Table of contents

List of	Tables	5
List of	Figures	6
1.	Introduction	7
2.	Compilation approach of the indicators	9
3.	Changes in the toxic chemicals indicator	12
4.	Toxic chemicals: aggregation scheme according to R-phrases and changes in the PRODCOM database	14
4.1.	Introduction	14
4.2.	Classification of chemicals by toxicity class	14
4.3.	Changes in the PRODCOM database	15
5.	Revision of the indicators	17
5.1.	Revision of hazard information: replacement of risk phrases by hazard statements .	17
5.1.1.	Background	17
5.1.2.	Content of the Classification and labelling Inventory	
5.1.3. 5.1.4.	Approaches to evaluating Classification and Labelling Inventory data	
5.2.	Assigning hazard statements to toxicity classes	22
5.3.	Changes in class assignment following the revision	23
6.	Update of the indicator	26
6.1.	Production of toxic chemicals according to H-statements: Production volume and share of toxicity classes	26
6.1.1.	EU-28	26
6.1.2.	EU-15	26
6.2.	Production of toxic chemicals according to R-phrases: Production volume and share of toxicity classes	28
6.3.	Production of toxic chemicals in EU-15: Comparison of results from 'H-statement aggregation' and 'R-phrases aggregation'	30
6.4.	Consumption of toxic chemicals: Results for aggregation by H-statements	34
7.	References	37
8.	Additional resources	38
8.1.	Eurostat information	38
8.2.	External links	39
9.	Annexes	40
9.1.	Annex 1: Assignment of risk phrases and hazard statements to toxic impact classes	40

9.2.	Annex 2: Assignment of risk phrases and hazard statements to environmental impact classes	. 42
9.3.	Annex 3: Assessing intermediates covered by the indicator	. 43
9.3.1.	Background	. 43
9.3.2.	Analysis	
	Registration types for reference substances evaluated within the Indicator	
	Indicator substances with full registrations only	
	PRODCOM data for indicator substances with full and intermediate registrations	
9.3.2.5.	Indicator substances with registrations as intermediates only Very high production volume substances	47
9.3.3.	Addendum: Comparison of indicator substances registered with a full registration and those registered with a full and an intermediate registration	. 49
9.4.	Annex 4: Toxicity classes of indicator substances	. 58
9.5.	Annex 5: Mapping of the new dataset ENV_CHMHAZ with the new codes and labels towards the old version	. 64
List	t of Tables	
	: PRODCOM categories in NACE Rev.1 and NACE Rev.2	
Table 2	: Classification of toxic properties	. 14
Table 3	: Classification by R-phrases	. 15
Table 4	: Coverage of chemicals and identified toxic chemicals	. 15
Table 5	: Number of products of toxic chemicals in PRODCOM per toxicity class	. 23
Table 6	: Comparison of the shares of CMR and 'all toxic chemicals' in EU-15 and EU-28 from 2004 to 2013	. 27
Table 7	: Change in production share in EU-15 for toxicity classes according to R-phrases and H-	
	statements	
Table 8	: Summary of the assignment to toxic impact classes	. 40
Table 9	: Summary of the assignment to environmental impact classes	. 42
Table 1	Results of the evaluation using REACH registration types for reference substances in the dataset	. 44
Table 1	1: Example of reference substances in the dataset with REACH registration types	. 45
Table 1	2: High production PRODCOM entries evaluated for the indicator and REACH registration type	
Table 1	Comparison of tonnage data in REACH registrations and PRODCOM to delineate uses for substances with both full and intermediate REACH registrations	
Table 1	4: Summary of the assignment to toxic impact classes per substance evaluated	. 58
Table 1	5: Mapping of the new dataset ENV_CHMHAZ for the new codes and labels towards the old version	. 64

List of Figures

Figure 1: Compilation approach for the indicator 'Production of toxic chemicals'	11
Figure 2: Development of the revised indicator 'Production of toxic chemicals'	12
Figure 3: Screenshot of information from the C & L Inventory for lithium hydroxide*	19
Figure 4: Screenshot of selected information from the C & L Inventory for isoprene	21
Figure 5: Decision tree for selection of data from the C & L Inventory	22
Figure 6: Changes in class assignment after inclusion of C & L Inventory data ('Production of toxic chemicals'): percent of substances assigned to each toxicity class	24
Figure 7: Development of the total production in EU-15 and EU-28: production volume (million tonnes per annum) by toxicity classes (based on H-statements)	27
Figure 8: Development of the total production in EU-15 and EU-28: share according to toxicity classes (based on H-statements)	28
Figure 9: Development of the total production in EU-15: production volume (in 1 000 tonnes per annum) according to toxicity classes (based on R-phrases)	29
Figure 10: Development of the total production in EU-15: share according to toxicity classes (based on R-phrases)	29
Figure 11: Number of chemicals per toxicity class based on R-phrases and based on H-statements	30
Figure 12: Results for 'Production of toxic chemicals' according to the two classification schemes for the year 2013: production volume in million tonnes per annum	31
Figure 13: Comparison for 'Production of toxic chemicals – EU-15' according to the H-statements and R-phrases classification scheme: production volume in million tonnes per annum	
Figure 14: Comparison for 'Production of toxic chemicals – EU-15' according to H-statements and R-phrases classification scheme: production share	
Figure 15: Consumption and production of chemicals by toxicity class (EU-28 based on H-statements, production volume in million tonnes per annum)	34
Figure 16: Consumption and production of chemicals (in million tonnes per annum) by toxicity class (EU-28 based on H-statements, 2013)	35
Figure 17: Share of net imports on consumption of chemicals by toxicity class (EU-28 based on H-statements, production volume 2013)	36
Figure 18: Tonnage band discrimination of substances with a full registration and substances with both a full and an intermediate registration	
Figure 19: Tonnage band information for reference substances in the dataset compared to all substances registered: cumulative percentage of substances	50
Figure 20: Comparison of REACH data and PRODCOM data for production figures	51