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ABSTRACT

Current world production of phosphate fertilizers amounts to about 41 million tonnes of P₂O₅ while reported consumption is estimated at about 38 million tonnes. More than 95% of these phosphate products are chemically processed to increase their solubility. The great majority (about 70% of total) of all fertilizer P₂O₅ is derived from wet-process phosphoric acid. The production of 1 tonne of water-soluble P₂O₅ derived from wet-process phosphoric acid results in the production of about 5 tonnes of phosphogypsum and varying amounts of contaminated process water. World production of phosphogypsum amounts to about 130 million tonnes annually. To date, technical and economic constraints have seriously limited the uses for phosphogypsum; therefore, its management and disposal, along with disposal of the contaminated process water involved in phosphoric acid processing, have given rise to an increasing number of environmental and cost concerns. Estimates described in the paper indicate that the farm level cost of phosphate fertilizers could increase significantly if some of the environmental protection initiatives currently being proposed are implemented on a broad scale at the major phosphate fertilizer production sites.

Agronomic evidence shows that, except for certain short-season crops grown in relatively cool soils, the high water solubility of the phosphate fertilizers currently being produced is not necessary for many crop production systems. A moderate level of water solubility in the range of 40%-60% of the total P₂O₅ is usually satisfactory for most of the world’s important food- and feed-grain crops, provided the remainder of the P₂O₅ is "available" as measured by traditional laboratory test methods.

Although the agronomic potential exists for decreasing the water solubility of most phosphate fertilizers, and thus the consumption of wet-process phosphoric acid, the farm level cost of P₂O₅ derived from these less water-soluble sources continues to be higher than that of P₂O₅ derived from the more water-soluble phosphoric acid-based products even if the cost of phosphoric acid is significantly increased.
1. INTRODUCTION

World agriculture in general, and the chemical fertilizer industry specifically, is faced with an increased worldwide awareness of the need to protect, and in many cases restore, the global environment. This paper identifies the major environmental issues facing the phosphate sector of the fertilizer industry, quantifies the costs for mitigating certain indicated impacts upon the environment, and suggests policy initiatives that may be required to ensure that adequate supplies of phosphate fertilizers continue to be available to sustain global agricultural productivity.

Production of food and fibre for a world population of approximately 5.3 billion, which is increasing 1.8% annually, takes place on about 950 million ha of cultivated land, of which about 25% is irrigated in some fashion [1.2]. Sustaining this production depends upon the continuous addition of essential nutrients to the soil, not only to replace those removed by the harvested crops but also to improve the fertility of marginal lands. Worldwide annual consumption of the three primary nutrients derived from chemical fertilizers nitrogen (N), phosphate (P₂O₅), and potash (K₂O)—currently amounts to about 146 million tonnes (figure 1) [3]. On a regional basis, however, there is a wide disparity in the use of these three primary nutrients ranging from a high of about 270 kg/ha in western Europe and China to a low of about 9 kg/ha in sub-Saharan Africa. Likewise, P₂O₅ consumption varies quite widely, from almost 70 kg/ha in western Europe to only about 3 kg/ha in sub-Saharan Africa (table 1) [2,3]. Current annual world phosphate fertilizer consumption amounts to about 38 million tonnes of P₂O₅ and is expected to reach about 43 million tonnes P₂O₅ by the end of the century [3,4]. Figure II shows the trends in consumption of the three primary nutrients since 1970 [2,3].

Since about 1840 when German a scientist, Justus von Liebig, first stressed the importance of replacing mineral elements removed by crops, the benefits of nutrients supplied by chemical fertilizers have been clearly established as a means for increasing agricultural production [5 to 8]. The recognized need for fertilizers in today's agriculture necessitates the continued need to implement production and use strategies designed to minimize any adverse impact upon the world's air and water resources.

Nitrogen fertilizers have received the most attention with regard to their contribution to elevated nitrate levels in some aquifers underlining large areas of land committed to intensive agricultural production. A number of initiatives are underway to curb the intrusion of nitrogen into the groundwater primarily in developed countries where the consumption of nitrogen fertilizers is relatively high. These initiatives include (1) legislation, including use taxes, to limit the amount of applied nitrogen and regulate its time of application, (2) improved application practices, (3) nitrogen product modifications to better regulate the nitrogen release rate according to the crop's need, and (4) the use of crop rotations and deep-rooting crops that intercept nitrate moving downward in the soil profile.
In contrast to nitrogen, applied phosphate is quite immobile in most soils. Its intrusion into the groundwater is very limited [5,7]. Because phosphate reacts with constituents of the soil, only a fraction of the phosphate is utilized by the crop to which it was applied. However, because the phosphate is so intimately associated with the topsoil particles, it is more easily transported to surface waterways through soil erosion [7].

The great majority of the phosphate fertilizers currently used worldwide are highly soluble in water. The remainder, though less soluble in water, are still relatively available to the crop, depending upon a number of soil, crop, and climatic factors discussed later (figure III).

Most of the highly water soluble phosphate fertilizers are derived from wet process phosphoric acid. Wet process phosphoric acid is produced by reacting sulphuric acid with phosphate rock and then separating the resultant dilute phosphoric acid from unwanted solid reaction products, silica, and other impurities in the phosphate rock. This solid residue is essentially calcium sulphate-dihydrate, or gypsum, commonly referred to as phosphogypsum.

Other methods for producing water-soluble phosphate fertilizer are also based on the reaction of acids with phosphate rock. When a limited amount of sulphuric acid is used, single superphosphate (SSP) is produced. This product, although relatively low in P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5}, typically 16%-20%, is very soluble and currently accounts for about 17% of world P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} consumption. When phosphate rock is treated with nitric acid, unwanted calcium is most often removed from the reaction liquor as solid calcium nitrate, which can be further processed into ammonium nitrate fertilizer and byproduct calcium carbonate. Variations of the nitric acid-type processes range from almost total calcium removal to yield a very highly water-soluble phosphate fertilizer to no calcium removal, which yields a less concentrated and moderately soluble product. Some nitric acid-based processes also use varying amounts of sulphuric acid and/or phosphoric acid to adjust the nitrogen-to-phosphorus ratio and the level of water-soluble P in the final product.

The water solubility of a phosphate fertilizer is roughly proportional to the amount of calcium removed during processing. Most phosphate rock (concentrate) typically contains about 1 tonne of calcium for each tonne of P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5}. Thus, the production of the more soluble phosphate fertilizers, which are derived from phosphoric acid, results in the production of about 150 million tonnes of byproduct phosphogypsum annually on a worldwide basis. This large quantity of phosphogypsum has given rise to concerns relative to the management and disposal of this solid material and the associated process water in an environmentally acceptable manner.

In searching for ways to meet the growing need for phosphate fertilizers in an economic way, and at the same time address the environmental concerns directed at the phosphate fertilizer producer and user, this paper raises the following issues (questions) for discussion and evaluation:

1. Is the current family of highly water-soluble phosphate fertilizers necessary from an agronomic point of view?

2. What are acceptable phosphate fertilizer water solubilities for the significant cropping systems in the world's major agroclimatic zones?
3. What are the costs associated with responding to the environmental concerns currently directed at the phosphate industry?

4. What alternative phosphate product options are available and what is their cost?

5. What are the technical, economic, and policy barriers (constraints) that would have to be overcome to change current phosphate fertilizer production and use practices?

2. AGRONOMICS OF PHOSPHATE FERTILIZER USE

The production of the world's most important food- and feed-grain crops removes anywhere from about 20 to 60 kg/h of P₂O₅ from the soil for each crop harvested. Because the crop is usually removed and consumed elsewhere, little of this phosphorus is recycled back to the soils from which it was taken. Add to this the phosphorus that is lost through erosion of topsoil or through reactions with soil components to form compounds that are only slightly soluble, and one can quickly appreciate the need for continuously replenishing the soil's phosphorus supply through the application of chemical fertilizers, manures, and recycled crop residues.

2.1. PHOSPHATE FERTILIZER PRODUCT CHARACTERIZATION

For agronomic purposes, phosphate fertilizer products are most often characterized by (1) solubility, (2) particle size, and (3) the chemical form of phosphate they contain, for example, monocalcium phosphate or dicalcium phosphate.

The solubility of fertilizer phosphate is measured by a number of laboratory methods depending upon the country. The differences in indicated solubility depend largely upon the test method used [9,10,11].

Particle size is easily measured using test screens. As with solubility test methods, there are also a number of screen standards and test procedures used [12]. The particular chemical form of the phosphate, or the mix of chemical forms found in a fertilizer, largely determines the solubility of the product as determined by chemical test methods. However, particle size can influence the rate at which the phosphate dissolves when it is applied to the soil.

2.2. BEHAVIOUR OF APPLIED PHOSPHATE FERTILIZERS IN SOIL

Water-soluble phosphates react quite rapidly with soil components after application to form compounds of lower solubility. In the process, there is some localized movement of dissolved phosphorus away from the particle or granule site. Because only a small volume of soil (about 2% of the plough layer) is normally affected by the applied fertilizer phosphate, placement of phosphate near the seed is an important management practice used to increase the chances of the young seedlings absorbing phosphorus when it is most needed.
Only about 10%-20% of applied phosphorus fertilizer is taken up by the crop to which it was applied. The remainder contributes to "build-up" of residual phosphorus in the soil, even though it is transformed into less soluble forms. In acid soils, these less soluble forms are primarily iron and aluminum phosphates; in calcareous soils, they are calcium phosphates of low solubility. Formation of such compounds explains why phosphorus is quite immobile and why so little is taken up by the first crop.

2.3. PHOSPHATE SOLUBILITY NEEDS FOR SELECTED CROPS

Many factors affect the response of a crop to water-soluble phosphorus; however, minimum levels of water-soluble phosphorus needed for certain crops can be estimated. Although this is a subjective judgement, the water-solubility seldom needs to be as high as currently found in most commercial phosphate fertilizers. For most crops, 40%-60% of the total phosphorus in the water-soluble form is considered adequate provided that most of the remainder is "available" as measured by conventional laboratory test methods. For short-season vegetable crops, the water solubility should be higher; for longer season crops, it can be lower. Most vegetable crops are grown over a fairly short period of time with root systems that are not well developed, whereas long-season crops are characterized by well-developed root systems. Because the phosphorus is quite immobile in the soil, a large and vigorous root system is more likely to intercept and absorb phosphorus from the soil.

Irrigated agriculture, which accounts for about 25% (about 240 million ha) of the current world total harvested crop area may require special fertilizer materials to facilitate application. Flooding and overhead sprinkling account for the majority of irrigated agriculture, with flooding and furrow water application techniques being the most common, representing about 40% of the total. Currently, drip-type irrigation systems account for less than 1% of the total, but the application of such systems is increasing. In general, if the fertilizer is not applied with the irrigation water, phosphate fertilizer products and application methods used for upland agriculture are appropriate for irrigated agriculture.

In summary, from an agronomic point of view, the production of highly water-soluble phosphate fertilizers is not necessary for the majority of cropping systems. A more moderately water-soluble family of phosphate fertilizers would be appropriate in most cases. A more complete discussion of the factors affecting the level of phosphate solubility required under specific crop production systems can be found in a recent IFDC literature review [13].

3. THE PHOSPHATE FERTILIZER INDUSTRY OF TODAY

Today, the world’s phosphate fertilizer industry produces about 41 million tonnes of P₂O₅ annually not including that used for animal feed supplements (about 1.8 million tonnes P₂O₅) and other industrial purposes (about 2 million tonnes P₂O₅). This amount of P₂O₅ is contained in about 140 million tonnes of fertilizer products in which about 70% of the P₂O₅ is derived from wet-process phosphoric acid.
The industry is characterized by (1) the concentration of raw material production in relatively few countries; (2) integrated processing; (3) extensive intra- and interregional trade in raw materials and increasingly in intermediate and finished products; and (4) excess capacity relative to demand.

3.1. GLOBAL OVERVIEW OF PHOSPHATE FERTILIZER PRODUCTION AND USE

In the last two decades, processed phosphate (phosphoric acid and finished products) trade has increased steadily, whereas phosphate rock concentrate trade has declined. Transport cost savings for the more concentrated phosphate materials and economies of scale attributed to the integration of mining and processing have been the main reasons for the trend.

3.1.1. Profile of basic phosphate raw materials

3.1.1.1. Phosphate rock concentrate

The annual production of 41 million tonnes of fertilizer P₂O₅ requires the mining of about 650 million tonnes of ore. About 80% of the mined ore is of sedimentary origin while the remainder is of igneous origin. This ore is processed into about 140 million tonnes of phosphate rock concentrate having a typical P₂O₅ content of about 31% for the sedimentary material; the P₂O₅ content of concentrate derived from some igneous ores may exceed 36%. An additional 15-20 million tonnes of phosphate rock concentrate is used annually for nonfertilizer purposes. In 1989, total production of phosphate concentrate amounted to about 163 million tonnes [14]. Although 34 countries currently produce phosphate concentrate, only four countries (United States of America, U.S.S.R., Morocco, and China) account for about 73% of all production (table 2).

Exports of phosphate rock concentrate account for about 27% of total deliveries (46.4 million tonnes in 1988, 43.1 million tonnes in 1989). Fourteen countries exported concentrate in 1988 but Morocco (14.3 million tonnes), the United States (9.3 million tonnes), and Jordan (5.6 million tonnes) accounted for 61% of export deliveries. Europe (42%) and Asia (22%) were the predominant regional destinations for these exports.

It should be noted that 1988 is chosen as a reference year for analysis because in 1989 the world phosphate trade was disrupted by a commercial disagreement which led to 1989 being atypical in the trade of phosphate fertilizer materials. Following resolution of the commercial differences, a return to the established trade patterns was again apparent in 1990.

Over the past decade, world exports of phosphate concentrate declined from about 53 million tonnes to about 46 million tonnes today. During this period, North African (Morocco and Tunisia) and West Asian (Jordan and Israel) producers emerged as major exporters, while exports from the United States declined. This trend is expected to continue. Overall, it is expected that phosphate concentrate exports will stagnate or even decline slightly until the end of the century with European imports declining by 3-4 million tonnes and Asian imports increasing by 2-3 million tonnes over the next decade [15]. Jordan seems likely to continue its
steady growth (8% annually) and currently is the most competitive exporter to the
growth regions of Asia because of its favourable freight advantages over the United
States and, to a lesser extent, over Morocco.

Currently, there is world capacity for about 200 million tonnes of phosphate
concentrate per annum [16]. This excess capacity will act as a major constraint
to price increases for phosphate fertilizers.

3.1.1.2. Sulphur

The second major raw material required for phosphate fertilizer production is
sulphur. Annual world production of sulphur in all forms has increased from 57
million tonnes in 1975 to almost 61 million tonnes today. Almost half (29 million
tones) is used for the manufacture of phosphate fertilizers, and an additional 4.3
million tonnes is used for the production of other fertilizers such as ammonium
sulphate. All but 8% of the total production of sulphur/sulphur equivalent is used
to manufacture sulphuric acid.

There have been marked changes in the sources of sulphur production over the
past 15 years with an increase in the proportion of sulphur recovered from sour gas
and oil (41% in 1990). This has been accompanied by stagnation or decline in the
percentage of Frasch (mined) sulphur (23%) and sulphur obtained from pyrites (17%)
and other sources (19%). These trends are expected to continue, resulting in some
two-thirds of all sulphur output coming from nonvoluntary production sources by
1995 [17].

Although more than 50 countries produce sulphur, only 4 (Canada, United
States, U.S.S.R., and Poland) account for 60% of world production. Thus, there is
considerable world trade in elemental sulphur, whereas trade in pyrites is limited
to Europe. There is also limited trade in sulphuric acid amounting to 1.5 million
tonnes of sulphur equivalent annually.

3.1.2. Profile of wet-process phosphoric acid production

World production of wet-process phosphoric acid was equivalent to 28.6 million
tonnes of P₂O₅ in 1988. Production declined 5% in 1989, primarily because of the
previously mentioned commercial dispute, but recovered in 1990. Because of freight
advantages, there has been a trend to integrate phosphate mining and processing
operations. Additionally, because sulphur may represent 40% of the cost of
production, phosphoric acid plants are most viable when located near economic
supplies of sulphur/sulphuric acid.

Of 40 producing countries worldwide, only 4 (United States, U.S.S.R., Morocco,
and Tunisia) account for two-thirds of the world production of wet-process
phosphoric acid. About 4.4 million tonnes of P₂O₅ as phosphoric acid was traded
in 1988. Morocco is the largest exporter with 1.7 million tonnes P₂O₅ shipped in
1988, mostly to India and western Europe. The United States, the second largest
exporter, exports about 0.9 million tonnes P₂O₅, of which about 70% goes to the
U.S.S.R. Within western Europe, about 0.5 million tonnes P₂O₅ is traded, sourced
primarily from Belgium and Spain.
About 1.9 million tonnes $P_2O_5$ as phosphoric acid (about 7%) is consumed for nonfertilizer uses. About 70% of this industrial use occurs in western Europe, North America, and Japan.

Very little net new production of phosphoric acid is expected to come on stream during the next 5 years because there is a current excess of capacity. China is expected to increase its very small phosphoric acid capacity by about 2 million tonnes over the next 5 years; this production will be based on the use of domestic rock. Morocco, Jordan, U.S.S.R., and Israel are expected to increase capacity, but this will most likely be offset by declines in capacity in Europe and Japan. Production in the United States is expected to remain static.

3.1.3. **Profile of finished phosphate fertilizer products**

Almost 40% of the current annual production of approximately 41 million tonnes $P_2O_5$ as finished products is in the form of ammonium phosphates (DAP and MAP), and a further 13% is produced as TSP. This production accounts for approximately 83% of the phosphoric acid used in fertilizer production. These data for 1988 are summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Type</th>
<th>$P_2O_5$ (thousand tonnes)</th>
<th>Percent of Total $P_2O_5$</th>
<th>Percent of Total Phosphoric Acid Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAP/MAP</td>
<td>16.235</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSP</td>
<td>5.507</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphoric acid-based NPKs</td>
<td>4.338</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitric acid-based NPKs</td>
<td>3.879</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSP</td>
<td>7.083</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other phosphate fertilizers</td>
<td>2.888</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct application phosphate rock</td>
<td>1.310</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic slag</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL*</td>
<td>41.445</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Totals may not add due to rounding.

The regional distribution of finished phosphate fertilizer production for 1988 is shown in table 3. Two-thirds of total production occurred in the United States, U.S.S.R., China, and Western Europe. Production derived from phosphoric acid varies from around 80% or more in North and Central America, North Africa, and West and South Asia to around 50%–60% in other regions, except Oceania and China where phosphoric acid contributes only about 14% and 1% of the $P_2O_5$, respectively.
3.1.4. Trade in finished phosphate fertilizer products

International trade in finished phosphate fertilizers is limited primarily to DAP, TSP, and compound NPKs. Exports of DAP have doubled in the past decade to around 4.8 million tonnes P₂O₅ annually. DAP, containing 18% N and 46% P₂O₅, is now the most internationally traded phosphate fertilizer.

The United States accounts for 60%-70% of all DAP and MAP exports (about 3 million tonnes P₂O₅). Morocco, Jordan, and Tunisia follow with approximately 10%, 7%, and 5%, respectively. Almost 60% of all ammonium phosphates are exported to Asia; China accounts for around one-third, and India, Iran, and Pakistan together account for more than 25% of the exports made to Asia. Recent estimates of landed costs for DAP to the Chinese market indicate comparative advantages from the United States while the North Africa and West Asia exporters have cost advantages in the South Asia and Western Europe markets.

Exports of TSP, 1.9 million tonnes P₂O₅ in 1988, have lagged behind that of DAP, presumably because TSP has a lower total nutrient content than DAP. Production of TSP is concentrated in the United States, U.S.S.R., North Africa, and West Asia. However, production in the U.S.S.R. is utilized domestically, leaving the United States, Tunisia, Morocco, and Turkey as the major exporters. One-third of all exports go to western and eastern Europe, and about 15% go to the U.S.S.R. Another 33% is imported throughout Asia, including China, for use as a straight phosphate fertilizer.

Trade of compound NPKs amounted to almost 2.3 million tonnes P₂O₅ in 1988. Over 40% of this trade was within Western Europe, and another 10% was between eastern Europe and western Europe. Western Europe also accounts for 30%-55% of all other exports of P₂O₅ in the form of compound NPKs.

3.1.4.1. Expected trends in traded phosphate fertilizer products

The concentration of raw material supplies, favourable economics of integrated processing, and the freight advantages for more concentrated finished products have led to the current structure of production and trade of phosphate fertilizers. Growth in total production of finished products, which decreased in annual percentage terms from 7.8% in the 1960s to 1.5% in the 1980s, is now expected to stabilize. With a current overcapacity of about 2.5 million tonnes P₂O₅ in the form of finished products (6.5% of world P₂O₅ consumption) and a forecast growth in demand of only 1%-1.2% per annum for the next 5-10 years, further rationalization within the industry can be expected. As the supply/demand balance comes into equilibrium during the next 5 years and prices improve, new capacity can be expected and is already being planned in China, North Africa, and West Asia. The main surplus areas will continue to be the United States and North Africa. The deficit areas will include East Asia, China, Eastern Europe, and Central and South America.

3.1.5. Demand for phosphate fertilizers

World consumption of phosphate fertilizers increased from about 10 million tonnes P₂O₅ in 1960 to 38 million tonnes P₂O₅ in 1988, representing 36% and 26%.
respectively, of total fertilizer nutrient (N + P.O. + K₂O) consumption. During the 1960s, all regions exhibited growth in P.O. consumption; growth averaged 7.3% per annum and ranged from 4.02% in western Europe to 20.27% in South Asia. During the 1970s, the growth rate slowed to 4.62%, but still all regions except Oceania maintained a positive growth. During the 1980s, a considerable divergence between regions occurred in the growth rate of consumption due to climatic and micro- and macroeconomic policy changes. Phosphate fertilizer use decreased in several regions, including significant declines in the mature markets of North America (-3.3%), western Europe (-2.1%), Oceania (-2.9%), and eastern Europe (-0.9%). The U.S.S.R., Asia, and sub-Saharan Africa, however, experienced more than 6% per annum growth while Central America grew at almost 5%. Because of the disparity in regional consumption growth patterns, the regional shares of P.O. consumption changed markedly between 1960 and 1988, as shown in figure IV.

Over the next decade, total world consumption is expected to increase by 1%-1.2% per annum to 43.3 million tonnes P.O. by the end of the century. Regional phosphate fertilizer demand, as forecast by the World Bank/FAO/UNIDO/Industry Working Group is shown in figure IV. Static or declining consumption is forecast for the developed market economies, eastern Europe, and the U.S.S.R. Growth is confined to the developing countries and socialist Asia: over 75% of the growth is forecast to occur in South and East Asia including China.

3.1.6. Current phosphate fertilizer manufacturing and farm-level cost structure

Prices for internationally traded phosphate fertilizers have fluctuated widely over the past few decades but have generally exhibited a downward trend (Figure V). The international prices, shown in Figure V and quoted in current U.S. dollars, do not fully reflect the impact of supply and demand or the cost of raw materials and processing due to several distorting factors including:
- A limited number of buyers and sellers.
- Increased government ownership of the industry.
- Limited entry and exit of producers in and from the industry.
- Long-term lags in adjustment to achieve commercial equilibrium.
- Imperfect short-term knowledge of market conditions.
- Effects of countertrade and bartering.
- Effects of tariffs, quotas, a. production and end-user subsidies.
- Impact of fluctuating international freight rates.

The industry is characterized not only by a regional concentration of raw material resources, but also over the past decade, by an increasing concentration of production within regions under the control of fewer firms. Low or negative profit levels have led to industry rationalization in the developed market economies, while the expansion of production in developing countries and centrally planned economies has led to increased public sector ownership of production resources.

On a new investment basis, the cost of raw materials for phosphate fertilizers accounts for 40% to 60% of the total production costs. However, for established plants with lower capital charges, such as those in the United States, raw materials account for as much as 80% of the total production cost [18]. With these high raw material cost components, price distortions can be significant where
government policy initiatives (in the form of subsidized production or lack of environmental control legislation and enforcement) are designed to generate foreign exchange for use in other sectors of the economy. Nonsubsidized private sector production is only able to compete against such price distortions through more efficient use of capital, raw material cost advantages, and plant operating efficiencies.

3.1.6.1. Estimated current cost structure assuming new production facilities

Estimates of conventional and alternative phosphate fertilizer production and farm-gate costs were made by IFDC in 1988, based on new capital investments in developing country locations [19]. These estimates assumed capital recovery at 12% annual interest over 15 years and delivered raw material costs of $135/tonne for sulphur, $60/tonne for phosphate concentrate, and $145/tonne for ammonia. These costs, including credits for nitrogen and sulphur where applicable, are summarized in figure VI. With the exception of direct application phosphate rock, the estimated farm-gate cost for all processed fertilizers is quite similar, at close to $700/tonne P₂O₅.

In order to more thoroughly examine expected regional differences in farm-gate costs for major phosphate fertilizers, estimates were made based on the above processing costs, including capital recovery and regional supply and consumption estimates, using 1988 as a base year. The delivered cost of phosphate rock concentrate was derived from an estimated domestic production cost of $107.6/tonne P₂O₅ for all regions except the United States ($61.5/tonne P₂O₅), U.S.S.R. ($143/tonne P₂O₅), North Africa, sub-Sahara Africa, and West Asia ($98.4/tonne P₂O₅), and an average export price of $123/tonne P₂O₅, f.o.b., plus estimated international freight and port-handling costs. The delivered cost for sulphur was estimated at $135/tonne for all regions, and phosphoric acid production costs and international freight costs were estimated. Where supplies of finished products were imported, the landed costs were derived from the estimated production costs in the region of origin plus freight and handling.

To arrive at the farm-gate cost, the domestic distribution and marketing costs were assumed to be $30 per tonne of product for all regions except sub-Sahara Africa, where a value of $80/product tonne was assumed (refer to section 5). Farm-gate product costs were then expressed per tonne P₂O₅ and credits for nitrogen or sulphur deducted, where applicable, at $520/tonne for nitrogen and $135/tonne for sulphur at the farm level. The results are summarized as follows:
### Estimated Farm-Level Cost of Phosphate Fertilizer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/Country</th>
<th>(US $/tonne P₀₅₃)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Sahara Africa</td>
<td>844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Asia</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia (excluding China)</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Average</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on new plant facilities (1988 basis) and current world product mix and phosphate trade. Values do not include estimated incremental costs for environmental compliance described in section 5.

Although an attempt was made to incorporate the impact of international movements of raw materials, intermediates, and finished products and differences in the cost of phosphate rock among the major exporting regions, the resultant farm-level costs should be regarded only as indicative values. The results of this analysis indicate an average current world cost of about $582/tonne P₀₅₃ at the farm gate, with a low of US $469/tonne P₀₅₃ in North America and a high of US $844/tonne P₀₅₃ in sub-Sahara Africa. Apart from direct application phosphate rock, DAP, at an average cost of $551/tonne P₀₅₃, is the least-cost source of phosphate followed closely by compound NPKs at $573/tonne P₀₅₃. TSP is $630/tonne P₀₅₃, and SSP is the most expensive source at $682/tonne P₀₅₃. The cost structure for the various products is described more fully in section 5.

This analysis indicates that the current industry structure and product mix, based heavily upon wet-process phosphoric acid, is providing the least-cost supply of phosphate fertilizers on a global basis. The cost advantage of phosphoric acid-based products produced in existing plants is even more favourable due to lower capital charges.

### 3.2. OVERVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS IN THE PHOSPHATE FERTILIZER SECTOR

#### 3.2.1. Summary of environmental regulations

A 1983 survey of member countries by the International Fertilizer Industry Association (IFA) indicated that "environmental concerns were not regarded as a
problem in developing countries, where food supplies are often insufficient, organic manure in short supply, and fertilizer use in a decline" [20].

A similar survey by IFA in 1989 showed that the situation has changed markedly: "The environmental movement has become a strong political force and is spreading to some developing countries, whether or not the conditions are appropriate" [20].

A sampling of existing environmental regulations directly affecting the phosphate fertilizer industry in selected countries is given in Tables 4 and 5. These data indicate a great deal of variability in the permitted values and the basis used for calculation.

In addition to legislation regarding effluent discharges to the environment, some countries have established workplace environmental standards. These standards, expressed as threshold limit values (TLVs), are designed to protect people who are exposed to toxic and hazardous substances in the workplace for long periods of time [21,22].

3.3. PHOSPHATE FERTILIZER MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY

3.3.1. Phosphate mining. land reclamation and beneficiation

As indicated earlier, the phosphate industry is characterized by the movement and processing of large tonnages of overburden, ore, and concentrate. The phosphate concentrate used to prepare the intermediate and finished products is derived from naturally occurring phosphate-bearing ore. Typically, the naturally occurring ore contains 15%-30% \( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 \) comingled with sand, clay, and other impurities. Current world phosphate reserves amount to the equivalent of about 12 billion tonnes of marketable concentrate, and the reserve base amounts to more than 30 billion tonnes (table 2) [14].

The great majority of the world’s phosphate ore is obtained using surface mining techniques. These mining operations often require the removal and eventual replacement and reshaping of as much as 5 tonnes of overburden per tonne of ore, or several times that amount of material per tonne of recovered \( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 \), because not all the \( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 \) contained in the mined ore is recovered as a marketable phosphate concentrate. Depending upon the characteristics of the ore, as much as one-third of the \( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 \) can be lost in the process of separating the phosphate from its parent ore consisting of sand, clay, limestone, and other materials. The separation (beneficiation) process may range from a crude dry-screening process to a very sophisticated process that may involve washing, wet screening, magnetic separation, hydraulic separation, centrifugation, flotation, calcination, settling/decantation, and drying.

The disposal of phosphatic clay waste is the most troublesome problem faced in most beneficiation processes. Even after years of settling, these very fine particles seldom consolidate to more than 20% solids [23]. Besides requiring a large land area for settling and storage of this material, careful management of the recirculated water which is used to transport the clay waste is also required to avoid contamination of water resources.
All phosphate ore contains traces of uranium and its radioactive decay products (radionuclides) and a number of metals which are being studied in relation to the health of humans and other animals (table 6:24.25 and table 7:26.27).

These metallic constituents, most notably cadmium, have received a great deal of attention in recent years, especially regarding international trade of phosphate concentrate containing elevated levels of cadmium. Techniques for removing cadmium from phosphate concentrate, for example, high-temperature calcination, have been evaluated and used to a limited commercial extent with generally unsuccessful and costly results. Removal of cadmium and other metals to tolerable levels from phosphoric acid seems to offer more promise. Such removal techniques, though currently not practiced commercially in the fertilizer industry, involve ion-exchange or solvent extraction methods [26,28].

Study of the ultimate fate of radioactive decay products and potentially harmful metals in the processing of phosphate ore to finished fertilizer products is yielding some interesting observations. For example, the concentration of radionuclides is reported higher in the small particle size fraction (minus 30 lnm) of phosphate concentrate [26], whereas in the beneficiation of central Florida phosphate ore, which is naturally low in cadmium, about one-third of the cadmium is removed with the phosphatic clay that is discharged to a disposal site [27]. The fate of certain metals and radioactivity, including their entry into the food chain through the soil and plant tissue, continues to receive considerable study [30,31,32,33].

3.3.1.1. Environmental factors related to phosphate mining, land reclamation, and beneficiation

Phosphate mining and beneficiation operations, depending upon a number of site-specific factors, may affect the environment to varying degrees in one or more of the following ways:
- Topography changes including the loss of aesthetic value, soil fertility, and soil moisture-holding capacity.
- Loss of natural plant and wildlife habitat.
- Loss of recreational, historical, and archaeological values.
- Disturbance of shallow aquifers.
- Contamination of surface and groundwater resources caused by the intrusion of contaminated water from mine sites and phosphatic clay and sand tailings disposal sites.
- Depletion of groundwater resources due to extraction of water used for processing.
- Erosion caused by wind and water.
- Concentration and/or escape of radionuclides that may be harmful to human health.
- Atmospheric contamination due to exhaust fumes and noise from mining/reclamation equipment.

Fortunately, for the most part, the level of environmental degradation caused by these factors is minimized, and in some cases eliminated, through responsible and innovative technical management of the mining, reclamation, and beneficiation operations. In some cases, mined-out sites have been restored to an aesthetic and
economic level far exceeding that of the original site. It is also important to note that some unreclaimed mine sites offer very favourable habitat for wildlife and natural vegetation that would otherwise be lost if the areas were reclaimed for agricultural or commercial development.

In some locations it is possible to integrate mine-site reclamation with the disposal of large quantities of phosphatic clay, sand tailings, and phosphogypsum discharged from the ore beneficiation and phosphoric acid units.

Reported costs for reclamation of mined-out land as practised in Florida (U.S.A.) range from about US $3,000/ha to US $25,000/ha depending upon the site, desired end use, and the method used to manage the surface water. Restoration to a mix of wildlife and agricultural uses in the "land and lake" format is among the most costly. In the example cited for Florida, about 15,000 tonnes of marketable concentrate (about 4,600 tonnes P2O5) is extracted per hectare. Thus, the cost of reclamation per tonne of P2O5 is in the range of about US $1-$9, with US $1 - $2 being more appropriate for the Florida operations.

Because mining and beneficiation will continue to be essential for the preparation of phosphate fertilizers regardless of the product type, it is expected that the adoption of environmentally sound mining and land reclamation procedures will continue to be expanded on a global basis. A discussion of the environmental aspects of the Jordanian phosphate industry by Taqieddin [34] is indicative of this trend. Also, it is expected that more sophisticated operational procedures in all aspects of mining and beneficiation will be implemented as the higher grade phosphate ores become depleted and thus necessitate the processing of lower grade material.

The production of phosphate fertilizers that are less water-soluble may benefit the mining and beneficiation operations in two ways. First, less beneficiation may be required, resulting in lower losses of P2O5. In some cases it may even be possible to produce phosphoric acid by the direct acidulation of the ore and avoid beneficiation entirely [35]. Second, the use of lower grade phosphate ores containing a higher level of impurities, such as magnesium, iron, and aluminum, will have the net result of increasing the level of phosphate reserves and increasing the economic life of existing production facilities.

3.3.2. Wet-process phosphoric acid

Phosphoric acid is the major intermediate used to produce phosphate fertilizer. As previously stated, approximately 70% of all fertilizer P2O5 is derived directly from wet-process phosphoric acid. Most of the balance is derived from phosphate concentrate that is usually treated with phosphoric or other acids (sulphuric or nitric acid) to increase its solubility. Additionally, small amounts of fertilizer-grade phosphates are derived from direct application phosphate rock, basic slag, thermophosphates, guano, bonemeal, and other minor sources.

Except for a small amount of phosphoric acid prepared from elemental phosphorus (furnace-grade acid) that may be used to prepare speciality fertilizers used in irrigation and greenhouse culture, all fertilizer-grade phosphoric acid is produced through a variety of wet processes in which the phosphate concentrate is digested in a dilute mixture of phosphoric acid and sulphuric acid.
The digestion process results in a slurry of phosphoric acid and solid calcium sulphate. The insoluble calcium sulphate, formed from the reaction of calcium contained in the concentrate and sulphuric acid, is separated from the phosphoric acid solution by filtration. The concentration of the phosphoric acid as it exits the filter (filter-grade acid) varies from about 27%-30% P₂O₅ to about 40%-50% P₂O₅, depending upon the specific process. The acid may then be further concentrated and clarified, depending upon its final use. Likewise, the calcium sulphate produced in the digestion step may be in the hemihydrate (CASO₄·½H₂O) or dihydrate (CASO₄·2H₂O) form, depending upon the specific process. In some of the hemihydrate processes, the calcium sulphate is recrystallized to the larger and easier to filter dihydrate (gypsum) form before filtration; in others, the calcium is removed in the hemihydrate form. The major wet-process phosphoric acid process routes are well described in the literature [36, 37, 38].

In most cases, calcium sulphate (phosphogypsum) discharged from the filter is slurried to a concentration of about 20% with recirculated process water and pumped to a disposal site. In some cases, the gypsum is purified and used for construction or other industrial purposes. In a phosphoric acid plant in Indonesia and India, for example, the phosphogypsum is reacted with ammonium carbonate to form ammonium sulphate fertilizer and purified calcium carbonate that is used in the production of cement. Although dependent upon an ammonia plant as a source of ammonia and carbon dioxide, this process effectively converts phosphogypsum into useful byproducts. However, the present-day economics of this technology are questionable. It is important to note, however, that the economic merits of phosphogypsum utilization are quite dynamic and site specific in that they depend heavily upon the alternative costs of disposal on one hand and the cost of sulphur, cement, and other useful products that can be derived from phosphogypsum on the other.

In addition to industrial uses, a relatively small amount of phosphogypsum is used as a source of agronomic calcium and sulphur (land plaster). Phosphogypsum is especially useful as a soil amendment for soils containing high levels of exchangeable sodium. Thus, phosphogypsum can often become an integral component in the reclamation of soils containing elevated levels of exchangeable sodium.

About 15% of the world production of wet-process phosphoric acid is traded in the form of merchant-grade material having a P₂O₅ content of 52%-54% and an undissolved solids content of less than 1%. The balance is used at the various production sites for the captive production of phosphate fertilizers, such as DAP, MAP, TSP, and compound NPKs. Also, as already mentioned, some acid is used to produce nonfertilizer products such as animal feed supplements. The average P₂O₅ content of acid used for the captive production of fertilizers at the basic production sites is usually in the range of about 40%-45%. Also, the undissolved solids content in this acid may be well above 1% depending upon the product produced.

3.3.2.1. Environmental factors related to wet-process phosphoric acid production

Just as the phosphatic clay waste is the bane of most phosphate ore mining and beneficiation processes, so phosphogypsum and its associated recirculated process
water are the bane of the wet-process phosphoric acid industry. As already indicated, each tonne of P.O. produced as wet-process phosphoric acid results in the production of about 5 tonnes (dry basis) of phosphogypsum and often about twice that amount of process water that must be dealt with.

3.3.2.2. Phosphogypsum

In some cases, the phosphogypsum is slurried with seawater and discharged to the sea beyond the low-tide beach. In other cases, it is discharged into rivers or integrated with mine reclamation projects where it is buried in mined-out areas. In very limited cases, the gypsum is processed into ammonium sulphate and calcium carbonate for use as a fertilizer and cement additive, respectively.

The technology for conversion of phosphogypsum to sulphuric acid, aggregate, and other useful products has been relatively well developed, but its commercial adoption is constrained primarily for economic reasons. The integration of wet-process phosphoric acid production with coal-fired electric power production could result in the almost total utilization of phosphogypsum in the form of recovered sulphur dioxide for the production of sulphuric acid and lime for the production of cement [39]. Such integration may be the key to improving the economics of phosphogypsum utilization; however, the opportunities for economic integration are often quite limited. Several methods for using phosphogypsum, although perhaps currently noneconomic, are well documented in the literature [40,41]. It should be noted, however, that the economics of phosphogypsum utilization will undoubtedly improve as the costs of alternative phosphogypsum disposal techniques increase.

For the most part, however, with the exception of a few locations, the phosphogypsum is stacked aboveground at disposal sites located near the phosphoric acid production units. Currently, it is estimated that by the year 2000 over 1 billion tonnes of phosphogypsum will be stored in stacks in the State of Florida (U.S.A.) alone. The central Florida stacks now exceed 400 million tonnes, not including the north Florida stacks, and are currently growing at an annual rate of about 30 million tonnes; the total annual production of phosphogypsum worldwide amounts to about 150 million tonnes. The design and operating criteria for phosphogypsum stacks are described by Baretinicic in The Fertilizer Institute's (TFI) comments to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S.-EPA). [42].

The closing or decommissioning of existing phosphogypsum stacks brings about another set of concerns, particularly because most of the existing stacks were not designed to accommodate current or proposed closure regulations. According to recently introduced, or proposed, U.S.-EPA and local regulations, idle or inactive stacks would have to be dewatered, reshaped, and covered with an impervious (plastic) membrane and a soil cap to support vegetation. Even if infiltration of fresh stormwater is eliminated by capping the stack, drainage from the stack may continue for many years. This drainage must be collected and properly dealt with. Kleinschmidt, at a recent symposium on phosphogypsum, described many of the practical aspects of stack decommissioning [25].
Replacement of the active phosphogypsum storage facilities according to proposed U.S.-EPA regulations is estimated to cost about US $2 billion "43”. One such stack site currently under construction in central Florida is reported to cost in the order of US $50 million. This particular stack and process water storage/cooling pond site is about 160 ha in size and completely lined with an impervious synthetic membrane. Assuming the US $50 million estimate as a base and an active life of 10 years, the capital cost alone, not including operation, per tonne of P.O. manufactured over a 10-year period would amount to about US $6.0 at a 14% annual interest rate.

3.3.2.3. Recirculated process water

A more troublesome issue than the phosphogypsum is the recirculated process water that is used to slurry the phosphogypsum and transport it to the disposal site. This recirculated process water is also used to remove heat and gaseous and particulate effluents from the wet-process phosphoric acid concentration unit and the finished product processing units. The acidic process water referred to as process wastewater by the U.S.-EPA, dissolves and holds in solution a number of elements originally contained in the phosphate rock. Also, slippage of phosphoric acid to the phosphogypsum during filtration, and the collection of particulate from other processing units, adds to the water small quantities of solubilized metallic ions in addition to compounds of phosphorus, sulphur, and fluorine. Furthermore, because the process water is recirculated on a closed-loop in an effort to obtain a zero-discharge mode of operation, the concentration of these dissolved species increases quite markedly with time.

Estimates by the U.S.-EPA indicate that in 1988 the U.S. phosphoric acid industry managed about 1.8 billion tonnes of contaminated process water. This is equivalent to an average of 84 million tpy for each of the 21 production facilities or about 130 tonnes per tonne of P.O. produced, assuming a total annual production of 14 million tonnes of P.O. in all forms including about 10 million tonnes in the form of wet-process phosphoric acid "29”. According to U.S.-EPA, the amount of contaminated process water managed among the facilities varied widely from about 13 million tpy to 280 million tpy. Most of this process water is reused in the process loop: fresh makeup water, including rainwater, may amount to only about 7-10 tonnes/tonne P.O. produced. The ultimate fate of the managed process water, thus requiring the 7-10 tonnes/tonne P.O. fresh makeup, includes evaporation, water of hydration to form gypsum, entrained water in the phosphogypsum stack, seepage into groundwater, and, in some cases, permitted discharge to surface waterways after appropriate treatment. Because the overall process water balance is heavily influenced by rainfall, it may be necessary to intentionally discharge water from the containment site from time to time. In the United States, such discharges must be treated to comply with local discharge permit criteria.

Treatment and containment of this contaminated process water are currently the subjects of major concern among both the regulatory agencies and the producers. Proposals put forth by some regulators include the use of impervious liners for the gypsum stacks and process water cooling ponds and the continuous treatment of the recirculated process water with lime to elevate the pH to at least 3.5 to promote the precipitation of fluorides.
Although treatment of the recirculated process water may be technically feasible, total containment without an intentional discharge is not technically possible in some locations because of gypsum stack design constraints and unfavourable rainfall and evaporation balances.

The estimated costs associated with the treatment of process water to comply with proposed U.S.-EPA regulations are given as an example and summarized in table 8 [44]. Besides the capital and operational costs directly related to treatment (equipment and lime), it is important to note that the loss of precipitated P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5}, which may amount to about 4% of the total processed P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5}, has a major influence on the net P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} recovery for the facility. Also, because of the loss of acidity, additional sulphuric acid must be fed to the digestion process to replace the acidic process water.

Furthermore, because the recirculated process water is an integral part of the phosphogypsum transport and management system, its treatment may adversely influence the stacking and drainage properties of the phosphogypsum. Laboratory tests indicate that the presence of precipitated metal compounds from the process water, including silica gel, increases not only the settled volume of the phosphogypsum but also the moisture retention properties, thus making dewatering more difficult [45].

The ultimate disposal of the precipitated solids from the process water presents still another technical/cost concern. Laboratory, as well as limited commercial, experience indicates that the insoluble compounds resulting from liming of the recirculated process water to pH 3.5 consolidate to only about 15% solids after 5 years, making soil/vegetation capping (reclamation) of such settling ponds impractical [45].

Additionally, it is important to determine what, if any, collateral impact the proposed process water containment and treatment schemes may have on the performance of the process and final product cost, as well as on the environment. The cost of P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} production is likely to be increased by process inefficiencies and increased downtime due to blinding of the filter media and scaling of process equipment. It is also necessary to consider the costs associated with transport and handling of lime and to recognize that the increased production of lime will have other effects related to quarry operations, lime kiln emissions, and the consumption of energy.

In summary, the wet-process phosphoric acid industry may affect the environment in several ways. The degree of potential impact is very process- and site-specific as are the definitions and criteria used by the regulators and general public in assessing the level of impact. The reader is therefore cautioned not to generalize. The main possibilities include the following:

- Disturbance of land used for phosphogypsum and contaminated process water storage.
- Contamination of water resources caused by the disposal of phosphogypsum and its associated process water, including acidity, dissolved metals, and radionuclides.
- Fluorine emissions to the atmosphere from the phosphoric acid process and process water storage/cooling ponds.
- Escape of radionuclides that may be harmful to human health.
- Airborne solid and liquid particulates including those caused by wind erosion of phosphogypsum stacks.
- Release of contaminated cooling water, plant site stormwater drainage, and boiler blowdown residue.
- Release of metals and other residues from the regeneration or disposal of spent catalyst from sulphuric acid production units.
- Release of solvents, oils, and other contaminants from plant maintenance and workshop activities.

As with phosphate mining, the potential impact of phosphoric acid processing can be minimized through skilled technical management of the production facilities. However, new investments may be required to more completely control the long-term fate of some process wastes.

3.3.3. Finished phosphate fertilizer products

Except for relatively small quantities of basic slag, thermophosphate-type products, and miscellaneous organic fertilizer products, the current family of finished phosphate fertilizers can be grouped into the following basic categories:
- Direct-application phosphate rock.
- Superphosphates.
- Ammonium phosphates.
- Nitrophosphates.

A brief discussion of each of the basic product types, including their technical advantages and constraints, follows.

3.3.3.1. Direct application phosphate rock technology

The production of direct application phosphate rock (concentrate), of course, uses the simplest and least-cost process technology. It is also the basic building block for other more complex production technologies. For the purposes of this discussion, a beneficiated phosphate rock concentrate containing 30% $P_2O_5$ is assumed. However, beneficiation is not always needed, and thus the $P_2O_5$ content of such products can vary widely.

As indicated earlier, the agronomic performance of phosphate rock is heavily dependent upon the characteristics of the phosphate rock, soil, crop, and climatic conditions. In general, phosphate rock will perform best in acidic soils having low available phosphorus and calcium; its performance is further enhanced if the soil is warm and moist and if the crop growing season is long.

Perhaps more important than the absolute $P_2O_5$ content is the observed effectiveness of the phosphate rock (concentrate) as a fertilizer. This effectiveness is, in part, dependent upon the origin of the rock and its inherent ability to dissolve in the soil and become available to the crop. This characteristic of the rock, generally referred to as its "reactivity," is measured by a number of laboratory test methods. One commonly used method to indicate a rock's reactivity is based on the amount of $P_2O_5$ that can be extracted from a
sample using a neutral ammonium citrate (NAC) solution (46). Caution should be taken when interpreting laboratory reactivity data because the results of the tests can vary widely depending upon the solvent used and the test procedure (9,10,11). Another criterion, referred to as bioavailability, subjects the fertilizer to a greenhouse pot test to determine its performance. This test method is used to correlate chemical test methods with actual crop response.

The reactivity of a phosphate rock is determined not only by its geological origin and mineral characteristics, but also by its particle size. Most phosphate rock materials used for direct application need to be quite finely ground, typically 90% minus 150 μm. The cost of this grinding operation, of course, has a major influence on the cost of production of direct application phosphate rock. Typical data on the composition, reactivity, surface area, and grindability of selected phosphate rock materials are shown in table 9. If the phosphate concentrate is sufficiently reactive and does not have to be finely ground, as is likely with such highly reactive phosphate rock concentrates as Sechura (Peru), North Carolina (U.S.A.), and Gafsa (Tunisia) a significant cost advantage is realized.

Advantages and Constraints

Despite the apparent major advantages of low capital investment and production costs, the use of direct application phosphate rock technology is limited by (1) the lack of widespread availability of reactive phosphate rock materials that give the appropriate agronomic performance; (2) the difficulty of handling finely ground material and the possible worker health concerns related to handling dusty material; (3) limited versatility of use; and (4) increased cost of P₂O₅ delivery to the farm gate because the rock has a lower nutrient content than do the more concentrated processed phosphates such as TSP or DAP. Consequently, as previously indicated (figure III), only about 3.5% of world P₂O₅ consumption is in the form of direct application phosphate rock.

From an environmental viewpoint, direct application phosphate rock is quite benign. Except for the impact of mining, the direct application products may require less beneficiation and thus generate less waste in the form of contaminated water, phosphatic clay, or atmospheric discharges as a result of calcination to remove unwanted carbonates or organic material. However, because of its small particle size caused by grinding, it is more difficult to handle, and special precautions must be taken to avoid the impact of airborne dust when it is transported, handled, and applied. Also, because the rock is not chemically or thermally treated, the level of cadmium and other unwanted constituents per tonne of applied P₂O₅ may be higher than that found in the processed phosphates.

3.3.3.2. Superphosphate-type products technology

The superphosphate family of phosphate fertilizers includes two major products—SSP and TSP. With SSP, sulphuric acid is reacted with phosphate concentrate to produce a product usually containing 16%-20% plant-available P₂O₅ and about 10% sulphur. With TSP, phosphoric acid is used instead, and the product usually contains 46% available P₂O₅ and only a trace of sulphur. These basic products/processes can be altered to produce enriched superphosphate—basically
a mixture of SSP and TSP - and some partially acidulated phosphate rock (PAPR) products in which the level of soluble P\(_2\)O\(_5\) depends upon the characteristics of the phosphate rock and the amount of acid used [9].

Advantages and Constraints

The factory-gate cost of granular SSP and PAPR, on a nutrient basis, is often quite favourable when compared with that of granular TSP. However, the cost of delivering an equivalent amount of P\(_2\)O\(_5\) to the farm gate in the form of the lower analysis SSP and PAPR products usually makes the more concentrated TSP product the most favourable choice, especially in the case of imports and when the delivery distance to the farmer is long. One possible disadvantage of TSP, in addition to its partial (approximately 70%) dependence upon phosphoric acid, is that the production complex, including sulphuric acid and phosphoric acid is quite costly and can remain economical only if operated at a relatively high capacity utilization. In contrast, the less costly SSP and PAPR units are affected less by a decline in capacity utilization. Another potential disadvantage of TSP is its lack of agronomic sulphur content despite the relatively heavy dependence upon sulphur in producing the phosphoric acid used in TSP production.

The SSP and TSP technologies have another significant advantage over TSP: their simplicity and lower investment requirements make them better suited for smaller scale operations that may often use locally available phosphate resources to supplement or replace more costly imported phosphate raw materials or intermediates such as phosphate concentrate or wet-process phosphoric acid.

With specific reference to environmental impact, the entire family of superphosphate products has less adverse impact at the production site than do the ammonium phosphate products: because a smaller amount of phosphoric acid is consumed per tonne of marketable P\(_2\)O\(_5\), and in some cases no phosphogypsum and contaminated process water are produced. The recovery of fluorine further enhances the environmental integrity of these processes, whether the fluorine-based acid is recycled to the process as an acid source or is converted into a marketable byproduct.

3.3.3.3. Ammonium phosphate products technology

DAP (18-46-0) is the most common ammonium phosphate product. However, the production of MAP with a typical analysis of about 11-52-0 is gaining in importance in those locations where ammonia is lacking or where, for transport cost reasons, it is important to maximize the level of P\(_2\)O\(_5\) in the product. Also, MAP may be preferred over DAP when applied with, or close to, the seed because damage to the seed by ammonia is less likely. Another significant ammonium phosphate-based product, especially in parts of Asia, is 16-20-0. This product is basically a mixture of ammonium phosphate and ammonium sulphate. Unlike DAP or MAP, this product typically contains 8%-12% sulphur. All three of these products can be produced in the basic DAP-type plant provided precautions are taken to cope with the higher level of equipment corrosion normally encountered with the 16-20-0 product.
Advantages and Constraints

As a source of phosphate, the DAP and MAP products rank very favorably with regard to delivered cost and agronomic effectiveness when compared with other phosphate product alternatives. Additionally, these products usually exhibit very good physical properties even when mixed with other materials, and they usually store well. The most significant disadvantages of the ammonium phosphate products are similar to those cited for TSP, for example, (1) required large capital investment, (2) heavy dependence upon sulphur (about 1 tonne of S/tonne of P₂O₅), (3) a relatively rigid specification for phosphate rock for economic production of phosphoric acid, and (4) loss of costly sulphur in the form of phosphogypsum. Furthermore, because these products depend entirely upon wet-process phosphoric acid as the source of P₂O₅, about 2.5 tonnes of phosphogypsum is produced for each tonne of DAP, or the equivalent of about 5 tonnes per tonne of P₂O₅. Additionally, the ammonium phosphate process requires ammonia that must either be produced locally or imported.

Modern fully integrated ammonium phosphate plants producing sulphuric acid and phosphoric acid are very energy efficient; except for the heat lost from the phosphoric acid evaporation units, a relatively small amount of waste heat is discharged into the environment resulting in optimum production costs. Additionally, small amounts of ammonia, fluorine, and solid particulate are discharged to the atmosphere. However, these pollutants are quite easy to control and their impact on the environment is generally minimal in a well-managed production facility.

3.3.3.4. Nitrophosphate-based products technology

Nitrophosphate-based technology differs markedly from the previously discussed technologies in that nitric acid is used to digest and solubilize some or all of the phosphate rock. Therefore, in a true nitrophosphate process, for example, the Odda process, which originated in Norway, it is possible to produce a very soluble phosphate fertilizer without using sulphur. This characteristic continues to attract interest, especially during times of sulphur shortages or high sulphur prices. Continued environmentally related pressures on the wet-process phosphoric acid industry are expected to focus additional attention on the merits of nitrophosphate technology.

It is also possible to use sulphuric and/or phosphoric acid or ammonium phosphate to arrive at variations of the basic nitric acid-type process—the so-called phosphonitrifurc or mixed acid processes. Such raw material additions are made to adjust the N/P₂O₅ ratio, react with calcium nitrate, or add agronomic sulphur to the final product. These techniques add considerable flexibility to the basic process but increase dependency upon the need for sulphur and, ultimately, phosphoric acid.

Another variation of nitrophosphate-type processing involves the calcium precipitation process in which a soluble sulphate, typically ammonium sulphate, is used to precipitate and remove calcium from the digested liquor (as waste gypsum) while at the same time adding nitrogen to the mother liquor. In still another variation, ion exchange techniques are used to remove calcium. The ion exchange
process has the added advantage of producing chloride-free NPK fertilizers, but the waste liquor from the ion exchange unit must be treated.

Nitrophosphate-based technology offers the opportunity to obtain a broad range of \( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 \) solubility in the products. The \( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 \) water solubility is dependent upon the amount of calcium removed from the digested slurry and/or the amount of phosphoric acid, or its derivatives, used in the process. In the Odda process, essentially all of the calcium can be removed as calcium nitrate by cooling (refrigeration) the digested liquor to about 5°C. As a result, the water solubility of the final \( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 \) product is quite high—approaching 100%. The calcium nitrate is subsequently converted into an ammonium nitrate (AN) or calcium ammonium nitrate (CAN) coproduct. In contrast, in the phosphonitric or mixed acid processes, none of the calcium is removed and the water solubility of the \( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 \) is dependent largely upon the amount of phosphoric acid (or alternatively solid ammonium phosphate) added to the process. In these processes, the water-soluble \( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 \) may be as low as 30% of the total while the plant-available \( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 \) usually exceeds 95% of the total.

**Advantages and Constraints**

The most often quoted advantages of the true nitrophosphate (Odda) process over phosphoric acid-based processes are (1) its complete independence of sulphur, (2) the ability to use lower quality phosphate rock, (3) flexibility with regard to water-soluble \( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 \) in the product, (4) its overall agronomically favourable ratio of N-to-\( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 \) (2:1) for upland crops when all coproduct AN is utilized either in the form of AN/CAN or when it is combined with the phosphate into a product such as 26-13-0, and (5) less environmental impact because the production of phosphogypsum and its associated process water is avoided. Some of the possible disadvantages of the process are (1) the production of coproduct AN/CAN is very high, amounting to 2 tonnes of N for each tonne of \( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 \). This amount of nitrogen in the nitrate form may not be appropriate for some crops, for example, flooded rice; (2) relatively low \( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 \) content of the product, resulting in a higher delivered cost per unit of \( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 \) nutrient; (3) complex process technology requiring large-scale operation to be economic; and (4) the ammonium nitrate-containing products are not chemically compatible with urea, thus mixed storage or blending in the marketing system must be avoided. Also, because nitrophosphate-type processing is heavily dependent upon the use of ammonia and nitric acid, the collateral impact on the environment caused by these production units must be considered.

The phosphonitric (mixed acid) technology is less capital intensive and complex than the Odda nitrophosphate process—the level of capital investment and technology more closely approximates that of DAP—but the process depends upon the use of some sulphur and phosphoric acid and therefore the production of phosphogypsum, either directly or indirectly. The mixed acid process, in effect, combines many advantages of the ammonium phosphate and the Odda nitrophosphate processes. In those locations where the lower level of \( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 \) water solubility obtainable with moderate dependence upon sulphur (phosphoric acid or ammonium phosphate) is agronomically acceptable, this technology appears to offer advantages over the more water-soluble phosphate products such as TSP, DAP, or the Odda-type nitrophosphates.
3.3.3.5. Environmental factors related to the production of finished phosphate products

The environmental impact resulting from the production of finished phosphate fertilizer products may vary widely depending upon the scale of operation and the level of process integration. For example, a small superphosphate plant located far from the source of phosphate concentrate and acid (sulphuric or phosphoric) may very well have a more adverse impact upon the environment, despite its small size, than a large fully integrated facility. The small, remote facilities often lack financial resources to achieve the level of technical management, process technology, and integration of facilities needed to collect and recycle or market process wastes and byproducts, particularly fluorine-containing wastes. On the other hand, the large integrated facilities usually enjoy a higher level of technical skills and financial resources needed for the proper environmental management of the facility. This higher level of integration also results in the more efficient use of waste heat (energy) and thus decreases the collateral impact of fertilizer processing caused by the burning of additional fuel to produce electricity and steam for the process.

The production of finished phosphate fertilizers may adversely affect the environment in one or more of the following ways:

- Release of airborne solid and liquid particulates.
- Release to the atmosphere of ammonia, fluorine, nitrogen oxides, carbon dioxide, and other gaseous compounds.
- Release of metals and other residues from the regeneration or disposal of spent catalyst (ammonia, sulphuric acid, and nitric acid production units).
- Release of carbon and nitrogen oxides (ammonia and nitric acid production units).
- Release of contaminated cooling water, process water, plant site stormwater drainage, and boiler blowdown residue.
- Release of solvents, oils, and other contaminants from plant maintenance and workshop activities.

The technology for containing and treating these potential pollutants is well developed. However, the effective application of the technologies is heavily dependent upon economics on the one hand and technical/managerial skills and the level of enforcement of environmental regulations at the plant location on the other. In many instances the economic constraints to compliance have resulted in the closure of facilities. For example, in the United States and Western Europe alone, more than 300 small to moderately sized plants engaged in the production of phosphate-based compound NPK fertilizers have closed since the mid-1970s [47]. The decision to close these plants, of course, involved a number of technical, market, and economic factors in addition to those directly associated with the environment.

4. THE COST OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

To estimate the possible future cost of environmental compliance in the global phosphate fertilizer sector, a number of assumptions must be made. This is because there are no uniform legislative compliance criteria, nor are compliance technologies uniformly applicable to all facilities due to a large variety of
site-specific factors, including location of plant, climatic conditions, mine and plant site geology and hydrology, and population and political pressures coupled with land-use priorities. In some cases extraordinary measures are being taken to guard against any real or perceived adverse impact that the industry may have upon the environment; in other cases less stringent measures are practiced.

For the purpose of this discussion, a regulatory/cost scenario is described to give the reader an impression of the range of costs that could possibly accrue in the global phosphate industry if the industry was required to substantially conform to certain environmental protection initiatives currently being examined. In evaluating these costs, it is not practical to assume that the entire global phosphate industry will be equally affected with respect to the level of compliance technology used, estimated cost, and implementation timeframe. Therefore, the illustrated technology and estimated costs should be considered indicative only while still providing useful insight to those charged with formulating policy initiatives that are compatible with maintaining an ecologically sustainable phosphate fertilizer industry.

With the exception of the United States, the authors found little environmental compliance cost information available in the public sector relative to the other major basic phosphate producing countries (U.S.S.R., Morocco, China, Jordan, and Tunisia). Therefore, because the U.S. industry supplies about 35% of the world's basic phosphate materials and considerable information was available in the public sector, it was selected to illustrate the broad range of compliance criteria and costs being examined. Information described in this paper was initially derived from data presented in the July 1990 U.S.-EPA Report to Congress on Special Wastes From Mineral Processing [29]. This U.S.-EPA report, particularly Chapter 12, focuses on the environmental management of phosphogypsum and process water resulting from the production of wet-process phosphoric acid. The technical and cost data described in the U.S.-EPA report was further expanded with information derived from a number of technical and economic evaluations developed by industry and engineering bodies during the course of preparing public comments on the U.S.-EPA Report to Congress.

1. The term "environmental compliance," as used in this discussion, does not imply that the industry is currently out of compliance with existing regulations. Instead, the term is used to denote what incremental compliance costs may accrue if additional regulations are implemented in the future.
The reader is reminded that the environmental issues facing the global phosphate fertilizer sector are very dynamic and subject to constant review and change. To illustrate, on May 20, 1991, the Administrator of the U.S.-EPA issued a Final Regulatory Determination regarding the 20 special wastes (including phosphogypsum and process water) addressed in the above-mentioned July 1990 U.S.-EPA Report to Congress. The Administrator has concluded that "the proposed regulation of the 20 special wastes as set forth in the July 1990 U.S.-EPA Report to Congress on Special Wastes From Mineral Processing is inappropriate." The Administrator goes on to say that "the U.S.-EPA plans to redress 18 of the wastes possibly in a program being developed for mining wastes and to proceed with the development and promulgation of a program under the Toxic Substances Control Act that will address the management of the remaining two wastes (phosphogypsum and process water) from wet-process phosphoric acid production."

The regulatory criteria ultimately applicable to the U.S. industry and the related costs that may evolve as a result of this particular action are not known. Because the majority of the data presented in this discussion paper were developed prior to the Administrator's Final Regulatory Determination, the reader is urged to view the data in this context. However, a range of costs is indicated in those cases where data were available to reflect a possible less stringent compliance criteria.

With regard to the global situation; if the same environmental compliance criteria described in this paper are applied to other locations, it is unlikely that the average incremental cost of environmental compliance illustrated for the United States will change much. In fact, in locations such as the Middle East and North and West Africa where fresh water is scarce and the majority of the population depends on surface sources for water, the cost of possibly having to deal with land disposal of phosphogypsum and process water as an alternative to sea disposal may be higher than the costs indicated for the United States. Furthermore, it should be noted that the cost of complying with existing or proposed environmental standards is very site-specific, and it is beyond the scope of this discussion to attempt to more fully quantify these costs on a regional or country basis.

It is also important to note that, except for limited opportunities for industrial integration designed to utilize process wastes, technological innovations in the phosphate industry seem to offer little scope in the near term for significantly decreasing the quantity of basic process wastes encountered; e.g., phosphatic clay materials, phosphogypsum, and process water. Thus, the development and implementation of methods for dealing with these materials to minimize their impact upon the environment are expected to be expanded on a global basis.

4.1 ESTIMATED INCREMENTAL COST OF COMPLIANCE

The estimated cost for environmental compliance for the scenario described herein is expressed as the "incremental cost of compliance" over and above the current cost of production which, of course, includes existing, but often unspecified, compliance costs. The estimates assume a U.S. industry aggregate annual production of 14 million tonnes of $P_2O_5$ in the form of phosphate concentrate of which the equivalent of 10 million tonnes of $P_2O_5$ is converted into wet-process
phosphoric acid. The difference between phosphate concentrate $P_2O_5$ and phosphoric acid $P_2O_5$ (4 million tonnes) reflects the concentrate used for the domestic production of TSP, SSP, animal feed supplements, and that sold on the export market.

The compliance costs for the scenario are grouped into four major categories which include (1) phosphate mining and land reclamation, (2) phosphogypsum management, (3) process water management, and (4) finished product processing. A discussion of each of these cost categories follows.

### 4.1.1 Phosphate Mining and Land Reclamation

In many locations, particularly outside of the United States, reclamation of mined-out phosphate lands is not widely practiced. In the United States about 75,000 ha of land has been disturbed over the years by phosphate mining in Florida, Tennessee, North Carolina, and the western states, particularly Idaho and Wyoming [48].

In the United States reclamation of mined-out areas has been practiced since the mid-1970s. Since that time, land reclamation has generally occurred on an as-mined basis. However, much of the approximately 35,000 ha of land mined prior to the mid-1970s, mostly in Florida, has not been reclaimed. In Florida all lands mined since July 1, 1975, must be reclaimed.

As indicated earlier, the cost of reclamation varies widely depending upon the site and desired end use of the land (from about US $5,000/ha to US $25,000/ha). For the purpose of this discussion, an incremental compliance cost of US $4/tonne $P_2O_5$ is assumed as a global average taking into account existing mined-out sites in Africa, the Middle East, and elsewhere that may require reclamation. However, in the United States, a reclamation cost of about US $1/tonne $P_2O_5$ to US $2/tonne $P_2O_5$ seems more appropriate and this cost, for the most part, is already included in the cost of production and therefore should not be viewed as an additional cost.

Additionally, it is important to note that changes in land use priorities can have a significant effect on the cost of phosphate mining. For example, national and local regulations dealing with encroachment of mining operations on property boundaries, streams, and other land features can significantly decrease the minable reserve base and thus adversely affect the overall economics of the mining operation. Thus, the quantity of reserves indicated in Table 2 could be significantly less than stated. Because the additional costs that may be attributed to land use priorities are quite variable from one location to another, it is not possible to assign a meaningful value for the purposes of this discussion.

### 4.1.2 Phosphogypsum Management

#### 4.1.2.1 Active Stacks and Containment Sites

In the worst case, some phosphogypsum could be defined as a hazardous waste according to certain U.S. criteria. In such a case, the new phosphogypsum disposal
site for such a material would resemble a pond much like those used for the storage and disposal of phosphatic clay waste from the phosphate ore beneficiation process: the traditional elevated stack would not be allowed and, of course, a much greater land area would be required. The impoundment-type configuration would be designed to facilitate future closing and capping in accordance with a U.S. hazardous waste regulatory scenario. The disposal sites would have to be constructed to facilitate collection and total containment of contaminated process water and leachate. Such containment would require that the phosphogypsum disposal site meet specific design and management criteria, including the installation of two layers of an impermeable synthetic liner in addition to specific criteria for soil preparation and process water removal and containment.

In the July 1990 Report to Congress, the U.S.-EPA estimated that phosphogypsum produced by 11 of the 21 U.S. phosphoric-acid production facilities could be classified as a hazardous waste primarily because of its radionuclide and heavy metal content [29]. U.S.-EPA further estimated that an investment of about US $3.64 billion would be required for the construction of the 11 phosphogypsum disposal sites according to the above criteria [29].

Using the US $3.64 billion as a base and assuming that the 11 production facilities produce a total of 6 million tonnes of P₂O₅ annually in the form of wet-process phosphoric acid, the estimated incremental compliance cost per tonne P₂O₅ for capital charges alone would be about US $90 according to U.S.-EPA estimates, or about US $54 if the cost is prorated across the entire industry to reflect the average impact on the U.S. production cost.

For the same 11 affected facilities, U.S.-EPA estimates indicate a total annual cost of about US $685 million, including operating and capital charges [29]. Again, assuming an annual production of 6 million tonnes of P₂O₅, a cost of about US $114/tonne P₂O₅ is indicated (US $90/tonne capital plus US $24/tonne operating). If this cost (capital and operating) is prorated across the entire industry, the average cost per tonne of P₂O₅ would be about US $68. Subsequent to the U.S.-EPA July 1990 Report to Congress, the estimated cost for this hazardous waste regulatory scenario was adjusted downward in the order of 50% by the U.S.-EPA.

According to U.S.-EPA, some of the U.S. phosphoric-acid production facilities would fall under less costly phosphogypsum management practices according to an alternative "special waste" classification being evaluated by the U.S.-EPA. In these cases, conventional stacking would be allowed; also, the need for impermeable liners and other operational or post-operational practices would be determined on a plant-by-plant basis. The cost for managing the phosphogypsum according to the special waste criteria is estimated by U.S.-EPA at about US $28 to US $36/tonne P₂O₅, depending upon the site-specific management criteria [29]. As with the more rigorous criteria, capital charges account for the majority (about 80%) of this cost.

Using the U.S.-EPA cost estimates as described in the July 1990 Report to Congress and assuming that 60% of the U.S. phosphogypsum fell under the most costly U.S.-EPA hazardous waste criteria, and the remainder fell under the less rigorous special waste criteria, the industry average incremental compliance cost for phosphogypsum management would amount to about US $80/tonne P₂O₅ produced as wet-process phosphoric acid. Of course, this industry average value could be
considerably less depending upon the regulatory criteria that is ultimately adopted in view of the May 1991 ruling of the U.S.-EPA Administrator.

To help place these estimated on-site waste management costs into perspective, it is interesting to note (though academic) that tipping fees for hazardous waste landfills in the United States average US $192/tonne of disposed material not including transportation and state/local taxes [49,50]. For ordinary residential waste (garbage) or "special waste" that meets the residential waste criteria, the landfill cost averages about US $30/tonne of material not including transportation and taxes.

4.1.2.2 Closed Stacks

Compliance with certain phosphogypsum stack closure scenarios being analyzed would call for the closing of about 30 active stacks and 34 inactive stacks in the United States. The cost of closing these stacks is estimated at US $1.3 billion (average of about US $20 million per stack), not including the cost for long-term monitoring and maintenance [43]. Again, using 10 million tonnes of phosphoric acid P₂O₅ production/year as a base and a 20-year capital recovery period at an annual interest rate of 14%, this closure cost would amount to an incremental compliance cost for capital charges alone of about US $20/tonne phosphoric acid P₂O₅ produced by the entire U.S. industry over a 20-year period. Extrapolation of one recent actual closure cost experience and a reported current estimate by a major U.S. producer, however, indicate that the cost of stack closure is quite variable and may be significantly less than the average value of US $20 million per stack. Values in the range of about US $5.5 to US $18 million per stack are indicated.

4.1.3 Process Water Management

As previously discussed, the recirculated process water associated with the production of wet-process phosphoric acid represents a major potential environmental compliance cost if such water would require treatment with lime to adjust the pH to a minimum value of 3.5. Estimates made by the U.S.-EPA for the U.S. wet-process phosphoric acid industry indicate an incremental compliance cost for process water treatment and management in the order of US $22/tonne P₂O₅ produced [49].

Detailed estimates, however, made by an engineering firm on behalf of TFI indicate a much higher additional cost for compliance: about US $70/tonne P₂O₅, as shown in Table 8 [44]. The large difference between the U.S.-EPA and the TFI-commissioned engineering estimates is attributed to differences in interpretation of the significance of a number of operational cost factors; for example, because some process water is normally returned to the phosphate rock digester, and treatment of this water with lime would result in a loss of acidity in the digestion/reaction section that would have to be replaced with additional sulfuric acid; the level of dissolved calcium would also be higher, thus requiring more sulfuric acid; a lower plant capacity is also expected due to lower filtration rates; and lower capacity utilization due to increased chemical scaling (foul) of process equipment would be expected [44].
It is important to note that treatment of recirculated process water with lime to maintain the prescribed pH is not commercially practiced. Therefore, such a practice may incur other costs that have not been identified, for example, the extra cost of phosphogypsum disposal caused by the adverse impact that the treated water may have upon the phosphogypsum stacking and drainage (dewatering) characteristics as reported by Ardaman [45].

4.1.4 Finished Product Processing

Because this portion of the overall phosphate manufacturing complex is largely independent from the phosphoric acid process loop, no significant additional cost attributed to environmental compliance is likely to be incurred in these units.

4.1.5 Summary of Incremental Cost of Environmental Compliance

According to the foregoing discussion, the following estimated range of incremental costs for environmental compliance is indicated for the major components. The total cost, of course, will depend upon the number of components that are ultimately included in the regulatory criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Component</th>
<th>Estimated Incremental Compliance Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phosphate mining and land reclamationa</td>
<td>US $1-$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphogypsum management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active stacks</td>
<td>US $6-$80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed stacks</td>
<td>US $5-$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process water management</td>
<td>US $20-$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finished product processing</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Applicable to all phosphate fertilizers; all other costs directly applicable to the production of wet-process phosphoric acid only.

The large variability in estimated compliance costs for the indicated components is due to a number of site-specific technical and regulatory factors, variations in the assumed capital recovery period, and the lack of a broad base of actual cost experience relative to the scenario examined.

According to an engineering study performed for TFI, the U.S. industry average cost of production for merchant-grade wet-process phosphoric acid (52%-54% P₂O₅ and 1% or less suspended solids) in 1989 was US $308/tonne P₂O₅, f.o.b. plant site; the average cost of production for acid having less than merchant-grade specifications was about US $250/tonne P₂O₅ [44]. This lower value does not include certain
concentration and clarification costs nor does it include interest and sales and administration charges that are normally associated with the marketing of merchant-grade product.

From this it can be seen that in current dollars the indicated environmental compliance costs could increase the f.o.b. cost of merchant-grade phosphoric acid anywhere from about 11% (US $308 + US $34) to about 57% (US $308 + US $175), depending upon the level of compliance cost incurred. In the case of the lower grade acid normally used within the complex for the production of TSP and DAP, the cost per tonne of P₂O₅ would be increased in the order of about 14% (US $250 + US $34) to about 70% (US $250 + US $175).

Using the above estimated incremental environmental compliance cost range as a base, the following f.o.b. factory-gate cost range is indicated for the major finished phosphate products produced by the U.S. industry in existing facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Triple superphosphate (TSP)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>12.5-179</td>
<td>291-389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46% P.O.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monammonium phosphate (MAP)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>270-410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 N, 52% P.O.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diammonium phosphate (DAP)</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>270-410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 N, 46% P.O.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Based on P₂O₅ content derived from phosphate concentrate and wet-process phosphoric acid.
c. Adjusted to reflect credit for contained nitrogen valued at US $300/tonne N.

It is quite likely that the total cost per tonne of P₂O₅ would be slightly higher than indicated after accounting for other cost increases caused by higher levels of required working capital due to the increased value of intermediate and finished product inventories. There is also the issue of the cost of long-term liability for the waste disposal sites that may continue after the useful life of the plant has expired.
5. PHOSPHATE FERTILIZER PRODUCT ALTERNATIVES FOR MITIGATING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT AND THE COST OF COMPLIANCE

5.1. PHOSPHATE PRODUCT CHOICES

Aside from the minor phosphate fertilizer products, such as basic slag and bone meal, the most likely commercial phosphate product choices are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Approximate Current Contribution to Total P(_2)O(_5) Production (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct application phosphate rock</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single superphosphate (SSP) and enriched superphosphate</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially acidulated phosphate rock (PAPR)</td>
<td>(nil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple superphosphate (TSP)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonium phosphate (DAP or MAP)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odda- and mixed acid-type nitrophosphates</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other compound (NPK) products derived from various phosphate sources including thermophosphates</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relative agronomic, technical, and environmental merits of each of these basic phosphate sources have already been discussed. The practical commercial features of each product choice are briefly summarized.

5.1.1. Direct application phosphate rock

Only a small amount of the world’s commercial phosphate rock is sufficiently reactive to make it suitable for widespread agronomic use as a direct application product. Also, because the agronomic effectiveness of direct application phosphate rock depends heavily upon the occurrence of acid soils with low phosphorus levels, its use is often most appropriate in locations that, unfortunately, are generally located long distances from the major commercial sources of reactive rock that occur in North Carolina (U.S.A.) and Tunisia in North Africa. Therefore, except for special cases where the phosphate rock is sufficiently reactive and located close to the consumption area, direct application phosphate rock is not considered a major alternative source of fertilizer phosphorus.
5.1.2. Single superphosphate and enriched superphosphate

Although an excellent source of agronomic phosphorus, sulphur, calcium, and a number of trace elements, (SSP) is generally too costly on a delivered P.O. basis when compared with TSP or DAP. If, however, the sulphur value of SSP could be reflected in its nutrient content and selling price, then it would be quite competitive with the more concentrated sources of P.O., such as TSP or DAP if transport costs are not excessive. Enrichment of SSP with phosphoric acid and ammonia to a grade such as 5-25-0 may offer a practical means for increasing the total nutrient content and agronomic performance of the basic SSP product where a low dose of nitrogen may be needed. Also, the addition of ammonia to SSP improves its physical properties and compatibility with urea, an important feature if it is used for blending NPK grades. Nevertheless, the widespread use of SSP-type products is expected to continue to be limited by the economies of transport and distribution.

5.1.3. Partially acidulated phosphate rock

The partially acidulated phosphate rock (PAPR) family of products are characterized as agronomically intermediate between direct application phosphate rock and its more soluble counterparts, SSP and TSP. As with direct application phosphate rock, the agronomic effectiveness of PAPR depends upon the properties of the phosphate rock on one hand and the characteristics of the soil and crop on the other. Because of these constraints, it is unlikely that PAPR can be viewed as an alternative to the more soluble phosphate products if, in fact, such solubility is agronomically required.

5.1.4. Triple superphosphate

Triple superphosphate (TSP) offers many of the advantages of DAP while depending less on wet-process phosphoric acid; thus it is a better choice from an environmental viewpoint provided the fluorine evolved from the process is properly dealt with. Also, it is important to note that a TSP unit often complements a merchant-grade wet-process phosphoric acid/DAP complex because the sludge-type phosphoric acid produced during the clarification of merchant-grade phosphoric acid is often suitable for the production of TSP.

5.1.5. Ammonium phosphate (DAP or MAP)

These products currently account for the largest single share of world phosphate fertilizer production, about 39% of the total P.O. Although currently the most economic phosphate fertilizer to produce and transport, especially if one considers the nitrogen content, the ammonium phosphate products do cause the most severe potential impact upon the environment at the production site because of their total dependence on wet-process phosphoric acid as the source of P.O. However, because of the high nutrient content, good physical properties, and good agronomic performance under a wide variety of conditions, it will be difficult to replace, on a large scale, ammonium phosphates with other phosphate products.
5.1.6. **Odda-type nitrophosphates**

This phosphate production technology has the least impact on the environment because phosphogypsum and its associated process water are not produced. The main disadvantage of this technology is that 2 tonnes of nitrogen in the nitrate form is produced for each tonne of P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>. If, for example, 50% of world's current P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> consumption was supplied with Odda-type nitrophosphate products, about 38 million tonnes of nitrogen would be produced. The international marketing of such a large amount of nitrate-nitrogen, that is agronomically inappropriate for flooded rice, would be difficult, considering that total world consumption of nitrogen amounts to about 79 million tonnes, of which urea currently accounts for nearly 40%.

Because of the nitrogen constraint, it appears that the Odda-type nitrophosphate plants are most appropriate to supply local and regional markets where the 2:1 N:P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> nutrient ratio and the nitrate form of nitrogen are preferred. The plants in Europe, India, Pakistan, and China, for example, meet these criteria. Also, the recently announced decision by a major European phosphate fertilizer producer to close its phosphoric acid plant at Antwerp, Belgium, and expand its Odda nitrophosphate-type facility illustrates the advantage offered by the Odda process when the costs associated with the disposal of phosphogypsum and contaminated process water become unacceptable [51].

5.1.7. **Mixed acid-type nitrophosphates (phosphonitric products)**

This technology, also developed in Europe, is very flexible and well suited for local or regional locations where a number of N:P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> nutrient ratios are required. Also, because the technology is less capital intensive and less complex than the more fully integrated Odda-type process, it is well suited for developing countries that often depend heavily upon imported raw materials, including ammonia and phosphoric acid. Today, however, some of these import-dependent countries are converting their production units to blending of imported granular materials. This approach often proves to be more cost effective especially if the level of government production subsidies is decreased or eliminated.

5.1.8. **Compound NPK products**

Compound NPK products, including nitrophosphate- and thermophosphate-type products but not including DAP and MAP, currently account for about 35% of world P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> consumption (figure III). For the most part, with the exception of the Odda-type nitrophosphate products and the thermophosphates, these compound products derive their P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> from SSP, TSP, or directly from wet-process phosphoric acid. Worldwide, about 275 plants are currently producing compound NPK products, not including the major producers of DAP and MAP [47]. The combined production of these 275 compound NPK production units is estimated at about 10-12 million tonnes of P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>. Growth in compound NPK production capacity has stagnated, and blending is expected to replace some of the capacity lost through plant closures/industry rationalization.
5.2. COMPARATIVE COST OF PHOSPHATE PRODUCTS INCLUDING ESTIMATED INCREMENTAL COST OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

According to the foregoing discussion and estimates, it is seen that the incremental cost of environmental compliance is roughly proportional to the amount of P₂O₅ in the fertilizer product that is derived from wet-process phosphoric acid. In addition to the costs directly related to wet-process phosphoric acid, an average incremental cost equivalent to US $4/tonne P₂O₅ is also estimated for the reclaiming of existing and future mine sites to make these sites conform to existing or proposed standards.

The most common phosphate fertilizer product choices are listed according to their increasing dependence upon wet-process phosphoric acid and, therefore, increasing incremental cost for environmental compliance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>PC Derived from Wet-Process Phosphoric Acid</th>
<th>Incremental Cost of Environmental Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct application phosphate rock, 10% PC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single superphosphate, SSP 21% PC, 10% S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially acidulated phosphate rock (PAPR—sulphuric acid based), 22% PC, 5% S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrophosphate (wet process), 26% N, 11% PC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrophosphate (mixed acid process), 20% N, 20% PC</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.8 - 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enriched superphosphate, 10% PC, 5% S</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.7 - 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially acidulated phosphate rock (PAPR—phosphoric acid based), 42% PC</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7.6 - 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple superphosphate (TSP), 46% PO₅</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12 - 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diammonium phosphate (DAP), 18% N, 46% PO₅</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16 - 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monammonium phosphate (MAP), 11% N, 52% PO₅</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18 - 91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Indicated P₂O₅ content of direct application phosphate rock and the PAPR products is total; P₂O₅ in other products is assumed to be available according to normal commercial test methods.

b) Quantity of wet-process phosphoric acid may vary slightly depending upon properties of phosphate rock and wet-process phosphoric acid.

5.2.1. Estimated impact of product choices on the delivered cost of phosphate fertilizer

To arrive at an estimate of the impact that environmental compliance costs at the production site would have on the farm-level cost of phosphate fertilizer, the current logistics of the world phosphate industry were examined on a regional basis as described in section 4.

The data in section 4 were used to determine the delivered cost of P₂O₅ to the farm level on a regional basis for several products according to two scenarios as
shown in table 10 [19]. The Case 1 scenario (base case) reflects the estimated farm-level cost of P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5}, assuming production in a new facility according to current commercial standards. The Case 2 scenario assumes the Case 1 production costs plus an additional (incremental) cost for environmental compliance as described in 5.2.

The estimated and incremental environmental compliance costs for phosphogypsum disposal described for the United States were adjusted downward by US $20/tonne P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} for non-U.S. phosphoric acid producers. This was done to correct for the cost of closing inactive phosphogypsum stacks which is more likely to be the case in the United States than elsewhere.

The cost of international and domestic transport and marketing was also estimated (table 11). Also, because some phosphate products contain nitrogen and/or sulphur, these nutrients were credited on a farm-level cost basis of US $520/tonne for nitrogen and US $135/tonne for sulphur to arrive at a net delivered cost for P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} at the farm level. For compound NPK products, all calculations were made on a net P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} basis to avoid the complexity of determining credits for other nutrients commonly contained in NPKs.

As shown in table 10, the estimated maximum incremental cost of environmental compliance (world weighted-average basis) at the farm level varies from US $94/tonne P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} (direct application phosphate rock and SSP) to US $165/tonne P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} (DAP). However, the net cost of P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5}, delivered at the farm level, including the environmental compliance cost, varies from US $376/tonne P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} for direct application phosphate rock to US $720/tonne P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} for DAP and US $757/tonne P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} for TSP. Again, the reader is reminded that these costs not only reflect the estimated cost of environmental compliance but also the higher cost of production in new facilities, which is caused by higher capital charges than currently experienced by the established industry. These data are summarized in table 12 along with the estimated current delivered cost of P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5}, derived from DAP and TSP, based on 1990 average international f.o.b. prices (shown for comparison).

5.2.1.1. Relating delivered cost of phosphate fertilizer to agronomic (solubility) needs

The above analysis quite clearly shows that DAP, even with its relatively high estimated cost for environmental compliance, ranks very favorably among the phosphate product choices from the point of view of delivered cost. Although SSP and some NPKs may effectively deliver P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} to the farm level at a net cost slightly below that of DAP (in the order of 5%-10%), it would not be practical or cost effective in many cases to assume that the total P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} requirements could be effectively supplied in the form of SSP or NPKs that usually contain only about 15%-20% P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5}.

It is interesting to note that TSP, with an estimated environmental compliance cost of about 70% that of DAP, still remains less attractive on a delivered P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} basis than DAP. This, of course, is due to the extra value placed on DAP (US $94/tonne DAP) for its nitrogen content.

Direct application phosphate rock is, of course, the least-cost form of P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5}. Its delivered cost (P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} basis) at the farm level is about 57% that of P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} derived
from DAP, according to the assumptions used for this evaluation. As already noted, the widespread use of direct application phosphate rock as a source of P₂O₅ is severely limited for agronomic reasons as well as by the lack of general availability of suitably reactive material.

The overall economics (production and use) of PAPR, produced either from sulphuric acid or phosphoric acid, fall between those of direct application phosphate rock and conventional low-P₂O₅ products such as SSP and many NPKs. Therefore, it is unlikely that such products offer a significant alternative to DAP and TSP on a global basis. In certain very specific locations, however, the PAPR family of products may be appropriate provided the cost of production and physical distribution can be minimized.

The agronomic suitability of phosphate fertilizer products containing lower levels of water-soluble P₂O₅, for example, 40%-60%, as discussed in Section 2 may offer significant economic advantages other than those related directly to mitigating the cost of environmental compliance, including the following:

1. The use of lower grade phosphate rock to produce conventional products, such as DAP, TSP, and SSP, containing lower levels of water-soluble P₂O₅, would extend the useful life of existing mines and production facilities.
2. Less soluble products would help to expand the regional and global phosphate resource base to include phosphate ores containing higher levels of impurities.
3. Less soluble products would tend to decrease the environmental impact at the production site because less intensive beneficiation would be required.
4. The use of less soluble products would increase the possibility of improving agronomic performance in those locations where the soil characteristics and climatic conditions permit.

5.2.2. Impact of increased fertilizer cost

From the previous discussion, it can be concluded that any significant change in the overall phosphate fertilizer product mix is unlikely even if the indicated incremental costs for environmental compliance for the phosphoric acid-based products were uniformly applied on a global basis. However, the increased costs would most certainly have an adverse effect on demand and consumption patterns. The expected regional impact of the estimated incremental environmental compliance costs at the farm-gate is summarized in table 10. In North America the cost increase is highest in both absolute and percent terms due to the high proportion of phosphoric acid-based products used. China, Oceania, and Eastern Europe, all regions with high proportions of SSP use in the current product mix, would be least affected. However, the absolute farm-gate cost for P₂O₅ in developing countries, except China, would increase by $80 to $130/tonne to over $700/tonne P₂O₅, and up to about $1,000/tonne P₂O₅ in sub-Saharan Africa.

There is no doubt that under this scenario the demand for phosphate fertilizer would decrease in most regions and the impact would be particularly severe in the developing countries. In Western Europe the combination of an estimated 19% incremental cost increase with high average application rates could increase average phosphate fertilizer costs by more than $7/ha, twice the increase of any
other region. However, the impact on the benefit/cost ratio attributed to phosphate fertilizer use would be much less for European farmers than for farmers in developing countries where fertilizer costs represent a much higher proportion of the total crop production costs. The likely impact in sub-Saharan Africa with its already very low use of phosphate fertilizer would be catastrophic with regard to opportunities for increased food production.

5.3. BARRIERS TO CHANGE AND INITIATIVES REQUIRED TO BRING ABOUT CHANGE

As indicated in the foregoing discussion, the phosphate fertilizer industry will face a significant increase in the cost of producing certain phosphate fertilizers if compliance with some of the proposed environmental initiatives is widely mandated. The phosphate fertilizer products that depend heaviest upon wet-process phosphoric acid as the source of $\text{P}_2\text{O}_5$ will be affected the most as shown above and in Table 10. A number of barriers will need to be overcome to bring about change and help mitigate the expected impact that certain environmental initiatives may have upon the phosphate fertilizer production industry, the farmer, and society in general. The following observations address the most significant barriers.

5.3.1. Identifying and overcoming the barriers to change

An examination of the alternatives that may be available for mitigating the impact of an increased level of environmental compliance in the phosphate fertilizer production and use sectors indicates the following barriers (constraints) to achieving widespread implementation:

- Lack of Definition of Acceptable Environmental Standards
- Lack of Global Environmental Compliance Standards
- Cost Required to Implement Available Technology
- Major Investments Required to Change Product Mix
- Limited Availability of Foreign Exchange
- Marginal Competitive Status Within the Phosphate Fertilizer Industry
- Disturbance of Commercial Equilibrium
- Lack of Significant Farm-Level Cost Differences
- Restrictive Fertilizer Product Legislation
- Difficulty in Changing Farmers' Practices

A discussion of these constraints follows.

5.3.1.1. Lack of definition of acceptable environmental standards

There is currently no universal definition or criteria for objectively judging the "environmental acceptability" of a fertilizer production or use practice. The criteria for an "acceptable standard" may vary widely depending upon climatic, geological, and other technical and nontechnical factors including population density and public pressures. The lack of credible scientific evidence coupled with public pressure can result in restrictive and costly environmental regulations that lack a sound technical/economic basis.

Currently, in many countries, industry standards are being debated and
negotiated at the national and local level between environmental regulatory agencies, public action groups, and fertilizer industry representatives. Although it is unlikely that a single set of standards for universal application in the industry can, or should, be established, it seems desirable for the global industry to agree to scientifically established minimum environmental standards appropriate to given locations. It is therefore appropriate that international and national industry agencies, together with national environmental regulatory agencies, convene to establish and agree upon minimal standards for environmental compliance in the phosphate industry. Additional compliance standards for national industries, where deemed necessary or desirable, could be resolved on a national or local level.

5.3.1.2. Lack of global environmental compliance standards

An increase in the farm-level cost of P₂O₅ can be influenced directly or indirectly by environmentally related cost factors. Therefore, unless environmental compliance is viewed as a global responsibility, there can be a great disparity in production costs and consequently an unhealthy competitive environment caused by unilateral environmental legislation and enforcement. The net result may be supply/demand-driven farm-level cost increases and a declining farm-level benefit/cost ratio attributed to fertilizer use without mitigating the environmental impact of the nonregulated production units.

Without a global initiative for environmental compliance, or at least an environmental policy agreed upon by the leading producers of phosphate fertilizers, it is doubtful whether the cost of an increased level of environmental compliance could be sustained.

5.3.1.3. Cost required to implement available technology

The lack of technology is perhaps the least significant barrier to change. Today's modern phosphate fertilizer industry has evolved over a period of nearly 150 years. During this time, technological progress together with strong local and international competition for market share has resulted in a very efficient industry, especially with regard to optimizing production costs, including the recovery of effluents and their conversion into marketable byproducts.

On the basis of the industry's demonstrated performance, it is clear that, given the appropriate economic incentives, the industry, in general, is not significantly constrained by the lack of knowledge and available technology. The widespread implementation of the available technology required to mitigate certain environmental concerns is, however, severely constrained by cost-related market factors.

If, for instance, the proposed environmental standards described in this paper were adopted globally, the annual total industry cost for compliance might be in the order of $4 billion. This raises questions concerning the social cost/benefit ratio of environmental protection. Because of the industry structure, environmental benefits will accrue to a limited number of countries where strict compliance is observed, but the costs will be incurred globally. A growing body
of opinion, however recognizes that environmental stewardship should be approached on a global basis and therefore its costs should be shared globally.

Lack of profitability in the private sector, and inertia in the public sector in many countries, will preclude or delay enforcement of any agreed-upon minimum standards. It is therefore appropriate that acceptance of minimum industry standards should be coupled with international agreement on an implementation timetable for compliance. With the concentration of production in only a few countries and the preponderance of public-sector ownership of the production resources, a significant level of international cooperation may be an achievable goal.

3.1.4. Major investments required to change product mix

While it is clear from the foregoing discussion that the farm-level cost of P.O. derived from direct application phosphate rock, SSP, and some NPKs would be least affected by increased environmental compliance costs at the production site, the industry would have to undergo a major restructuring to meet the world's P.O. demand with such products. Not only would such a restructuring to change the product mix require large investments in new and modified production and distribution facilities, but, as already mentioned, the increased cost of distribution would offset most of the environmentally related production cost advantages as shown in Table 10.

In some countries, the current viability of existing or proposed SSP, NPK, and direct application phosphate rock production units is questionable because the more concentrated DAP and TSP products offer economic advantages even though they are imported. Given adoption of increased environmental compliance costs for the more concentrated phosphoric acid-based products, the viability of production units that do not depend upon phosphoric acid will be improved. Under certain conditions, such plants will be more cost effective in supplying local markets when compared with DAP or TSP. This would provide increased opportunities for exploiting indigenous phosphate resources for serving selected local markets.

3.1.5. Limited availability of foreign exchange

Compliance with many of the proposed environmental standards will require large investments at the production facilities and thus increase the cost of phosphate fertilizer at all levels. In many cases, the foreign exchange required to finance the necessary investments and/or fertilizer raw material and finished product imports is expected to be lacking. This constraint will be especially critical in those resource-poor countries that depend heavily upon imported raw materials and finished phosphate fertilizers.

3.1.6. Marginal competitive status within the phosphate fertilizer industry

The generally depressed state of the phosphate fertilizer industry, with its overcapacity, high capital investment, low returns, and intense competition between the major phosphate-surplus countries, is not conducive to voluntary increases in
investments and production costs related to environmental compliance. This is not to say that the industry is ignoring its social responsibilities, but it acknowledges that commercial realities dictate that least-cost approaches be taken, and thus the value of many of the proposed environmental initiatives continue to be questioned.

Multilateral enforcement of agreed-upon compliance standards would tend to equalize the increased cost of production among producers. These increased costs would be reflected in increased product prices. This, in turn, would provide the economic incentives required for compliance.

5.3.1.7. Disturbance of commercial equilibrium

As described in section 4, the phosphate fertilizer industry is highly integrated at all levels of raw- and intermediate-material supply, production, and marketing. It is especially important to also recognize the role played by fertilizer raw materials, intermediates, and products as a means for payment in international trade for food and other non-fertilizer commodities.

Although very dynamic in the short term, the commercial sector constantly seeks to achieve some sort of "equilibrium" based on local and international supply/demand-driven economic forces.

The difficulty of introducing a major change in the global phosphate fertilizer product mix and its associated raw- and intermediate-material requirements constitutes a major constraint to change. Change is also perhaps more difficult to obtain in the phosphate sector than in the nitrogen and potassium (potash) sectors because phosphate products have more product distinction relative to solubility and companion nutrient content including nitrogen, potassium, sulphur, and calcium. The optimum phosphate product equilibrium is also closely tied to the cost and availability of ammonia, sulphur, and energy.

The reliance of the majority of the developing countries on imported phosphate raw materials and/or finished products to sustain domestic food production requires an uninterrupted supply of phosphate materials on the international market. Only under conditions where all major international suppliers meet similar environmental (competitive) standards can the current levels of supply be maintained or increased.

5.3.1.8. Lack of significant farm-Level cost differences

Even though the indicated incremental cost of environmental compliance is the highest for DAP and TSP, the farm-level delivered cost of P₂O₅ derived from these products is still very competitive with SSP and compound NPKs, as shown in tables 10 and 12. The favourable factory-gate cost advantage of those products less dependent on wet-process phosphoric acid, for example, some NPKs and, of course, SSP, which is totally independent of phosphoric acid, is significantly eroded as the less concentrated products are moved through the distribution system.
The farm-level cost differential between low- and high-analysis phosphate fertilizers will decline with the application of the incremental cost of environmental compliance on the high-analysis phosphoric acid-based products. This will increase the break-even distribution distance from any given source of supply for the lower analysis products. Many developing countries still adhere to pan-territorial (uniform) delivered pricing policies for fertilizers regardless of distance from supply. This distorts the real farm-gate cost and inhibits the marketing of low-analysis products in markets located close to the source of supply. The natural market areas for low-analysis products such as SSP and some NPKs will be increased if pricing policies reflect the true cost of distribution.

5.3.1.9. Restrictive fertilizer product legislation

National and local legislation relative to fertilizer product specifications, including product type, nutrient sources, solubility, and particle-size characteristics, constitutes a major constraint to changing the current fertilizer product mix in many locations. Legislation designed to encourage or protect local or regional production and marketing initiatives can result in product mixes that may actually be detrimental to meeting the agronomic needs of the crop in addition to having an adverse impact on the environment at the level of production and use.

To encourage, where economically appropriate, changes in product mix towards less soluble phosphate forms (less dependency upon phosphoric acid), there is a need for fertilizer legislation in many countries to be amended so that all agronomically suitable sources of phosphate can be used by farmers without penalty. Many developing countries providing production or end-user subsidies for phosphate fertilizers restrict eligibility for such subsidies by specifying the product type, nutrient source, and water-soluble \( P_2O_5 \) content. Unless such restrictions are removed, the use of less water-soluble products, even though they may be agronomically effective and less costly, will be constrained.

5.3.1.10. Difficulty in changing farmers' practices

In addition to the cost-related constraints affecting manufacturing and distribution, farm-level fertilizer use practices must also be considered. In most developing countries, effective farm-level extension programmes are woefully lacking. Thus, when considering a change from one fertilizer product type or use practice to another, it is most important to evaluate the results of such change in the context of farm-level benefit/cost criteria under actual farming conditions. Because reliable benefit/cost data are often lacking, it is difficult to develop a convincing case for using any type of fertilizer let alone changing or tailoring the product type to reflect a more environmentally optimum mix of products.

An environmentally sustainable phosphate industry can only be achieved at an additional cost. This cost will undoubtedly be initially borne by the farmer, but it will ultimately be transferred to the consumer of agricultural products if fertilizer use and crop production are to be maintained or increased. In developed economies this does not pose a major problem; however, in the developing countries, characterized by resource-poor farmers and large and poor urban populations, considerable problems arise. In those developing countries where farm prices have
been kept below international parity prices. there is a need to progressively increase farm prices to parity in order to provide sufficient benefit/cost ratio incentives for farmers to ensure and promote the use of the more costly, but environmentally sustainable fertilizers. Unless developing countries with low-cost food policies increase crop prices to maintain farmer benefits, food crop production will decline, adding to the problem of food security.

Partial resolution for the problem of increased phosphate fertilizer costs at the farm level lies in improving phosphate fertilizer use efficiency. It is therefore essential that a high priority be given to programs that will assist developing countries in improving use efficiency of phosphate fertilizers through improved application methods and the use of integrated nutrient management systems.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The foregoing analysis of the global phosphate fertilizer sector suggests the following conclusions with respect to coping with environmental pressures on the one hand and maintaining agricultural productivity on the other.

- Phosphate fertilizer is essential to crop production. The removal of phosphate from the soil in the form of harvested crops, which are marketed elsewhere, minimizes the level of phosphate fertilization that can be accomplished by recycling crop residues and animal manure. Thus, the supply of phosphate fertilizers in an environmentally sustainable manner must be assured.

- The current phosphate fertilizer product mix, in which about 70% of the total P₀₈ is derived from wet-process phosphoric acid, is usually the most cost effective at the farm level. This cost effectiveness is maintained even if the cost of phosphoric acid is increased by about 50% to cover the estimated incremental cost of environmental compliance.

- Products that are less dependent upon wet-process phosphoric acid (NPKs and SSP, for example) have a more favourable cost per unit of P₀₈ at the factory gate. However, because of their lower nutrient concentration and, in some cases, their unfavourable companion nutrient content (nitrate-nitrogen, for example), they become less competitive with the ammonium phosphate and TSP products in the overall marketing system.

- In some cases, products that require little or no phosphoric acid, for example, direct application phosphate rock, PAPR, and SSP, have an advantage. When this occurs and the agronomic needs are met, production, or even importation, of such products for local consumption should be encouraged.

- Although, from an agronomic point of view, the current family of highly water-soluble phosphate fertilizers is not required for most crop production systems, these very soluble and concentrated products continue to provide the most cost effective source of P₀₈ at the farm level even with the added cost that may be required for more rigorous environmental compliance.
The global phosphate fertilizer production industry is faced with an increasing level of environmental concerns that are gradually being formulated into legislation at the local and national levels. At present, however, there is no clear definition of what constitutes "environmental acceptability" or "environmental sustainability" in the phosphate fertilizer production sector. There is an urgent need for a more clear definition of what constitutes environmental sustainability in the production sector.

Wet-process phosphoric acid currently accounts for about 70% of world P₂O₅ consumption in the form of DAP/MAP, TSP, and NPKs. The cost-effective production of wet-process phosphoric acid by certain producers will be threatened if the cost of treatment and disposal of process wastes, primarily phosphogypsum and contaminated process water, is unilaterally escalated as a result of certain proposed environmental-compliance legislation. This suggests the need for some form of scientifically based multilateral compliance legislation.

It is quite apparent that the phosphate fertilizer producers will face increased costs as they strive to comply with a number of new environmental legislative initiatives that are likely to be implemented quite soon on a widespread basis. These increased costs of production will result in a significant increase in the farm-level cost of fertilizer. While the impact of increased costs can be more easily borne in the developed countries, it could be devastating in many of the resource-poor countries of the world where fertilizer use is already small and the need for increased local food production is paramount. Thus, methods need to be formulated to help finance the increased costs attributed to achieving a higher level of environmental sustainability.
TABLE 1. PHOSPHATE FERTILIZER AND TOTAL FERTILIZER CONSUMPTION PER HECTARE OF ARABLE LAND (1989)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Phosphate Fertilizer Consumption Total (million t P2O5)</th>
<th>Total Fertilizer Consumption (kg N+P2O5+K2O/ha arable land)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excluding China)</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Asia</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include arable land in permanent crops.

b. Refer to Appendix for regional classification of countries.

Source: FAO [2.3].
### TABLE 2. MAJOR PRODUCERS OF PHOSPHATE CONCENTRATE AND WORLD PHOSPHATE RESERVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Mine Production, 1989* (million t)</th>
<th>Reserves, b (million t)</th>
<th>Reserve Base, b (million t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>1.230</td>
<td>4.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>1.330</td>
<td>1.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco and Western Sahara</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>5.900</td>
<td>21.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>2,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>2,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>World Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>163.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,480</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.790</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. Marketable phosphate concentrate.
- c. Totals may not add due to rounding.

**Source:** U.S. Bureau of Mines [14].

### TABLE 3. FINISHED PHOSPHATE FERTILIZER PRODUCTION (1988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin (Region/Country)*</th>
<th>Production (thousand tonnes P2O5)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>4,354</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>2,824</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>9,235</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>10,005</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>1,954</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Asia</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>2,453</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia</td>
<td>2,156</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>3,607</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41,490</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. Refer to Appendix for regional classification of countries.

**Source:** Derived from published statistical data and IFDC data file.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Austria (mg/m³)</th>
<th>Belgium (mg/m³)</th>
<th>Germany (FR)</th>
<th>Greece (mg/m³)</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Indonesia</th>
<th>Iran (mg/L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Particulate (dust)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50–75</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>(Regulations being formulated and initially published in 1991)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH₃</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50–300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.5–2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.0–5.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCl</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>(300–600)</td>
<td>1 kg/t P₂O₅⁻¹</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(10 mg/L)‎</td>
<td>For some liquid effluents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH₄⁺–H⁻</td>
<td>(150)</td>
<td>2 kg/t H⁻</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(50 mg/L)</td>
<td>(0.5–2.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₃⁻–H⁻</td>
<td>(225)</td>
<td>2 kg/t H⁻</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10–20 mg/L)</td>
<td>(1.0–5.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₂⁻</td>
<td></td>
<td>450 mg/m³ (nitric acid plants)</td>
<td>5 kg/t HNO₃⁻¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>(2–0.3)</td>
<td>100 mg/t P₂O₅⁻¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01–1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>(50–300)</td>
<td>0.5 kg/t P₂O₅⁻¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5 mg/L)</td>
<td>(1.0 mg/L)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₂</td>
<td>10 kg/t H₂SO₄⁻¹</td>
<td>4 kg/t H₂SO₄⁻¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(300 mg/L)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₃</td>
<td>0.8 kg/t H₂SO₄⁻¹</td>
<td>50 mg/m³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfuric acid mist</td>
<td>(300–450)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical oxygen demand</td>
<td>(200–600)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total suspended solids</td>
<td>(5–9.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8.5–8.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8.5–8.5/5–8 (well)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
### TABLE 4.
**SAMPLING OF EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS AFFECTING THE PHOSPHATE FERTILIZER INDUSTRY--INDICATIVE VALUES FOR SELECTED COUNTRIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Jordan</th>
<th>Saudi Arabia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Zimbabwe</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Particulate (dust)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200 mg/m³</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Refer to Table 6 for U.S. regulations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH₃ (g)</td>
<td>15 mg/L</td>
<td>(2.5 mg/L)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(15 mg/L)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(15 mg/L)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5 mg/L)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>6 mg/L</td>
<td>(3 mg/L)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5 mg/L)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₃⁻⁻Cd</td>
<td>20 mg/L</td>
<td>(50 mg/L)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(50 mg/L)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₂⁻⁻Cd</td>
<td></td>
<td>(800 mg/m³)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.5 mg/L)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01 mg/L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cd</td>
<td>0.01 mg/L</td>
<td>(35 mg/L)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.5 mg/L)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01 mg/L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (v/v)</td>
<td>10 mg/L</td>
<td>(0.3 mg/L)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(35 mg/L)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₂</td>
<td>(30 mg/L)</td>
<td>(25 mg/L)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4 kg/t H₂SO₄)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical oxygen demand</td>
<td>(100 mg/L)</td>
<td>(200 mg/L)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(200 mg/L)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total suspended solids</td>
<td>(30 mg/L)</td>
<td>(100 mg/L)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(35 mg/L)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>6.5-9</td>
<td>(6-9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6.5-9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature (°C above ambient)</td>
<td>(30°C)</td>
<td>(35°C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

- **a.** Derived from IFA Environment, Legislation Survey (1989) and other reported data. Values in parenthesis ( ) indicate liquid effluents, all others indicate gaseous effluents. Values not shown do not necessarily indicate lack of legislated limit. Gaseous values assumed to be expressed in normal cubic meters (m³).
- **b.** Values for Austria pertain to new installations.
- **c.** For Iran, lower values refer to wastewater discharged into wells and higher values refer to surface discharge.
- **d.** Allowable limit calculated as N existing in indicated form.
- **e.** NO₂ calculated and indicated as concentration of NO₂⁻⁻.
- **f.** Higher value pertains to brackish water applications.
- **g.** Lower value pertains to brackish water applications.
- **h.** NH₃ regulated at discretion of local authorities.
- **i.** Proposed limit using best available technology.
- **j.** Based on 100% H₂SO₄ or 100% HNO₃.
- **k.** Concentration indicated as NH₃ and NO₂⁻⁻.
- **l.** Concentration indicated as SO₂⁻⁻.
- **m.** Jordan currently has no regulations pertaining to emissions to atmosphere.
- **n.** Fluorine value may be as low as 1.5 mg/L depending upon recipient stream of outfall.
- **o.** Higher value (25 mg/L) is applicable to phosphate fertilizer production units.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance</th>
<th>Wet-Process Phosphoric Acid</th>
<th>Superphosphoric Acid</th>
<th>Diammonium Phosphate</th>
<th>Triple Superphosphate</th>
<th>Granular Triple Superphosphate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sulfuric Acid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitric Acid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ammonia (NH₃)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia (expressed as N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acid mist</td>
<td>0.075 kg/t H₂SO₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluorides (expressed as F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 g/t P₂O₅</td>
<td>5 g/t P₂O₅</td>
<td>30 g/t P₂O₅</td>
<td>100 g/t P₂O₅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen oxides (expressed as NO₂)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 kg/t HNO₃</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate (expressed as N)</td>
<td></td>
<td>23-170 g/t HNO₃</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur dioxide (SO₂)</td>
<td>2 kg/t H₂SO₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stack opacity</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total suspended solids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**pH**

* (Continued)
# TABLE 5.
SELECTED FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS PERTAINING TO THE FERTILIZER SECTOR IN THE UNITED STATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance</th>
<th>Source of Effluent--Production Unit/Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source of Effluent--Production Unit/Operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia (NH₃)</td>
<td>Phosphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia (expressed as N)</td>
<td>Rock Calciner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acid mist</td>
<td>Grinder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluorides (expressed as F)</td>
<td>Phosphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen oxides (expressed as NO₂)</td>
<td>Rock Dryer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate (expressed as N)</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate (dust)</td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance</th>
<th>Source of Effluent--Production Unit/Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phosphorus (expressed as P)</td>
<td>120 g/t rock §</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur dioxide (SO₂)</td>
<td>55 g/t rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stack opacity</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total suspended solids</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>50-150 mg/L §</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Source:

---

### Notes:

- **a.** Indicated limits for phosphate operations refer to phosphate rock or P₂O₅ equivalent fed to process. Except for wastewater, all values refer to discharges to the atmosphere. Additional state and local regulations may also apply.
- **b.** Based on acid produced; 100% H₂SO₄ or HNO₃. Atmospheric discharge values refer to a maximum 2-h average. Lower value is average of daily values for 30 consecutive days; higher value is maximum for any one day. Total suspended solids is waived if water is treated to remove phosphorus and fluorine.
- **c.** Standard for new facility based on gaseous ammonia raw material.
- **d.** Based on tonnes P₂O₅ equivalent in storage facility.
- **e.** Refers to calcination of unbenefficiated rock or blends of beneficiated and unbenefficiated rock. Lower value (55 g/t) pertains to calcination of beneficiated rock.

---

### Source:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Radioactive Element</th>
<th>U-238 (pCi/g)</th>
<th>Ra-226 (pCi/g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phosphate concentrate&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedimentary origin</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igneous origin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphogypsum&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Florida</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background soil</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Source: Economic Commission for Europe and FADINAP/ESCAP [24].

<sup>b</sup> Source: Berish, Proceedings of the Third International Symposium on Phosphogypsum [25].
### TABLE 7. SUMMARY OF POTENTIALLY HAZARDOUS ELEMENTS IN SELECTED PHOSPHATE CONCENTRATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phosphate Concentrate</th>
<th>As (ppm)</th>
<th>Cd (ppm)</th>
<th>Cr (ppm)</th>
<th>Hg (ppb)</th>
<th>Pb (ppm)</th>
<th>Se (ppm)</th>
<th>V (ppm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sedimentary Origin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel (Arad)</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>12-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan (El Hassa)</td>
<td>5-12</td>
<td>3-12</td>
<td>50-127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco (Khouribga)</td>
<td>10-25</td>
<td>3-27</td>
<td>188-212</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco (Youssoufia)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-19</td>
<td></td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal (Taiba)</td>
<td>4-28</td>
<td>60-115</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-10</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>8-14</td>
<td>48-67</td>
<td></td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>30-56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States (Central Florida)</td>
<td>4-25</td>
<td>3-20</td>
<td>37-100</td>
<td>9-55</td>
<td>2.6-3</td>
<td>70-160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States (North Florida)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3-10</td>
<td>62-68</td>
<td>10-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98-109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States (North Carolina)</td>
<td>7-13</td>
<td>20-51</td>
<td>129-197</td>
<td>3-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States (Western Deposits)</td>
<td>16-60</td>
<td>40-150</td>
<td>330-1,000</td>
<td>5-16</td>
<td>4-13</td>
<td>300-1,737</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Igneous Origin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>5-27</td>
<td>1.1-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Phalaborwa)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R. (Kola)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Values in parentheses () indicate average concentration of element based on indicated range. A dash (-) indicates lack of sufficient data.

Source: Derived from Baechle and Wolstein [26], Tennessee Valley Authority [27], IFDC data file, and other reported data.
TABLE 8. ESTIMATED COST OF LIMING RECIRCULATED PROCESS WATER TO pH 3.5 IN TYPICAL U.S. PHOSPHORIC ACID FACILITY

| Estimated Cost Increase Per Tonne of P205 Produced as Wet-Process Phosphoric Acid |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Cost Component                  | Estimated Cost (US $/tonne P205) |
| Raw material (lime, CaO)        | 22.6                            |
| P205 lost due to precipitation from recirculated process water | 5.3                             |
| Additional sulfuric acid required to neutralize excess calcium and replace acidic process water normally fed to digester | 9.3                             |
| Lost production because of lower filtration rates due to presence of silica gel | 24.8                            |
| Lost production due to scaling of process equipment | 8.1                             |
| TOTAL                           | 70.1                            |

Source: Jacobs Engineering Group Inc. (1991) [44].
TABLE 9. CHEMICAL AND PHYSICAL PROPERTIES OF SELECTED PHOSPHATE ROCK CONCENTRATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemical Composition</th>
<th>Surface Area*</th>
<th>Grindability&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(m²/g)</td>
<td>(kWh/tonne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P₂O₅</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CaO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. BET nitrogen adsorption method.
b. Derived from Bond ball mill work index.
c. Uncalcined concentrate.

| Region/Country | Ammonium Phosphate (DAP) | Triple Superphosphate (TSP) | Single Superphosphate (SSP) | Other Phosphate Products (NPKs) | Direct Application Phosphate Rock |
|---------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------
|               | Case b | Case c | Difference | Case b | Case c | Difference | Case b | Case c | Difference | Case b | Case c | Difference |
| Western Europe | 553    | 720    | 167        | 663    | 789    | 126        | 742    | 746    | 4          | 548    | 859    | 110        | 425    | 428    | 4          |
| Eastern Europe | 573    | 736    | 163        | 645    | 771    | 126        | 707    | 711    | 4          | 585    | 655    | 70         | No reported market |
| U.S.S.R.       | 507    | 668    | 161        | 598    | 722    | 126        | 631    | 635    | 4          | 432    | 499    | 77         | No reported market |
| North America  | 489    | 651    | 182        | 552    | 688    | 136        | 586    | 600    | 4          | 453    | 555    | 97         | No reported market |
| Central America| 504    | 732    | 184        | 648    | 775    | 126        | 726    | 740    | 4          | 607    | 708    | 101        | No reported market |
| South America  | 527    | 698    | 171        | 605    | 732    | 123        | 657    | 661    | 4          | 605    | 771    | 122        | 330    | 334    | 4          |
| North Africa   | 498    | 659    | 161        | 570    | 694    | 125        | 621    | 625    | 4          | 548    | 638    | 95         | No reported market |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | 687    | 853    | 166        | 781    | 887    | 126        | 912    | 916    | 4          | 929    | 1,043  | 114        | No reported market |
| South Africa   | 534    | 698    | 167        | No reported market |                 |                 | 658    | 762    | 104       | 622    | 768    | 158        | No reported market |
| West Asia      | 551    | 726    | 175        | 600    | 726    | 126        | 657    | 661    | 4          | 599    | 692    | 93         | 326    | 330    | 4          |
| South Asia     | 507    | 734    | 167        | 627    | 784    | 127        | 726    | 730    | 4          | 692    | 822    | 120        | 414    | 418    | 4          |
| East Asia      | 598    | 770    | 172        | 697    | 823    | 126        | 748    | 752    | 4          | 801    | 881    | 80         | 426    | 440    | 4          |
| (excluding China) | 573    | 731    | 178        | 620    | 746    | 126        | 623    | 627    | 4          | 400    | 404    | 4          | 312    | 318    | 4          |
| China          | 601    | 772    | 171        | 682    | 809    | 127        | 765    | 769    | 4          | 503    | 512    | 9          | 385    | 398    | 4          |
| Oceania        | 551    | 720    | 169        | 630    | 757    | 127        | 682    | 688    | 4          | 573    | 836    | 83         | 372    | 378    | 4          |

a. Refer to Appendix for regional classification of countries.
b. Case 1 (base case) assumes a new plant with full capital charges as described by Dehui and Le [18].
c. Case 2 values include the base case (case 2) values plus estimated incremental costs due to environmental compliance as described in the text. Refer to Table II for summary of estimated physical distribution and marketing costs.
d. Difference is attributed to the estimated cost of environmental compliance. Values are independent of base case investment requirements (capital charges) so they may be applied to current production costs in existing facilities to give a reasonable approximation of the cost of compliance.
TABLE 11. ESTIMATED PHYSICAL DISTRIBUTION AND MARKETING COSTS FOR PHOSPHATE FERTILIZER MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin (Region/Country)</th>
<th>Western Europe</th>
<th>Eastern Europe</th>
<th>U.S.S.R.</th>
<th>North America</th>
<th>Central America</th>
<th>South America</th>
<th>African Sub-Saharan</th>
<th>African South Asia</th>
<th>African East Asia</th>
<th>Chinese Asia</th>
<th>Oceania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Asia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Domestic (Internal) Transport and Marketing Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/Country</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other regions/countries</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Estimated costs are indicative only and are assumed to cover all costs of moving (including handling and in-transit storage) fertilizer materials from their source, through processing, and on to the farm level.
b. Refer to Appendix for regional classification of countries.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Incremental Cost of Environmental Compliance (US $/t ( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 ))</th>
<th>Delivered Cost at Farm Level (US $/t ( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 ))</th>
<th>Existing Production Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct application phosphate rock</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>Delivered Cost at Farm Level Using Average 1990 f.o.b. Prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound NPKs</td>
<td>28 - 83</td>
<td>601 - 656</td>
<td>With Environmental Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>(US $/t ( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 ))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAP</td>
<td>32 - 169</td>
<td>583 - 720</td>
<td>Without Environmental Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSP</td>
<td>26 - 127</td>
<td>656 - 757</td>
<td>(US $/t ( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 ))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Refer to Table 10 for regional/country cost data.
b. Based on average 1990 U.S. Gulf Coast f.o.b. prices plus US $70/tonne product to cover transportation, bagging, and marketing costs. DAP is given credit for its nitrogen content at US $520/tonne nitrogen delivered at farm level.
c. NPKs assumed to contain 15% \( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 \).
Total World Nutrient Consumption (N+P₂O₅+K₂O) – 146 Million Tonnes (1989).

Source: FAO [3].
Figure I. Distribution of total world nutrient consumption by region (1989)
Source: FAO [2,3].
Figure II. Trends in world total nutrient consumption and harvested area (1970-1989)
Direct Application Phosphate Rock 3.5%

Basic Slag 0.4%

TSP 12.9%

SSP 17.1%

DAP/MAP 30.6%

Compounds Other Than DAP/MAP 35.5%

Total World P₂O₅ Consumption—38 Million Tonnes (1989).

Source: Various published data by British Sulphur Corporation Ltd., FAO and IFA.

Figure III. Distribution of world phosphate (P₂O₅) fertilizer consumption by product type
1960
9.8 Million Tonnes P₂O₅

1988
37.8 Million Tonnes P₂O₅

2000 Forecast
43.3 Million Tonnes P₂O₅

Source: Derived from FAO and World Bank/FAO/UNIDO/Industry Working Group Statistical Data. Figure IV. Trends in regional share of world phosphate (P₂O₅) consumption.
Price trends in current U.S. dollars for internationally traded phosphate materials (f.o.b. U.S. Gulf coast, bulk)

Source: IFDC Data File as Derived from Green Markets Fertilizer Market Intelligence Weekly.
Note:
1. Indicated costs for P₂O₅ are net after taking credit for nitrogen or sulfur contained in product.
2. Marketing costs, including transportation and storage are estimated at US $25/ton product for D.A. phosphate rock, SSP, and SAB-PAPR and US $40/ton for all others.

Source: Schultz and Le [19].

Figure VI. Estimated factory and farm-gate cost of P₂O₅ from various products (new production facilities with full capital charges are assumed using 1988 cost basis).
## APPENDIX

### Regional Classification of Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North America</th>
<th>Western Europe</th>
<th>Eastern Europe</th>
<th>U.S.S.R.</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Latin America</th>
<th>Asia</th>
<th>Oceania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Central America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Belgium-Lux</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Central America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Germany FR</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Central African</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Congo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chishia</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Congo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Developed Countries/Includes North America, Western Europe, Eastern Europe, U.S.S.R., Japan, Israel, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand.**

**Developed Countries/Includes Latin America, Asia (except Japan and Israel), Africa (except South Africa), and Oceania (except Australia and New Zealand).**

a. Includes Puerto Rico.
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I. OVERVIEW

Today, the world’s phosphate fertilizer industry produces about 41 million tonnes of \( P_2O_5 \) annually not including that used for animal feed supplements (about 1.8 million tonnes \( P_2O_5 \)) and other industrial purposes (about 2 million tonnes \( P_2O_5 \)). Almost 40% of the current annual production of approximately 41 million tonnes \( P_2O_5 \) as finished products is in the form of ammonium phosphates (DAP and MAP), and a further 13% is produced as TSP. This production accounts for approximately 83% of the phosphoric acid used in fertilizer production. These data for 1988 are summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Type</th>
<th>( P_2O_5 ) (thousand tonnes)</th>
<th>Percent of Total ( P_2O_5 )</th>
<th>Percent of Total Phosphoric Acid Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAP(^1)/MAP(^2)</td>
<td>16,235</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSP(^3)</td>
<td>5,507</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphoric acid-based NPKs(^4)</td>
<td>4,338</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitric acid-based NPKs</td>
<td>3,879</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSP(^5)</td>
<td>7,083</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other phosphate fertilizers</td>
<td>2,888</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct application phosphate  rock</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic slag</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL(^*)</td>
<td>41,445</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Diammonium Phosphate (DAP)
(2) Monoammonium Phosphate (MAP)
(3) Triple Superphosphate (TSP)
(4) Nitrogen Phosphate Potassium (NPK)
(5) Single Superphosphate (SSP)

Two-thirds of total production occurred in the United States, U.S.S.R., China, and Western Europe. Production derived from phosphoric acid varies from around 80% or more in North and Central America, North Africa, and West and South Asia to around 50%-60% in other regions, except Oceania and China where phosphoric acid contributes only about 14% and 1% of the \( P_2O_5 \), respectively.

II. RESOURCES

Phosphate rock concentrate

The annual production of 41 million tonnes of fertilizer \( P_2O_5 \) requires the mining of about 650 million tonnes of ore. This ore is processed into about 140 million tonnes of phosphate rock concentrate having a typical \( P_2O_5 \) content of about 31% for the sedimentary material; the \( P_2O_5 \) content of concentrate derived from some igneous ores may exceed 36%. An additional 15-20 million tonnes of phosphate rock
concentrate is used annually for nonfertilizer purposes. In 1989, total production of phosphate concentrate amounted to about 163 million tonnes. Although 34 countries currently produce phosphate concentrate, only four countries (United States of America, U.S.S.R., Morocco, and China) account for about 75% of all production.

Sulphur

The second major raw material required for phosphate fertilizer production is sulphur. Annual world production of sulphur in all forms has increased from 52 million tonnes in 1975 to almost 61 million tonnes today. Almost half (29 million tonnes) is used for the manufacture of phosphate fertilizers, and an additional 4.3 million tonnes is used for the production of other fertilizers such as ammonium sulphate. All but 8% of the total production of sulphur/sulphur equivalent is used to manufacture sulphuric acid.

III. PROCESSES:

Phosphoric acid is the major intermediate used to produce phosphate fertilizer. Approximately 70% of all fertilizer P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} is derived directly from wet-process phosphoric acid. Most of the balance is derived from phosphate concentrate that is usually treated with phosphoric or other acids (sulphuric or nitric acid) to increase its solubility.

The degree of potential environmental impact is very process- and site-specific. The main possibilities include the following:

- Disturbance of land used for phosphogypsum and contaminated process water storage.
- Contamination of water resources caused by the disposal of phosphogypsum and its associated process water, including acidity, dissolved metals, and radionuclides.
- Fluoride emissions to the atmosphere from the phosphoric acid process.
- Escape of radionuclides that may be harmful to human health.
- Airborne solid and liquid particulates including those caused by wind erosion of phosphogypsum stacks.
- Release of contaminated cooling water, plant site stormwater drainage, and boiler blowdown residue.
- Release of metals and other residues from the regeneration or disposal of spent catalyst from sulphuric acid production units.
- Release of solvents, oils, and other contaminants from plant maintenance and workshop activities.

Phosphate mining

Phosphate concentrate is derived from naturally occurring phosphate-bearing ore. Typically, the naturally occurring ore contains 15%-30% P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} comingle with sand, clay, and other impurities. Current world phosphate reserves amount to the equivalent of about 12 billion tonnes of marketable concentrate, and the reserve base amounts to more than 30 billion tonnes.
The great majority of phosphate ore is obtained using surface mining techniques. This requires the removal and eventual replacement and reshaping of as much as 5 tonnes of overburden per tonne of ore, or several times that amount of material per tonne of recovered $P_2O_5$ because not all the $P_2O_5$ contained in the mined ore is recovered as a marketable phosphate concentrate. Depending upon the characteristics of the ore, as much as one-third of the $P_2O_5$ can be lost in the process of separating the phosphate from its parent ore consisting of sand, clay, limestone, and other materials. The separation (beneficiation) process ranges from crude dry-screening to washing, wet screening, magnetic separation, hydraulic separation, centrifugation, flotation, calcination, settling/decantation, and drying.

Metallic constituents of phosphate ore, most notably cadmium, have received a great deal of attention in recent years, especially regarding international trade of phosphate concentrate containing elevated levels of cadmium. Techniques for removing cadmium from phosphate concentrate, for example, high-temperature calcination, have been evaluated and used to a limited commercial extent with generally unsuccessful and costly results. Removal of cadmium and other metals to tolerable levels from phosphoric acid seems to offer more promise. Such removal techniques, though currently not practiced commercially in the fertilizer industry, involve ion-exchange or solvent extraction methods.

Phosphogypsum

Each tonne of $P_2O_5$, produced as wet-process phosphoric acid, results in the production of about 5 tonnes (dry basis) of phosphogypsum and often about twice that amount of process water.

In some cases, phosphogypsum is slurried with seawater and discharged to the sea beyond the low-tide beach. In other cases, it is discharged into rivers or integrated with mine reclamation projects where it is buried in mined-out areas.

The technology for conversion of phosphogypsum to sulphuric acid, aggregate, and other useful products has been relatively well developed, but its commercial adoption is constrained primarily by economic factors. The integration of wet-process phosphoric acid production with coal-fired electric power production could result in the almost total utilization of phosphogypsum in the form of recovered sulphur dioxide for the production of sulphuric acid and lime for the production of cement.

The main technical obstacle to the replacement of natural gypsum by phosphogypsum is the impurities contained in the latter which are passed on from the phosphate ore during $H_3PO_4$ production. These are entrained phosphoric acid, unreacted phosphate ore, fluoride compounds, cadmium and other heavy metals, and naturally occurring radioactive substances.

Where naturally occurring gypsum is available or where pure gypsum is available from other manufacturing sources, it is improbable that crude phosphogypsum can ever be competitive for any useful purpose. It is clear that, notwithstanding possible processes for the re-use of phosphogypsum, by far the greater part of production will continue to be stored on land or disposed of to the sea in the foreseeable future.
Possible areas of phosphogypsum use are: production of cement and lime, production of sulphuric acid, construction materials, in agriculture and as a pigment for the paper industry. Although the quantities used for these purposes are relatively small and usually account for only a minor proportion of phosphogypsum production, there may be some room for their further development. Phosphogypsum is used in the manufacture of cement in Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Indonesia, Sweden and Turkey. It is used in the production of \( \text{H}_2\text{SO}_4 \), cement and lime in Austria and Poland. It is used in the production of construction materials in France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Spain and Sweden. It is used in agriculture in France, Greece, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States. It is used as a paper pigment in Finland.

Under specific soil and climatic conditions, it may be possible to use more phosphogypsum in agriculture and in the production of construction materials in those countries which do not possess natural gypsum deposits.

Further small quantities of phosphogypsum may be used as a pigment in the paper industry. The production method of such a pigment has been developed in Finland, based on high quality phosphogypsum produced from magmatic phosphate ores.

Recirculated process water

Recirculated process water is used to slurry phosphogypsum and transport it to the disposal site. It is also used to remove heat and gaseous and particulate effluents from the wet-process phosphoric acid concentration unit and the finished product processing units. The acidic process water, referred to as process wastewater by the U.S.-EPA, dissolves and holds in solution a number of metallic elements originally contained in the phosphate rock. Also, slippage of phosphoric acid to the phosphogypsum during filtration, and the collection of particulate from other processing units, adds to the water small quantities of solubilized metallic ions in addition to phosphorus, sulphur, and fluorides. Furthermore, because the process water is recirculated on a closed-loop in an effort to obtain a zero-discharge mode of operation, the concentration of these dissolved species increases quite markedly with time.

IV. ALTERNATIVE PRODUCTS

Many factors affect the response of a crop to water-soluble phosphorus: however, minimum levels of water-soluble phosphorus needed for certain crops can be estimated. Although this is a subjective judgement, the water-solubility seldom needs to be as high as currently found in most commercial phosphate fertilizers. For most crops, 40%-60% of the total phosphorus in the water-soluble form is considered adequate provided that most of the remainder is "available" as measured by conventional laboratory test methods. For short-season vegetable crops, the water solubility should be higher; for longer season crops, it can be lower. Most vegetable crops are grown over a fairly short period of time with root systems that are not well developed, whereas long-season crops are characterized by well-developed root systems. Because the phosphorus is quite immobile in the soil, a large and vigorous root system is more likely to intercept and absorb phosphorus from the soil.
Irrigated agriculture, which accounts for about 25% (about 240 million ha) of the current world total harvested crop area may require special fertilizer materials to facilitate application. Flooding and overhead sprinkling account for the majority of irrigated agriculture, with flooding and furrow water application techniques being the most common, representing about 90% of the total. Currently, drip-type irrigation systems account for less than 1% of the total, but the application of such systems is increasing. In general, if the fertilizer is not applied with the irrigation water, phosphate fertilizer products and application methods used for upland agriculture are appropriate for irrigated agriculture.

In summary, from an agronomic point of view, the production of highly water-soluble phosphate fertilizers is not necessary for the majority of cropping systems. A more moderately water-soluble family of phosphate fertilizers with less dependence upon wet-process phosphoric acid would be appropriate in most cases.

V. POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Comparative Cost of Phosphate Products Including Estimated Incremental Cost of Environmental Compliance

Except for limited opportunities for industrial integration designed to utilize process wastes, technological innovations in the phosphate industry seem to offer little scope for significantly decreasing the quantity of basic process wastes encountered, e.g., phosphatic clay material, phosphogypsum, and process water. Thus, the costs for pollution abatement were estimated according to a scenario which assumes current available technology and relatively stringent regulatory requirements currently under examination in the United States of America. The following range of industry average incremental costs for environmental compliance is indicated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Component</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>phosphate mining and land reclamation</td>
<td>US $ 1-5/tonne*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phosphogypsum management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active stacks</td>
<td>US $ 6-8/tonne*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closed stacks</td>
<td>US $ 5-20/tonne*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process water management</td>
<td>US $ 22-70/tonne*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finished product processing</td>
<td>no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>US$ 34-175/tonne*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* US $/tonne P₂O₅ as wet-process phosphatic acid produced over assumed project life at an annual production of 10 million tonnes P₂O₅.

The large variability in estimated costs is due to a number of site-specific technical and regulatory factors, variations in the assumed capital recovery period, and the lack of a broad base of actual cost experience relative to the scenario examined.
Estimated Impact of Product Choices on the Delivered Cost of Phosphate Fertilizer

The estimated and incremental environmental compliance costs for phosphogypsum disposal described for the United States scenario were adjusted downward by US $20/tonne P$_2$O$_5$ for non-U.S. phosphoric acid producers. This was done to correct for the cost of closing inactive phosphogypsum stacks which is more likely to be the case in the United States than elsewhere.

The cost of international and domestic transport and marketing was estimated. Also, because some phosphate products contain nitrogen and/or sulphur, these nutrients were credited on a farm-level cost basis of US $520/tonne for nitrogen and US $135/tonne for sulphur to arrive at a net delivered cost for P$_2$O$_5$ at the farm level. For compound NPK products, all calculations were made on a net P$_2$O$_5$ basis to avoid the complexity of determining credits for other nutrients commonly contained in NPKs.

Using the upper end of the estimated compliance cost range, the estimated incremental cost of environmental compliance (world weighted-average basis) at the farm level varies from US $4/tonne P$_2$O$_5$ (direct application phosphate rock and SSP) to US $169/tonne P$_2$O$_5$ (DAP) as shown in the following table. The net cost of P$_2$O$_5$ delivered at the farm level, including the environmental compliance cost, varies from US $376/tonne P$_2$O$_5$ for direct application phosphate rock to US $720/tonne P2O5 for DAP and US $757/tonne P$_2$O$_5$ for TSP. These costs not only reflect the estimated cost of environmental compliance, but also the higher cost of production in new facilities, which is caused by higher capital charges than currently experienced by the established industry. The favorable position of the existing industry with its relatively low capital charges is clearly illustrated.

### Estimated World Average Delivered Cost of P$_2$O$_5$ at the Farm Level Including Incremental Cost of Environmental Compliance - New and Existing Production Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Production Facilities</th>
<th>Existing Production Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incremental Cost of Environmental Compliance (US $/t P$_2$O$_5$)</td>
<td>Delivered Cost at Farm Level with Environmental Compliance (US $/t P$_2$O$_5$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product</strong></td>
<td><strong>Env. Compl.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Delivered Cost at Farm Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphate Rock</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound NPKs</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAP</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSP</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- A. Based on average 1990 U.S. Gulf Coast f.o.b. prices plus US $70/tonne product to cover transportation, bagging, and marketing costs. DAP is given credit for its nitrogen content at US $520/tonne nitrogen delivered at farm level.
- B. Environmental Compliance
- C. NPKs assumed to contain 15% P$_2$O$_5$. 

- **B.** ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE
- **C.** NPKs ASSUMED TO ContAIN 15% P$_2$O$_5$. 

The agronomic suitability of phosphate fertilizer products containing lower levels of water-soluble $P_{2}O_{5}$, for example, 40%-60%, may offer significant economic advantages other than those related directly to mitigating the cost of environmental compliance, including the following:

1. The use of lower grade phosphate rock to produce conventional products, such as DAP, TSP, and SSP, containing lower levels of water-soluble $P_{2}O_{5}$, would extend the useful life of existing mines and production facilities.
2. Less soluble products would help to expand the regional and global phosphate resource base to include phosphate ores containing higher levels of impurities.
3. Less soluble products would tend to decrease the environmental impact at the production site because less intensive beneficiation would be required.
4. Under some soil/crop/climatic conditions the use of less soluble products would improve the agronomic performance of the applied phosphate fertilizer.

Relating Delivered Cost of Phosphate Fertilizer to Agronomic (Solubility) Needs

DAP, even with its relatively high estimated cost for environmental compliance compared with alternative products, ranks very favorably among the phosphate product choices from the point of view of delivered cost. Although SSP and some NPKs may effectively deliver $P_{2}O_{5}$ to the farm level at a net cost slightly below that of DAP (in the order of 5%-10%), it would not be practical or cost effective in many cases to assume that the total $P_{2}O_{5}$ requirements could be effectively supplied in the form of SSP or NPKs that usually contain only about 15%-20% $P_{2}O_{5}$.

It is interesting to note that TSP, with an estimated environmental compliance cost of about 70% that of DAP, still remains less attractive on a delivered $P_{2}O_{5}$ basis than DAP. This, of course, is due to the extra value placed on DAP (US $94/tonne DAP) for its nitrogen content.

Direct application phosphate rock is, of course, the least-cost form of $P_{2}O_{5}$. Its delivered cost ($P_{2}O_{5}$ basis) at the farm level is about 52% that of $P_{2}O_{5}$ derived from DAP, according to the assumptions used for this evaluation. The widespread use of direct application phosphate rock as a source of $P_{2}O_{5}$ is severely limited for agronomic reasons as well as by the lack of general availability of suitably reactive material.

VI. BARRIERS TO CHANGE AND INITIATIVES REQUIRED TO BRING ABOUT CHANGE

Lack of Definition of Acceptable Environmental Standards

There is currently no universal definition or criteria for objectively judging the "environmental acceptability" of a fertilizer production or use practice. The criteria for an "acceptable standard" may vary widely depending upon climatic, geological, and other technical and nontechnical factors including population density and public pressures.
It seems desirable for the global industry to agree upon scientifically established minimum environmental standards appropriate to given locations. It is therefore appropriate that international and national industry agencies, together with national environmental regulatory agencies, convene to establish and agree upon minimal standards for environmental compliance in the phosphate industry. Additional compliance standards for national industries, where deemed necessary or desirable, could be resolved on a national or local level.

Cost Required to Implement Available Technology

The widespread implementation of the available technology required to mitigate certain environmental concerns is, however, severely constrained by cost-related market factors. If, for instance, some of the proposed environmental standards were adopted globally, the annual total industry cost for compliance might be in the order of US$4.0 billion. Because of the industry structure, environmental benefits will accrue to a limited number of countries where strict compliance is observed, but the costs will be incurred globally.

Lack of profitability in the private sector, and inertia in the public sector in many countries, will preclude or delay enforcement of any agreed-upon minimum standards. It is therefore appropriate that acceptance of minimum industry standards should be coupled with international agreement on an implementation timetable for compliance. With the concentration of production in only a few countries and the preponderance of public-sector ownership of the production resources, a significant level of international cooperation may be an achievable goal.

Major Investments Required to Change Product Mix

The farm-level cost of P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} derived from direct application phosphate rock, SSP, and some NPKs would be least affected by increased environmental compliance costs at the production site. However, the industry would have to undergo a major restructuring to meet the world's P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} demand with these products. Not only would such a restructuring to change the product mix require large investments in new and modified production and distribution facilities, but the increased cost of distribution would offset most of the environmentally related production cost advantages.

In some countries, the current viability of existing or proposed SSP, NPK, and direct application phosphate rock production units is questionable because the more concentrated DAP and TSP products offer economic advantages even though they are imported. Given adoption of increased environmental compliance costs for the more concentrated phosphoric acid-based products, the viability of production units that do not depend upon phosphoric acid will be improved. Under certain conditions, such plants will be more cost effective in supplying local markets when compared with DAP or TSP. This would provide increased opportunities for exploiting indigenous phosphate resources for serving selected local markets.

Limited Availability of Foreign Exchange

Compliance with many of the proposed environmental standards will require large investments at the production facilities and thus increase the cost of
phosphate fertilizer at all levels. In many cases, the foreign exchange required to finance the necessary investments and/or fertilizer raw material and finished product imports is expected to be lacking. This constraint will be especially critical in those resource-poor countries that depend heavily upon imported raw materials and finished phosphate fertilizers.

Marginal Competitive Status Within the Phosphate Fertilizer Industry

The generally depressed state of the phosphate fertilizer industry, with its overcapacity, high capital investment, low returns, and intense competition between the major phosphate-surplus countries, is not conducive to increases in investments and production costs related to compliance. This dictates that least-cost approaches be taken.

Lack of Significant Farm-Level Cost Differences

The farm-level \( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 \) cost differential between low (some NPKs and SSP) - and high DAP, MAP and TSP) - analysis phosphate fertilizers will decline with the application of the incremental cost of environmental compliance on the high-analysis phosphoric acid-based products. This will increase the break-even distribution distance for the lower analysis products. Many developing countries still adhere to pan-territorial (uniform) delivered pricing policies for fertilizers regardless of distance from supply. This distorts the real farm-gate cost and inhibits the marketing of low-analysis products in markets located close to the source of supply. The natural market areas for low-analysis products such as SSP and some NPKs will be increased if pricing policies reflect the true cost of distribution.

Restrictive Fertilizer Product Legislation

Legislation designed to encourage or protect local or regional production and marketing initiatives can result in product mixes that may actually be detrimental to meeting the agronomic needs of the crop in addition to having an adverse impact on the environment at the level of production and use. To encourage, where economically appropriate, changes in product mix towards less soluble phosphate forms (less dependency upon phosphoric acid), there is a need for fertilizer legislation in many countries to be amended so that all agronomically suitable sources of phosphate can be used by farmers without penalty. Many developing countries providing production or end-user subsidies for phosphate fertilizers restrict eligibility for such subsidies by specifying the product type, nutrient source, and water-soluble \( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 \) content. Unless such restrictions are removed, the use of less water-soluble products, even though they may be agronomically effective and less costly, will be constrained.

Difficulty in Changing Farmers' Practices

When considering a change from one fertilizer product type or use practice to another, it is most important to evaluate the results of such change in the context of farm-level benefit/cost criteria under actual farming conditions. Because
reliable benefit/cost data are often lacking. It is difficult to develop a convincing case for using any type of fertilizer let alone changing or tailoring the product type to reflect a more environmentally optimum mix of products.

An environmentally sustainable phosphate industry can only be achieved at an additional cost. This cost will undoubtedly be initially borne by the farmer, but it will ultimately be transferred to the consumer of agricultural products if fertilizer use and crop production are to be maintained or increased. In developed economies this does not pose a major problem; however, in the developing countries, characterized by resource-poor farmers and large and poor urban populations, considerable problems arise. In those developing countries where farm prices have been kept below international parity prices, there is a need to progressively increase farm prices to parity in order to provide sufficient incentives for farmers to ensure and promote the use of the more costly, but environmentally sustainable, fertilizers. Unless developing countries with low-cost food policies increase crop prices to maintain farmer benefits, food crop production will decline, adding to the problem of food security.

Partial resolution for the problem of increased phosphate fertilizer costs at the farm level lies in improving phosphate fertilizer use efficiency. It is therefore essential that a high priority be given to programs that will assist developing countries in improving use efficiency of phosphate fertilizers through improved application methods and the use of integrated nutrient management systems.