vol. 30, pp. 2959-2968.
- Ecotec (1986) Identification and Assessment of Materials Damage to Buildings and Historic Monuments by Air Pollution. Report to the UK Department of the Environment. Ecotec Consulting Ltd., Birmingham.
- Kucera V., Henriksen J., Knotkova D., and Sjöström C., 1993: "Model for Calculations of Corrosion Costs Caused by Air Pollution and its Applications in three Cities", Proc. 10th European Corros. Congr., Barcelona.
- Kucera V., J. Tidblad, K. Kreislova, D. Knotkova, M. Faller, D. Reiss, R. Sneath, T. Yates, J. Henriksen, M. Schreiner, M. Melcher, M. Ferm, R.-A. Lefèvre and J. Kobus, "UN-ECE ICP materials dose-response functions for the multi-pollutant situation," *Water, Air, & Soil Pollution: Focus*, vol. 7, 2007, pp. 249–258.
- MULTI-ASSESS final report, 2005. "Model for multi-pollutant impact and assessment of threshold levels for cultural heritage". <http://www.corr-institute.se/MULTI-ASSESS/>
- Tolstoy N., Andersson G., Sjöström C and Kucera V. 1989: "External building materials – quantities and degradation." Statens institut för byggnadsforskning, Gävle. ISBN 91-540-9315-5.
- Tidblad, J., Mikhailov, A.A. and Kucera, V., 2000. Model for the prediction of the time of wetness from average annual data on relative air humidity and air temperature. *Protection of Metals (Russia)*, 36(6), 533-540.
- Tidblad, J., Kucera, V., Mikhailov, A. A., Henriksen, J., Kreislova, K., Yates, T., Stöckle, B. and Schreiner, M., 2001. UN-ECE ICP Materials. Dose-response functions on dry and wet acid deposition effects after 8 years of exposure. *Water, air and soil pollution*, 130(1-4 III), 1457-1462.
- Tidblad J., T. Yates, S. Doytchinov, M. Faller, and K. Kreislova, UN-ECE International co-operative programme on effects on materials, including historic and cultural monuments. Report No 61 Assessment of stock of materials at risk including cultural heritage., Swerea KIMAB AB, Stockholm, Sweden., 2010.
- Tidblad J., Faller M., Grøntoft T., Kreislova K., Varotsos C., De la Fuente D., Lombardo T., Doytchinov S., Brüggerhoff S. and Yates T., 2010: UN-ECE International co-operative programme on effects on materials, including historic and cultural monuments. Report No 65 Economic assessment of corrosion and soiling of materials including cultural heritage, Swerea KIMAB AB, Stockholm, Sweden.
- UN-ECE Economic Workshop, 1997: "Economic Evaluation of Air Pollution Damage to Materials." Proceedings of the UN-ECE Workshop on Economic Evaluation of Air Pollution Abatement and Damage to Buildings including Cultural Heritage, Eds V. Kucera, D. Pearce and Y.-W. Brodin, Report 4761, Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, Stockholm, Sweden, 1997.
- Watt J., Navrud S., Slizkova Z. and Yates T., 2009a: "Economic Evaluation", in *The effects of air pollution on cultural heritage*. Springer (book chapter), pp. 189-214.
- Watt J., Doytchinov S., Lefevre R.-A., Ionescu A., Dela Fuente D., Kreislova K and Screpanti A., 2009b: "Stock at risk", in *The effects of air pollution on cultural heritage*. Springer (book chapter), pp. 147-188.

Chapter I

WGE (2009). “Review of air pollution effects. Indicators and targets for air pollution effects”. Report to the 28th session of the Working Group on Effects, UN-ECE Convention on Long range Transboundary Air Pollution, Working Group on Effects, Geneva, Switzerland. ECE/EB.AIR/WG.1/2009/16. 12 p. <http://www.UN-ECE.org/fileadmin/DAM/env/documents/2009/EB/wge/ece.eb.air.wg.1.2009.16.e.pdf>.

Chapter II

Chapter III

Chapter IV

Chapter V

Chapter VI

Chapter VII

Chapter VIII

Annexes

WGE (2013). Guidance document on health and environmental improvements using new knowledge, methods and data. Report to the 32nd Executive Body meeting UN-ECE Convention on Long range Transboundary Air Pollution, Working Group on Effects, Geneva, Switzerland. ECE/EB.AIR/2013/8, 14 p. http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/env/documents/2013/air/eb/ECE_EB.AIR_2013_8_E.pdf