

Analysis of environmental sustainability reporting in the waste-to-energy sector: Performance indicators and improvement targets of the EMAS-registered waste incineration

Original

Analysis of environmental sustainability reporting in the waste-to-energy sector: Performance indicators and improvement targets of the EMAS-registered waste incineration plants in Italy / Comoglio, Claudio; Castelluccio, Stefano; Scarrone, Anna; Fiore, Silvia. - In: JOURNAL OF CLEANER PRODUCTION. - ISSN 0959-6526. - ELETTRONICO. - 378:(2022), p. 134546. [10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.134546]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11583/2972266 since: 2022-10-12T14:05:24Z

Publisher:

Elsevier

Published

DOI:10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.134546

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

Elsevier postprint/Author's Accepted Manuscript

© 2022. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>. The final authenticated version is available online at:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.134546>

(Article begins on next page)


1 Analysis of environmental sustainability reporting in the waste-to-energy sector: 2 performance indicators and improvement targets of the EMAS-registered waste 3 incineration plants in Italy

4
5 Claudio Comoglio, Stefano Castelluccio, Anna Scarrone, Silvia Fiore*

6
7 DIATI, Department of Engineering for Environment, Land, and Infrastructures, Politecnico di
8 Torino, Corso Duca degli Abruzzi 24, 10129, Turin, Italy

9
10 *Corresponding author: S. Fiore (silvia.fiore@polito.it)

11



12

13 Highlights

- 14 • The analyzed organizations defined 197 indicators and 140 improvement goals
- 15 • Energy consumption, emissions to air and waste production received high attention
- 16 • 79.8 M€ budget was mostly (73%) allocated to process efficiency improvement goals
- 17 • A quantitative comparison of the plants' environmental performance is presented
- 18 • The results provide a reference for EMAS implementation and reporting in the sector

19 **Abstract**

20 This work analyzed how 15 Italian waste incineration (WI) plants registered to the European Eco-
21 Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS) in 2020 reported to the public their environmental
22 sustainability. Their EMAS Environmental Statements (ESs) were analyzed to identify the
23 environmental performance indicators and metrics used by the companies, the improvement actions
24 planned, and the adoption of the Best Available Techniques (BAT) for WI. 197 environmental
25 performance indicators and 140 improvement objectives, with an overall allocated budget of 79.8
26 M€ were inventoried. WI companies emphasized reporting and improvement of energy
27 consumption, emissions to air, waste production, process management and energy production.
28 Current values of 8 key performance indicators (HCl, NO_x, CO, and dust concentrations in flue-gas,
29 water consumption, waste production, and electricity consumption/production per 1 ton of treated
30 waste) were assessed and compared. GHG reporting and compliance with the BAT for WI (on
31 emissions to air, energy and raw materials consumption, and waste production), although often not
32 detailed, was also analyzed. Requesting companies to report a pre-defined subset of key metrics,
33 possibly related to the BAT emissions levels, and an explicit section on the adopted BAT could
34 provide an even more representative description of the environmental performances of the WI
35 plants. This study shows a novel approach that could be extended to other industrial sectors to
36 analyze their environmental performance from a consistent, validated, and publicly available data
37 source (EMAS ESs). It also provides metrics and recommendations that could be useful references
38 for the environmental reporting of the WI sector.

39

40 **Keywords:** waste incineration; environmental management system; environmental performance
41 indicator; Best Available Techniques; environmental improvement.

42

43 **1. Introduction**

44 As global waste generation continues to increase due to demographic changes and growing wealth
45 and consumption (Jia et al., 2022; Smejkalová et al., 2020), adopting effective and sustainable
46 waste management solutions has become a priority (Rodrigues et al., 2018). At least 10 out of 17
47 Sustainable Development Goals established in the United Nation's 2030 Agenda can be linked to
48 waste management (Pujara et al., 2019; Sharma et al., 2021). Decreasing the waste generated
49 through reduction, reuse and recycling is essential (Giannetti et al., 2020), and the research focusing
50 on this direction is steadily expanding. For instance, various studies demonstrated waste reduction
51 effectiveness through modification of supply chains (Garai and Sarkar, 2022; Sarkar et al., 2021,
52 2022a, 2022b) or remanufacturing (Sarkar et al., 2022c; Yu et al., 2021; Moon et al., 2022).

53 However, for waste that cannot be otherwise prevented, reused, or recycled, waste-to-energy (WtE)
54 processes (e.g., waste incineration - WI with energy recovery) offer an appealing alternative to
55 landfill (Sarkar and Seo, 2021; Sarkar and Chung, 2021; Somorin et al., 2017). They also support
56 the achievement of the Circular Economy EU targets through materials recovery in synergy with
57 recycling operations (Abis et al., 2020) and help to "close-the-loop" also on the energy side (Tomić
58 and Schneider, 2018). The main technical bottlenecks of WI are: handling of the flue-gas cleaning
59 (FGC) ash and of uncontrolled emissions (Munir et al., 2021); recovery of fly ash (Astrup et al.,
60 2016); and bottom ash management (Bruno et al., 2021; Blasenbauer et al., 2020). Environmental
61 groups and local communities usually contest WtE plants. While WI is preferred over landfill, few
62 residents are in favor of hosting a WI plant due to perceived health risks (Baxter et al., 2016),
63 demographic issues (Liu et al., 2021), and low trust in the information provided by the local
64 government (Subiza-Pérez et al., 2020). However, the WI sector is based on mature and well-
65 established technologies that can limit and control its environmental impacts. The Best Available
66 Techniques (BAT) reference document (BREF) for WI (Neuwahl et al., 2019), i.e., the reference in
67 EU-27, identified the emissions to air and water, waste production, noise, energy
68 production/consumption and raw materials consumption as crucial environmental issues. Moreover,
69 through a benchmark analysis in the EU and the world, the BREF for WI inventoried the currently

70 available applied technologies that could minimize the emission levels originated by WI plants. The
71 BAT Conclusions for WI (Neuwhal et al., 2019) included a list of the recommended BAT, their
72 associated emission levels and monitoring actions and identified the implementation of an
73 Environmental Management System (EMS) as BAT to manage this type of plants.
74 EMS are voluntary schemes built on the “plan-do-check-act” iterative cycle (Fet and Knudson,
75 2017) that the companies can adopt to assess and improve their environmental performances. The
76 international reference standards for EMS implementation are the ISO 14001 (ISO, 2015) and the
77 European Eco-Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS) (European Commission, 2009). ISO 14001
78 and EMAS exhibit significant differences (Testa et al., 2014) and are often both adopted by
79 companies (Murmura et al., 2018). Specifically considering EMAS, two key distinguishing features
80 can be highlighted. Firstly, before the release of the EMAS registration to an organization, the
81 National Competent Authority carries out a formal assessment through the support of the
82 Environment Agency to verify its compliance with the applicable legal environmental requirements.
83 Secondly, EMAS requires the registered organizations to publish an Environmental Statement (ES),
84 annually validated by an independent environmental verifier, containing the relevant environmental
85 information related to its registered installation(s). The consequences of EMS implementation on
86 the environmental performances of organizations have been questioned in the scientific literature.
87 Some authors outlined reductions in air emissions, waste production, and water/energy/materials
88 consumption after EMS implementation (Russo, 2009; Martin-Pena et al., 2014). Johnstone and
89 Hallberg (2020) highlighted environmental performance improvements linked to operational
90 advancements. It is vital that companies registered to EMAS declare significant environmental
91 indicators and reliable improvement objectives in the ES, and apply a continuous monitoring of the
92 related operational advancements and objectives’ achievement. The key shortcomings of EMAS
93 application are related to the limited use of eco-efficiency indicators (Heras-Saizarbitoria et al.,
94 2020a), the symbolic adoption of EMS to obtain certifications (Heras-Saizarbitoria et al., 2020b), or
95 to advancements occurring mainly in the initial implementation phase (Testa et al., 2014).

96 Nevertheless, the EMAS process is rigorous; companies are requested to identify their significant
97 environmental aspects and to keep them under continuous quantitative monitoring through
98 operational procedures. EMAS ESs contain detailed and publicly available data on site-specific
99 environmental performances, are verified by the National Competent Authorities, and validated by
100 an independent environmental verifier. Therefore, the ESs represent a significant source of
101 validated and verified site-specific environmental data (Comoglio and Botta, 2012; Petrosillo et al.,
102 2012), and provide reliable information in a more consistent and specific way compared to other
103 environmental sustainability reports (Tsalis et al., 2020; Iosifov and Ratner, 2018). For those
104 reasons, ESs have been repeatedly used as a quality data source in literature. Various authors
105 analyzed the ESs to evaluate trends in the environmental performances reported by several
106 companies (Daddi et al., 2011; Marrucci and Daddi, 2022; Heras-Saizarbitoria et al., 2020a).
107 Castelluccio et al. (2022) performed an environmental assessment of the performances of the Italian
108 bio-waste sector based on the data disclosed in the EMAS ESs. Sisani et al. (2022) used data
109 retrieved from EMAS ESs of WI plants with other literature data to define the significant
110 environmental aspects (waste treated, recovered energy and slag treated) to conduct a Life Cycle
111 Assessment (LCA) of the incineration of municipal solid waste.
112 LCA remains the most common tool to perform environmental assessments in the WI sector. Few
113 authors used LCA to analyze the environmental performances of WI plants on a national scale,
114 highlighting benefits for most of the considered impact categories (Beylot et al., 2018; Sisani et al.,
115 2022). Other authors used LCA to compare the performance of WI with other waste management
116 alternatives or with thermoelectric powerplants, often observing that WI outperformed most
117 alternatives (Abușoğlu et al., 2017; Adeleke et al., 2022). LCA allowed to analyze the impacts of
118 different WI plants (Havukainen et al., 2017), and of the reuse of bottom ash (Margallo et al.,
119 2015). However, LCA has bottlenecks described in the scientific literature. It provides detailed
120 results related to a specific context, sometimes controversial, and may present relevant problems
121 related to data integrity and uncertainty (Khandelwal et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2021), and definition

122 of system boundaries (Olofsson and Börjesson, 2018). Another relevant area that has received the
123 attention of researchers is the specific impact on the human health of WI. A review (de Titto and
124 Savino, 2019) found no studies indicating that modern-technology waste incineration plants are a
125 cancer risk factor or adversely affect reproduction or development.

126 In the described framework, this study analyzed the reporting of the environmental performances of
127 the WI sector in Italy, based on the data described in the ESs of the plants registered to EMAS in
128 2020. Other studies describing the environmental assessment of WI and of waste management
129 operations or other processes at local/national scale, based on literature data and/or ESs, and
130 reporting the environmental performance and impacts, are available (Table 1). However, to our
131 knowledge, no literature exists reporting the environmental assessment of full-scale WI processes
132 based not only the environmental performance and impact evaluation, but also on the indicators and
133 improvement objectives set by the companies, and on their compliance with the BAT for WI.
134 Therefore, although state-of-the-art research on WI impacts

135 **Table 1.** Comparison of the existing literature on the environmental assessments of various processes and waste management operations (WI =
 136 Waste incineration; ESs = Environmental statements).

Authors	Sector	Scale	N. of plants analyzed	Data source	Performance levels	Impacts evaluation	Indicators used by companies	Improvement objectives	BAT compliance
de Titto and Savino (2019)	WI	-	-	Literature	-	Yes	-	-	-
Margallo et al. (2015)	WI	-	-	Literature	-	Yes	-	-	-
Havukainen et al. (2017)	WI	Local	4	Primary, Literature	Yes	Yes	-	-	-
Adeleke et al. (2022)	Waste management	Local	-	Primary, Literature	-	Yes	-	-	-
Abuşoğlu et al. (2017)	WI	Local	1	Primary, Literature	-	Yes	-	-	-
Sisani et al. (2022)	WI	National	39	ESs, Literature, Primary	Yes	Yes	-	-	-
Beylot et al. (2018)	WI	National	90	Primary, Literature	Yes	Yes	-	-	-
Daddi et al. (2011)	Various	National	64	ESs	-	-	-	-	-
Heras-Saizarbitoria et al. (2020b)	Various	National	268	ESs	-	-	-	-	-
Marrucci and Daddi (2022)	Manufacturing	National	414	ESs	-	-	-	-	-
Castelluccio et al. (2022)	Bio-waste	National	16	ESs	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	-
Present study	WI	National	15	ESs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

138 (based on LCA and/or EMAS ESs) is established, our literature review highlighted the following
139 research gaps:

- 140 • The environmental performances of WI installations are rarely assessed (Sisani et al., 2022)
141 through publicly available and validated data, such as those present in EMAS ESs.
- 142 • The performance analysis is mostly performed through LCA, considering specific case studies
143 (Adeleke et al., 2022; Havukainen et al., 2017; Abuşoğlu et al., 2017); the few national-scale
144 studies are context-specific due to the application of the LCA approach (Sisani et al., 2022;
145 Beylot et al., 2018).
- 146 • There is an overall lack of focus (Table 1) on which environmental aspects WI companies
147 consider significant, how they quantify their impacts and plan to improve their environmental
148 performances.

149 In details, compared to existing literature on the environmental assessment of WI processes, this
150 study provides the following novel contributions and objectives:

- 151 • Assessment of the average environmental performances of the WI sector in Italy using validated
152 data and key performance indicators (KPIs) present in the ESs of the EMAS registered plants
- 153 • Inventory of the environmental aspects considered significant by the WI companies and related
154 performance indicators and metrics.
- 155 • Identification of the environmental performance improvement targets set by WI companies.
- 156 • Analysis of the compliance with the BAT for WI.

157 This research analyzed the Italian WI sector, a context that is significant and representative of EU
158 reality (Abis et al., 2020). After a preliminary phase consisting in an inventory of the WI plants
159 registered to EMAS in Italy in 2020 and the analysis of their technical features, the research was
160 based on the following research questions: 1. Which are the indicators (and metrics) used by the
161 EMAS registered WI plants in Italy to evaluate their environmental performance? 2. On which
162 environmental aspects, how, and to what extent are the companies managing WI plants committed
163 to improve their performances? 3. Which is the level of adoption of the BAT for WI, and which are

164 the current environmental performance levels of the analyzed WI plants in relation to selected
165 KPIs? This study is not intended to propose a methodology competing with LCA, but rather has the
166 main goal of analyzing how the Italian WI plants registered to EMAS report quantitative data to the
167 public about their environmental sustainability.

168 The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section 2 describes the adopted novel
169 methodological approach. Results are presented and discussed in Section 3. The last section concludes
170 the paper with the study's key findings and recommendations to WI organizations and institutions.
171 The most relevant previous research is compared with the present study in Table 1.

172


173 **2. Methodology**

174 This research was based on a methodological approach made of seven inter-related phases applied
175 in sequence (Figure 1), as follows.

176 1. Inventory of the WI plants registered to EMAS in Italy (reference year: 2020) by cross-checking
177 the WI plants database compiled by the national Environmental Agency (ISPRA, 2020) and the
178 National Register of the EMAS-certified sites (ISPRA, 2021), considering the NACE codes
179 "E38.2.x", i.e., waste treatment and disposal (European Commission, 2006) (related to the
180 preliminary phase described within the aims of the research).

181 2. Analysis of the ESs and initial selection of the plants to exclude from the inventory the facilities
182 involving other processes/activities besides WI (e.g., sites including a manufacturing plant and a WI
183 plant, providing aggregated performance data) (related to the preliminary phase described within
184 the aims of the research).

185 3. Analysis of the technical features of the selected WI plants by cross-checking the information
186 available in the ESs and in the plants' Integrated Environmental Authorizations (accessed on the
187 Local Authorities websites) (related to the preliminary phase described within the aims of the
188 research).



203 **Figure 1.** Outline of the applied methodology

204

205 4. Analysis of the key environmental aspects, related metrics, and indicators used by the companies

206 in the ESs to describe the impact of their plants (related to research questions 1 and 2). In details, 14

207 environmental aspects (emissions to air/water, waste production, energy/water/raw materials

208 consumption, odor/noise/light emissions, visual impact, radiations, risks of environmental

209 accidents, soil contamination, and effects on biodiversity) and 5 other aspects not strictly qualifying

210 as “environmental” (type of treated waste, transport, process management, energy production, and

211 stakeholder engagement), were considered. Their occurrence (i.e., if the aspect was reported in the

212 ES) and significance (i.e., the number of ESs considering the aspect as relevant) and the related

213 metrics and indicators were assessed. From this analysis of environmental indicators and metrics,

214 representative KPIs were selected, based on their occurrence in the ESs and on their relevance to
215 the WI sector, to be subsequently used to analyze and compare the current environmental
216 performance levels of the 15 WI plants (see phase 7).

217 5. Analysis of the environmental improvement objectives set by the companies managing the
218 selected plants (related to research question 2). The environmental improvement program reported
219 in each ES was analyzed, identifying the objectives set from 2016 to 2019, and collecting data on
220 the specific actions, metrics, and allocated budget.

221 6. Analysis of the compliance to the BAT specified in the BREF for WI (Neuwahl et al., 2019)
222 (related to research question 3). The ESs were analyzed to retrieve information about the level of
223 adoption by the 15 plants of the BAT for WI related to emissions to air, energy and raw materials
224 consumption, and waste production.

225 7. Analysis and comparison of the current environmental performance levels of the WI plants of the
226 sample related to the selected KPIs (related to research question 3). The performances reported in
227 the ESs over the period 2017 – 2019 were analyzed and compared based on the following 8 metrics:
228 HCl, NO_x, CO, and dust flue-gas (FG) concentrations, total water consumption, total waste
229 production, and total electricity consumption and production. The ESs report data over a period of 3
230 years, which is considered by EMAS an adequate short/medium period for monitoring the
231 fulfillment of the declared improvement objectives, and therefore data related to that timespan were
232 used in the analyses. The KPIs related to air emissions were selected among the pollutants
233 continuously monitored in all plants. HCl and CO were chosen to describe acid gas emissions and
234 the combustion quality inside the plant, respectively. Except for air emissions, the other parameters
235 were normalized to 1 ton of treated waste to compare the operational performances of the different
236 WI plants. A performance score (PS) metric was created to describe the performances of the plants
237 related to each KPI, as shown in eq. (1):

$$238 \quad PS = \frac{\bar{x}}{\mu} \quad (1)$$

239 where \bar{x} is the average value of the considered KPI reported over the period 2017 – 2019 for a
240 single plant, and μ is the average value of the same KPI calculated for the whole sample of selected
241 plants. Lower scores indicate better performances than higher scores, and a score of 1 equals the
242 sample average. The electricity production values were inverted to assign lower scores to better
243 performances.

244

245 *2.1. Sensitivity analysis*

246 The linear correlation between the data considered in phases 4, 5 and 7 of the methodology was
247 assessed, and its statistical significance was evaluated through the Pearson correlation coefficient.
248 When samples of plants with distinct characteristics exhibited different performance scores (PS),
249 the statistical significance of those differences was evaluated with the Welch t-test, eq. (2):

$$250 \quad t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{N_2}}} \quad (2)$$

251 Where \bar{x}_i , s_i , and N_i are the samples mean, standard deviation, and size. The Welch t-test was
252 selected instead of the Student t-test as it performs better when the groups compared have different
253 sample sizes and variances (Delacre et al., 2017).

254

255 **3. Results and discussion**

256 *3.1. Plants description*

257 From the application of phases 1-3, out of the 37 WI plants operating in Italy in 2020, 27 resulted
258 included in the National Register of the EMAS-certified sites, and 15 were selected according to
259 phase 2 of the methodology. 12 ESs were not included in the sample because other activities
260 besides WI were performed, and it was not possible to retrieve performance data exclusively related
261 to WI process. The 15 plants constituting the final sample (representing 55.6% of the total number
262 of WI plants in Italy) are located mainly in North/Central Italy (12) and fewer in Southern Italy (3)

263 (Supplementary Materials, Figure I). Considering their technical features (Table 2), the feedstock is
264 mostly municipal solid waste (>88 wt% for 7 plants out of 15), also with non-hazardous special
265 wastes (e.g., sludge from wastewater treatment, bulky waste) in variable amounts (23-50 wt%); two
266 plants treat exclusively refuse-derived fuel or solid recovered fuel, and one plant only special waste.
267 Concerning combustion, all plants involve incineration grates, 33.3 % flue-gas recirculation, and
268 40 % heat production in co-generation. About the FGC, all plants use bag filters, 33 % electrostatic
269 precipitators. All plants apply dry processes to reduce acidic gases emissions; in 3 plants they are
270 associated with wet processes, and in one with semi-wet processes. All plants apply systems to
271 reduce NO_x emissions; selective non-catalytic reactors and selective catalytic reactors are
272 frequently used, also in combination.

273

274 **Table 2.** Main technical characteristics of the considered waste incineration plants. A double tick in the flue-gas cleaning section indicates that the
 275 technology is installed twice (MSW: municipal solid waste; SW: non-hazardous solid waste; RDF: refuse-derived fuel; SRF: solid recovered fuel;
 276 BF: bag filters; ESP: electrostatic precipitators; DP: dry processes; WP: wet processes; SWP: semi-wet processes; SNCR: selective non-catalytic
 277 reactors; SCR: selective catalytic reactors).

Plant	Operational Data			Capacity t/h	Combustion		Flue Gas Cleaning						
	Treated Waste				Heat Production	Flue-Gas Recirculation	ESP	BF	DP	SWP	WP	SNCR	SCR
	MSW %	SW %	SRF/RDF %										
Acerra	100			81	-	-	-	✓✓	✓✓	✓	-	-	✓
Gerbido	100			67.5			✓	✓	✓				✓
Padova	100			25		✓		✓✓	✓✓			✓	✓
Piacenza	97			15				✓	✓			✓	✓
Schio	96			9.6	✓		✓	✓	✓				✓
Como	94			13.4	✓		✓	✓	✓				✓
Trieste	88	11		25.5				✓	✓		✓	✓	
Silla2	>70	<30		72.5	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓
Granarolo	68	31		25	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Trezzo	62	38		21				✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Brescia	57	23		108	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Ferrara	50	50		18	✓			✓✓	✓✓		✓	✓	✓
San Vittore			100	38.5		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Pozzilli			100	12				✓	✓		✓	✓	
Terni		100		12				✓	✓		✓	✓	

278
279

280 *3.2. Key environmental aspects and related performance indicators*

281 Phase 4 involved the analysis of the key environmental aspects, their significance and related
282 metrics and indicators used by the companies in the ESs to describe the impact of their plants. The
283 ESs revealed a detailed description of aspects, metrics, and indicators (Table 3). 11 key
284 environmental aspects (emissions to air/water, waste production, water/raw materials/energy
285 consumption, soil contamination, risk of environmental accidents, effects on biodiversity, process
286 management and waste treated) were listed in all ESs, over a total of 19 reported aspects. Few
287 aspects have been considered significant in most ESs: emissions to air and waste production
288 (>80 %), water consumption (60 %), raw materials consumption, and water/noise emissions (ca
289 50 %). These aspects, and particularly emissions to air and waste production, were recognized by
290 literature and the BREF as WI's most relevant impacts (Liu et al., 2021; Di Maria et al., 2021; Tait
291 et al., 2020). An exception was water consumption, considered significant by 60 % of organizations
292 but rarely highlighted as relevant in literature. 8 key aspects were instead considered significant by
293 only 3 or fewer companies and were generally aspects not identified as relevant in the literature.
294 One notable exception was the technical aspect energy production, considered significant only by
295 13 % of the companies, as energy production efficiency has been highlighted as a critical driver of
296 WI's impacts in literature (Beylot and Villeneuve, 2013; Damgaard et al., 2010).

297 The analysis of the quantitative metrics used in the ESs to describe the 19 aspects, resulted in a total
298 of 197 indicators (Supplementary Materials, Table I). 6 environmental aspects (emissions to air,
299 waste production, water/raw materials/energy consumption and effects on biodiversity) were
300 described by quantitative indicators by all companies. Only 3 environmental aspects (soil
301 contamination, odor emissions and light pollution) lacked quantitative indicators in all ESs. A
302 positive correlation between the significance of an aspect and the number of quantitative indicators
303 was found ($r(17) = 0.68$, $p < 0.01$), similarly to the findings reported in the study of Castelluccio et
304 al. (2022) related to the Italian bio-waste sector. The most significant aspects (emissions to air and

305 waste production) were in fact described by several indicators (avg. 7.7, max 12 and avg. 6.3, max
306 10, respectively). Interestingly, despite being considered significant by only one-third of the ESs,
307 the aspect energy consumption exhibited the highest number of indicators (avg. 7.9, max 14),
308 presumably because of its direct relationship with operational costs that could have led to accurate
309 monitoring by the companies. Summarizing, the aspects emissions to air, waste production and
310 energy consumption were described in all ESs by at least 3 different indicators. Only 3 other aspects
311 were described on average with over 2 indicators in all ESs: releases to water (2.7) and water (2.3)
312 and raw materials consumption (2.1). Apart from energy consumption, all the other 5 aspects were
313 considered significant by at least 7 ESs. On the other hand, the aspect soil contamination,
314 considered in all ESs and accounted as significant by 40 % of the companies, was never described
315 with indicators, as well as the aspects odor emissions and light pollution.

316 Table 4 lists the environmental indicators most frequently found (at least in 5 different ESs) for
317 each aspect. 4 indicators were used in all the 15 ESs: mean annual concentrations of pollutants
318 emitted to air, annual mass of waste produced (total and for each type), and total annual reagents
319 consumption. The set of indicators in Table 4 can represent a useful reference for future research to
320 describe the overall environmental performance of WI plants. 53 individual indicators followed the
321 eco-efficiency criteria defined by Heras-Saizarbitoria et al. (2020a), and 42.4% of the total
322 environmental indicators found were also reported following the mentioned criteria. This result is in
323 line with the findings of Erkkö et al. (2005) and Heras-Saizarbitoria et al. (2020a), which found that
324 42% of the analyzed indicators were calculated using minimum eco-efficiency principles.

325

326

327 **Table 3.** Summary of the key aspects considered in the ESs, significance assessment, and indicators
 328 (x: average; vertical line: median).

Aspect	Considered	Significant	Described by	No. of indicators			
	in the ESs		indicators	per plant [-]			
	%	%	%	0	5	10	15
Emissions to Air	100	93.3	100				
Waste Production	100	86.7	100				
Water Consumption	100	60.0	100				
Raw Materials Cons.	100	46.7	100				
Releases to Water	100	46.7	86.7				
Soil Contamination	100	40.0	0				
Energy Consumption	100	33.3	100				
Waste Treated	100	33.3	93.3				
Risk of Env. Accidents	100	20.0	60.0				
Process Management	100	20.0	13.3				
Effects on Biodiversity	100	13.3	100				
Noise Emissions	93.3	46.7	53.3				
Odor Emissions	93.3	20.0	0				
Stakeholder Engagement	93.3	0	46.7				
Transport	86.7	33.3	53.3				
Visual Impact	86.7	33.3	20.0				
Radiations	80.0	13.3	13.3				
Energy Production	73.3	13.3	60.0				
Light Pollution	26.7	0	0				

329
 330 **Table 4.** List of the most frequently reported environmental indicators.

Aspect	Indicator	Unit	No. ESs
Emissions to Air	Mean annual concentrations of pollutants emitted to air	mg/Nm ³	15
	Total annual mass of pollutants emitted to air	t	14
	Total annual CO ₂ mass emitted to air	t	12
	Total annual mass of pollutants emitted to air per treated waste	t/t	11
	Total annual CO ₂ mass emitted to air per treated waste	t/t	7
	Total annual mass of pollutants emitted to air per produced energy	t/MWh	6
	Total annual CO ₂ mass emitted to air per produced energy	t/MWh	5
	Mean annual concentrations of pollutants emitted to air as a percentage of the authorized limits	%	5
	Waste Production	Total annual mass of waste produced	t

	Total annual mass of waste produced per typology	t	15
	Total annual mass of waste sent to recycling	t	12
	Mass of waste produced per typology per total annual mass of produced waste	t/t	11
	Total annual mass of waste recycled per typology	t	8
	Total annual mass of waste sent to disposal	t	8
	Total annual mass of hazardous waste produced	t	7
	Total annual mass of waste produced per treated waste	t/t, m ³ /m ³	7
	Total annual mass of hazardous waste produced per treated waste	t/t	6
	Total annual mass of non-hazardous waste produced	t	5
	Total annual mass of waste produced per produced energy	t/MWh	5
	Total annual mass of non-hazardous waste produced per treated waste	t/t	5
Raw Materials Consumption	Total annual reagents consumption	t	15
	Total annual reagents consumption per treated waste	kg/t, l/t	10
	Total annual reagents consumption per produced energy	t/MWh	6
Water Consumption	Total annual water consumption	m ³	14
	Total annual water consumption per treated waste	m ³ /t	11
	Total annual water consumption per source	m ³	10
	Total annual water consumption per produced energy	m ³ /GWh	6
Waste Treated	Total annual amount of treated waste	t	14
	Total annual amount of treated waste per type	t, %	11
Energy Consumption	Total annual methane consumption	t, Sm ³	13
	Total annual electricity consumption	MWh	10
	Total annual self-produced electricity consumption	MWh	10
	Total annual electricity consumption per treated waste	MWh/t	8
	Total annual electricity consumption per produced energy	MWh/MWh	7
	Total annual electricity consumption from the grid	MWh	7
	Total annual oil consumption	t	7
	Total annual energy consumption	MWh	6
	Energy efficiency index Directive 2008/98/EC	-	6
Effects on Biodiversity	Total site area	m ²	13
	Total site area per use	m ²	12
Releases to Water	Mean annual concentrations of pollutants released to water	various	8
	Total annual wastewater volume produced	m ³	5
Risk of Environmental Accidents	Total annual number of emergency events	-	8
Noise Emissions	Maximum noise levels at the plant's boundaries	dB	7
	Maximum noise levels at sensitive receptors	dB	7
Energy Production	Total annual electricity production per treated waste	MWh/t	7
Transport	Total daily number of vehicles entering and exiting from the plant	-	7

331

332 *3.3. GHG emissions reporting*

333 The impact of the analyzed WI plants in terms of GHG emissions was generally sufficiently
334 detailed and explained in the ESs. This information allowed to analyze how the GHG emissions are
335 specifically inventoried and reported by WI plants, both in terms of emission sources considered
336 and emissions avoided, aspects that were lacking in the scientific literature on WI. Quantitative data
337 on produced GHG emissions were reported in 12 ESs. 8 ESs directly presented the total CO₂
338 emissions from the flue-gas measuring, generated by the incineration of waste, the use of fuels for
339 auxiliary burners, and the reagents reactions in the FGC section. 5 ESs reported the CO₂ emissions
340 contribution of the fossil fraction of the waste, estimated from analysis of the waste composition.
341 Secondary sources of GHG emissions were considered infrequently and accounted for only 0.3 to
342 1.9 % of total GHG emissions. 5 ESs reported the estimated emissions from fuels used for auxiliary
343 burners, emergency boilers, or vehicles, and 1 ES estimated the impact of NaHCO₃ use. Similarly,
344 the equivalent CO₂ emissions due to N₂O and CH₄ emissions were reported by 5 and 2 ESs,
345 accounting for 0.2 to 1.1 % of total GHG emissions. Despite the generally well-detailed sections on
346 GHG emissions, none of the organizations considered the contributions related to waste transport to
347 the plant, reagents' manufacturing, and WI waste disposal. Neglecting emissions due to the
348 transport of waste from the collecting facility to the WI plant represents a relevant deficiency, since
349 it is a secondary source of GHG emissions that could differentiate the overall performances of
350 different plants based on the origin of the waste treated. The same shortfall has been reported by
351 Castelluccio et al. (2022) regarding the Italian bio-waste sector. Avoided GHG emissions were
352 mentioned by 12 ESs: 7 companies estimated the avoided emissions related to the production of the
353 recovered energy from fossil fuels; 4 ESs estimated those related to landfill disposal of the treated
354 waste. Table II, in the Supplementary Material, presents an exhaustive overview of how GHG
355 emissions were reported in the ESs.

356

357 *3.4. Improvement objectives*

358 140 improvement objectives were found in the ESs (Supplementary Materials, Table III). Energy
359 consumption resulted the only key aspect with at least one objective set in every ES (Table 5) and
360 with the overall highest number of objectives (29), again showing a specific commitment towards
361 operational costs reductions. 29 improvement objectives were also related to the emissions to air in
362 13 ESs out of 15. Over 50 % of the ESs specified improvement targets for waste production, raw
363 materials consumption, and process management. 5 out of the 19 considered aspects accounted for
364 66 % of the total objectives: emissions to air, energy consumption, process management, waste
365 production, and water consumption. Less than one-third of the ESs set improvement objectives for
366 11 aspects and no objective was declared for light pollution and waste treated. A positive
367 correlation between the significance of an aspect and the number of improvement objectives set was
368 found, $r(17) = 0.49$, $p < 0.05$. This result is in contrast with the findings of Castelluccio et al. (2022)
369 regarding the Italian bio-waste sector, where no correlation between the significance of an aspect
370 and the number of improvement objectives was identified. Energy consumption was again an
371 outlier, being the environmental aspect with the highest number of improvement objectives set
372 despite its low significance. In contrast, noise emissions were defined as significant in 46.7 % of the
373 ESs, with only one improvement objective.

374 The allocated budget was specified for 74.3 % of the 104 declared improvement objectives,
375 resulting in a total sum of 79.8 M€ The aspects with the highest budget were energy production
376 (33.9 M€) and process management (24.2 M€), for a total of 19 improvement objectives. Emissions
377 to air, energy consumption, waste production and raw materials consumption accounted for a total
378 of 76 objectives (54.3 % of the total) and an overall budget of 18.6 M€(23.3 % of the total). The
379 environmental aspects with the highest allocated budget were emissions to air, energy consumption,
380 and waste production, with a mean budget per objective between 111 and 581 k€

381


382 **Table 5.** Summary of the environmental improvement objectives and allocated budget (cross:
 383 average; horizontal line: median).

Aspect	Tot allocated budget	Budget per objective	ESs with objectives	No. of objectives per plant [-]			
	k€	k€	%	0	2	4	6
Emissions to Air	12,778	581	85.7				
Waste Production	2,326	291	53.3				
Water Consumption	775	129	46.7				
Raw Materials Cons.	1,046	149	53.3				
Releases to Water	762	152	20.0				
Soil Contamination	20	20	13.3				
Energy Consumption	2,448	111	100				
Waste Treated	0	0.0	0.0				
Risk of Env. Accidents	739	185	33.3				
Process Management	24,216	2,018	66.7				
Effects on Biodiversity	0	6.7	6.7				
Noise Emissions	95	95	6.7				
Odor Emissions	499	499	13.3				
Stakeholder Engagement	51	13	20.0				
Transport	60	60	13.3				
Visual Impact	30	30	20.0				
Radiations	35	18	13.3				
Energy Production	33,920	4,846	40.0				
Light Pollution	0	0.0	0.0				

384

Aspect	Tot allocated budget	Budget per objective	ESs with objectives	No. of objectives per plant [-]			
	budget	objective	objectives	0	2	4	6
	k€	k€	%				
Emissions to Air	12,778	581	85.7				
Waste Production	2,326	291	53.3				
Water Consumption	775	129	46.7				
Raw Materials Cons.	1,046	149	53.3				
Releases to Water	762	152	20.0				

Soil Contamination	20	20	13.3
Energy Consumption	2,448	111	100
Waste Treated	0		0.0
Risk of Env. Accidents	739	185	33.3
Process Management	24,216	2,018	66.7
Effects on Biodiversity	0		6.7
Noise Emissions	95	95	6.7
Odor Emissions	499	499	13.3
Stakeholder Engagement	51	13	20.0
Transport	60	60	13.3
Visual Impact	30	30	20.0
Radiations	35	18	13.3
Energy Production	33,920	4,846	40.0
Light Pollution	0		0.0



385 In Table 6 the objectives set at least by two of the analyzed WI companies are listed. The ones with
386 the highest occurrence were related to the introduction of LED technology (12 ESs) and
387 components replacement (8 ESs) to reduce electricity consumption, and to the update of the
388 emissions to air monitoring systems (8 ESs).

389

390 **Table 6.** List of objectives set at least by two of the analyzed WI companies.

Aspect	Objective	Action	No. of ESs
Energy Consumption	Electricity consumption reduction	Replacement of lighting with LED technology	12
		Components replacement	8
	Energy consumption reduction	Energy efficiency monitoring	2
Emissions to Air	Emissions management improvement	Updating of emission monitoring systems	8
	Diffuse emissions reduction	Fly ashes discharge optimization	4
	NOx emissions reduction	DeNOx system installation	3

	Keeping emissions at current levels		2	
	Greenhouse gas emissions reduction	Connection as a supplier to the district heating network	2	
	Plant impact assessment	Air contaminants dispersion models	2	
	Emissions management improvement	Installation of activated carbon dosage system	2	
Water Consumption	Reduction of water consumption	Use of groundwater as process water	3	
		Reuse of treated wastewater	3	
		Water leaks elimination	2	
Waste Production	Bottom ashes management improvement	Implementation of an iron removal system	3	
		Waste management improvement	Improvements to the waste storage area	2
		Fly ashes management improvement	Transport optimization	2
Raw Materials Consumption	Reagents consumption reduction	Improvement of the acid gas dry abatement system efficiency	3	
		Paper consumption reduction	Computerized management	2
Releases to Water	Sewer discharge management improvement	Water discharges separation improvements	3	
		Increasing the capacity of the wastewater treatment plant accumulation tank	2	
Process Management	Line performances improvement	Refurbishment	2	
		Plant security improvement	Construction of a new perimeter fence	2
		Improvement of vapor generator reliability	Installation of a new superheater	2
Risk of Environmental accidents	Fire management improvement in the waste storage bunker	Installation of thermal cameras for fire detection	2	
Stakeholder Engagement	Increased awareness	External initiatives	2	
Transport	Traffic circulation improvement	Construction of a new waste weighing system	2	
Radiations	Radioactive waste detection improvement	Installation of a new radioactive material detection system	2	

391

392 45 % of the improvement objectives had direct implications in reducing the plant's operational costs
393 or improving production, contributing to increasing the number of objectives set for aspects such as
394 energy consumption and production. This suggests that environmental sustainability was not the
395 only driving force that led to setting improvement objectives in the environmental program.

396 Contrarily to the direct relationship found between the significance of an aspect and the number of
397 improvement objectives set, no correlation occurred between the significance of an aspect and the

398 budget allocated to its improvement ($r(17) = 0.04$, $p < 1$). The 73 % of the total budget was in fact
399 allocated to improvement objectives related to energy production and process management,
400 considered significant by 2 and 3 ESs, respectively. Excluding these 2 aspects, the correlation
401 between significance and budget allocated improved ($r(15) = 0.66$ $p < 0.01$).
402 Finally, it must be outlined that for over 25 % of the improvement objectives, the allocated budget
403 was not disclosed in the ESs. Furthermore, although information on the progress of the actions
404 related to the objective's achievement was usually reported, indicators allowing to track it and to
405 relate each action to a quantified improvement of an environmental aspect were rarely set.
406 Modifying the environmental program accordingly could help to better reveal the extent of the
407 organizations' commitment and the real effectiveness in improving environmental performance,
408 thus increasing public perception of information transparency.

409

410 *3.5. Compliance with the BAT for WI*

411 *3.5.1. Emissions to air*

412 Table IV in the Supplementary Materials summarizes the information contained in the ESs about
413 the compliance to the BAT specified in the BREF for WI (Neuwahl et al., 2019) related to the
414 emissions to air. It must be outlined that in no ES a specific section clearly detailing the plant's
415 compliance to the applicable BAT was present. Therefore, the information had to be obtained by
416 thoroughly analyzing technical details describing the plant's operations within the environmental
417 sustainability reports of the companies managing the considered WI plants. BAT 4 regulates the
418 monitoring frequency (continuous or discontinuous) of the contaminants' concentrations in the flue-
419 gas. All plants fulfilled the indications for NO_x , NH_3 , CO , SO_2 , HCl , dust, total volatile organic
420 compounds (TVOC), and polychlorinated dibenzodioxins and furans (PCDD/F). On the contrary,
421 only one ES reported monitoring N_2O emissions, even if requested explicitly by BAT4. As for the
422 other contaminants, 13 out of 15 ESs reported monitoring metals emissions, and 14 ESs HF, Hg,

423 and Benzo[a]Pyrene (BaP). While 6 ESs declared the implementation of advanced control systems
424 (BAT 15), no details about monitoring campaigns performed during the start-up and shut-down of
425 the incinerator (BAT 5) were provided, and this represents a remarkable gap: in fact, emissions to
426 air during other than normal operating conditions are a relevant issue, since emission peaks during
427 start-up and shut-down of WI plants have been observed for TVOC, CO, and HCl, and PCDD/F
428 emission loads equivalent to several months of normal operation have been associated to single cold
429 start events (Neuwahl et al., 2019).

430 About diffuse emissions, 7 ESs reported sufficient information about their containment from waste
431 storage (BAT 21) and 3 from slags and bottom ashes handling and treatment (BAT 24). All plants
432 declared to adopt at least one of the techniques indicated in BAT 29 for reducing NO_x, N₂O, and
433 CO emissions. 2 ESs did not mention any measure to minimize the slip of the NH₃ used for NO_x
434 removal. 6 ESs reported the implementation of FG recirculation technology (BAT 20), which can
435 further reduce NO_x emissions.

436 Regarding acid gas emissions (SO₂, HCl, and HF), all ESs reported at least one of the technologies
437 indicated in BAT 27, and 3 ESs also the automated dosage of reagents (BAT 28). All ESs
438 mentioned at least one of the techniques specified in BAT 25 and BAT 31 to reduce the channeled
439 emissions of dust, metals, and mercury. No ES reported complete information regarding extraction,
440 treatment, and analysis of air from the enclosed treatment of slags and bottom ashes (BAT 26),
441 while only 2 ESs declared the adoption of all the techniques required by BAT 30 to reduce
442 emissions of organic compounds, including PCDD/F and BaP. From the information in the ESs, it
443 was possible to deduce the compliance to at least one BAT for all the major air pollutants.

444 Exceptions were micropollutants such as TVOC, PCDD/F and BaP because BAT 30 requires the
445 application of a specific combination of techniques. This result, although based only on the data
446 included in the ESs, supports the findings of the study of Di Marco and Manuzzi (2018), which
447 highlighted that the 3 WI plants analyzed adopted the BATs to limit the emissions for each pollutant
448 of concern.

449

450 *3.5.2. Energy consumption, raw materials consumption, and waste production*

451 BAT compliance about energy and raw materials consumption, and waste production is detailed in
452 Table V of the Supplementary Materials. With regards to energy consumption, the BREF for WI
453 focuses on the ratio between consumed and produced energy, and on the production of electricity
454 and heat in relation to the treated waste mass. 14 out of 15 ESs reported sufficient information to
455 obtain the energy ratio. One ES reported the calculated gross electrical efficiency (BAT 2), while 13
456 ESs referred to at least one of the techniques prescribed in BAT 20 to increase the plant's energy
457 efficiency.


458 About waste production, all ESs mentioned the ratios between bottom/other ashes and treated
459 waste. These indicators were present 8 and 6 times, respectively, and were derivable 7 and 9 times.
460 However, the picture concerning other ashes management was uneven, partly because of the
461 conjunct analysis of the boiler and fly ashes, as they were mostly disposed of together. Furthermore,
462 different FGC technologies can lead to differences in the fly ashes composition and thus to the
463 European waste code definition. All plants complied with BAT 35, requiring separate handling and
464 treating of bottom ashes and FGC residues, and 8 ESs reported the adoption of at least one of the
465 bottom ash treatment techniques described in BAT 36.

466 Finally, considering raw materials' consumption, 4 ESs contained the necessary information to
467 derive the ratio between oil consumption and treated waste, and 3 ESs directly used that indicator.
468 In comparison, 13 ESs contained data to calculate the methane consumption to treated waste ratio,
469 and 3 ESs used that indicator. Concerning the reagents for the FGC, both the neutralizers and the
470 ammonia to treated waste ratio were reported 9 times. Sufficient data to calculate that indicator
471 were present 5 times. As previously stated, 3 ESs reported the automated dosage of the reagents
472 (BAT 28), thus limiting their consumption.

473

474 3.6. Comparison of plants' performances

475 Figure 2 presents the plants' performance scores for the 8 selected KPIs and the average
476 performance values calculated for the 15 WI plants over the period 2017 – 2019. Regarding
477 emissions to air (Figure 2A), most plants alternated performances above and below the sample
478 average for the 4 different pollutants. This result was expected as different contaminants are often
479 removed through separated FGC steps. Interestingly, few plants (4 out of 15) performed
480 significantly better than the sample average for all considered pollutants. In general, it was
481 impossible to identify the specific technical characteristics of the plants that led to these positive
482 results, although electrostatic precipitators' adoption significantly reduced the dust concentration in
483 the FG ($p = 0.004$, Welch t-test). Apart from water consumption, the performance scores related to
484 the other aspects exhibited less variance compared to air emissions (Figure 2B). Once again, few
485 plants outperformed the average score in all categories (of these, only the Acerra plant was also
486 among the outperformers in air emissions), but, again, no correlation with plants characteristics
487 could be clearly established, apart from lower performances in electricity production by WI plants
488 where heat production in co-generation was carried out (e.g., Como plant). Additionally, the plant
489 located in Terni exhibited excellent performance scores for electricity production and consumption
490 and the best ones related to water consumption and waste production. The Terni plant is
491 characterized by a specific feedstock, paper pulper, which led to a very low production of bottom
492 ashes and could have also influenced the excellent performances related to the other KPIs.
493 In Figure II in the Supplementary Material, the performance scores of the plants are plotted against
494 the budget allocated for the improvement of the respective environmental aspects. No significant
495 correlation was found between the two variables, although the plants that allocated the highest
496 budget to improve water consumption and waste production performed worse than the sample
497 average, probably indicating that significant investments were aimed at the improvement of poor
498 performances.



499 **Figure 2.** Performance scores of the analyzed WI plants related to: (A) emissions to air; (B) water
500 consumption, waste production and electricity production and consumption. Lower scores indicate
501 better performances and a score of 1 equals the sample average (reported in brackets). The energy
502 production values were inverted to assign lower scores to better performances.

503 The calculated average specific energy consumption was higher than the mass-weighted average
504 reported by Beylot et al. (2018) for WI plants in France (0.140 MWh/t compared to 0.104 MWh/t).
505 Although a significant correlation between the plants' size and the specific energy consumption was
506 excluded ($r(13) = 0.41$, $p = 0.12$), the mass-weighted average specific energy consumption of our
507 sample (0.123 MWh/t) was lower than the average but still higher than the value reported by Beylot
508 et al. (2018). The calculated average specific electricity production (0.676 MWh/t) confirms the
509 results of Sisani et al. (2022) based on data from 39 Italian WI plants (from 0.448 MWh/t to 0.766
510 MWh/t). Although the study highlighted the higher specific electricity production of WI plants with
511 higher waste treatment capacity, a significant correlation between those variables was excluded for
512 our sample ($r(13) = 0.39$, $p = 0.14$).

513

514 **4. Conclusions**

515 This study analyzed how the Italian WI plants registered to EMAS in 2020 report to the public
516 about their environmental sustainability. EMAS leads companies to disclose every year their
517 performance data in the ESs, a consistent source of independently verified and validated
518 information. Consequently, the novel methodological approach applied in the present study allowed
519 a quantitative analysis of the WI plants of the sample, and therefore, it could be applied to the
520 analysis of the environmental aspects and performances of other relevant industrial sectors.
521 From the selected ESs, a comprehensive set of 197 metrics and indicators used to measure the
522 environmental performances of WI plants was created. The indicators are related to 19 different
523 aspects, together with a list of 104 improvement objectives set by the companies of the sample with
524 an overall allocated budget of 79.8 M€ The obtained lists of environmental indicators and
525 improvement objectives can represent a useful reference for other companies of the WI sector
526 willing to assess their environmental performances, and implement an EMS. In some cases, the
527 number of indicators used was not directly related to the significance of the environmental aspect,

528 due to a specific commitment of the companies to keep under control aspects that can lead to a
529 significant reduction of operational costs (e.g., energy consumption). A subset of the collected
530 metrics, possibly more specifically linked to the emissions levels related to the BAT adoption, could
531 instead provide a more representative description of the environmental performances of this sector.
532 In this sense, a specific sectorial guideline issued by the EC on key metrics dedicated to EMAS
533 registered plants would represent a further step forward towards an even more transparent and
534 comparable environmental sustainability reporting. Most companies reported sufficient quantitative
535 data on key environmental performance indicators, thus allowing to identify the current
536 performance levels of the different plants in relation to air emissions (HCl, NO_x, CO, and dust flue-
537 gas concentrations) and water consumption, waste production, and electricity consumption and
538 production related to 1 ton of treated waste. However, no specific correlation was found between
539 plants' performances and budget allocated for the improvement of the environmental aspects. A
540 large portion (73 %) of the declared budget for improvement was attributed to expensive technical
541 interventions beneficial for the overall efficiency of the plant. These limitations did not allow to
542 clearly identify and quantify the direct influence of the EMS implementation on the improvement of
543 the environmental performances of the plants. Again, specific recommendations to EMAS
544 registered companies about drawing explicit links in the ESs between each action of the
545 environmental program and the expected environmental performance improvement, supported by
546 adequate metrics and quantitative data, would increase the transparency of information, thus
547 revealing the company's commitment and the environmental safeguard implications associated with
548 the allocated budget. The main limitations of the adopted methodology are that the sample size is
549 limited by the EMAS adoption rate in the WI sector and the short time spanned by the quantitative
550 data present in the ESs, which limits the ability to assess the statistical significance of correlations
551 and trends. Moreover, data interpretation may be limited by lacking descriptions of plants'
552 characteristics and features in the ESs.

553 In conclusion, the results of this study showed that the management approach required by EMAS
554 contributed to lead the analyzed WI plants to report to the public about their significant
555 commitments to: monitoring a vast number of environmental performance indicators; investing
556 relevant resources for their improvement, especially in relation to the aspects emissions to air,
557 energy and raw materials consumption, and waste production. EMAS can be considered a useful
558 tool for the WI sector to design and implement monitoring actions, to pursue the improvement of
559 environmental performances, and to transparently report and communicate validated data to the
560 stakeholders, contributing to raise the overall trust of the general public in the sector.

561

562 **Acknowledgments**

563 The authors declare no conflict of interest. The research received no specific funding. Authors'
564 contributions: Claudio Comoglio: conceptualization, methodology, supervision, writing – original
565 draft, writing- review & editing; Stefano Castelluccio: investigation, data curation, visualization,
566 writing - original draft; Anna Scarrone: investigation, data curation, visualization; Silvia Fiore:
567 methodology, supervision, writing – original draft, writing-review & editing.

568

569 **References**

- 570 1. Abis, M., Bruno, M., Kuchta, K., Simon, F.-G., Grönholm, R., Hoppe, M., Fiore, S., 2020.
571 Assessment of the Synergy between Recycling and Thermal Treatments in Municipal Solid
572 Waste Management in Europe. *Energies* 13, 6412. <https://doi.org/10.3390/en13236412>
- 573 2. Abuşoğlu, A., Özahi, E., İhsan Kutlar, A., Al-jaf, H., 2017. Life cycle assessment (LCA) of
574 digested sewage sludge incineration for heat and power production. *J. Clean. Prod.* 142, 1684–
575 1692. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.11.121>
- 576 3. Adeleke, O., Akinlabi, S.A., Jen, T.-C., Dunmade, I., 2022. Environmental impact assessment of
577 the current, emerging, and alternative waste management systems using life cycle assessment
578 tools: a case study of Johannesburg, South Africa. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* 29, 7366–7381.

- 579 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-16198-y>
- 580 4. Astrup, T., Muntoni, A., Poletini, A., Pomi, R., Gerven, T. Van, Van Zomeren, A., 2016.
- 581 Treatment and Reuse of Incineration Bottom Ash Chapter 24 -, Environmental Materials and
- 582 Waste. Elsevier Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-803837-6.00024-X>
- 583 5. Baxter, J., Ho, Y., Rollins, Y., Maclaren, V., 2016. Attitudes toward waste to energy facilities
- 584 and impacts on diversion in Ontario, Canada. *Waste Manage.* 50, 75–85.
- 585 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2016.02.017>
- 586 6. Beylot, A., Muller, S., Descat, M., Ménard, Y., Villeneuve, J., 2018. Life cycle assessment of the
- 587 French municipal solid waste incineration sector. *Waste Manage.* 80, 144–153.
- 588 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2018.08.037>
- 589 7. Beylot, A., Villeneuve, J., 2013. Environmental impacts of residual Municipal Solid Waste
- 590 incineration: A comparison of 110 French incinerators using a life cycle approach. *Waste*
- 591 *Manage.* 33, 2781–2788. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2013.07.003>
- 592 8. Blasenbauer, D., Huber, F., Lederer, J., Quina, M.J., Blanc-Biscarat, D., Bogush, A., Bontempi,
- 593 E., Blondeau, J., Chimenos, J.M., Dahlbo, H., Fagerqvist, J., Giro-Paloma, J., Hjelmar, O., Hyks,
- 594 J., Keaney, J., Lupsea-Toader, M., O’Caollai, C.J., Orupöld, K., Pająk, T., Simon, F.G., Svecova,
- 595 L., Šyc, M., Ulvang, R., Vaajasaari, K., Van Caneghem, J., van Zomeren, A., Vasarevičius, S.,
- 596 Wégner, K., Fellner, J., 2020. Legal situation and current practice of waste incineration bottom
- 597 ash utilisation in Europe. *Waste Manage.* 102, 868–883.
- 598 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2019.11.031>
- 599 9. Bruno, M., Abis, M., Kuchta, K., Simon, F-G., Gronholm, R., Hoppe, M., Fiore, S. 2021.
- 600 Material flow, economic and environmental assessment of municipal solid waste incineration
- 601 bottom ash recycling potential in Europe. *J. Clean. Prod.* 317, 128511, doi:
- 602 [10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.128511](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.128511)

- 603 10. Castelluccio, S., Comoglio, C., Fiore, S., 2022. Environmental Performance Reporting and
604 Assessment of the Biodegradable Waste Treatment Plants Registered to EMAS in Italy.
605 Sustainability 14, 7438. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14127438>
- 606 11. Cherubini, F.; Bargigli, S.; Ulgiati, S. 2009. Life cycle assessment (LCA) of waste management
607 strategies: Landfilling, sorting plants and incineration. Energy, 34, 2116–2123,
608 doi:10.1016/j.energy.2008.08.023.
- 609 12. Comoglio, C., Botta, S., 2012. The use of indicators and the role of environmental
610 management systems for environmental performances improvement: A survey on ISO 14001
611 certified companies in the automotive sector. J. Clean. Prod. 20, 92–102.
612 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2011.08.022>
- 613 13. Corsten, M., Worrell, E., Rouw, M., van Duin, A., 2013. The potential contribution of
614 sustainable waste management to energy use and greenhouse gas emission reduction in the
615 Netherlands. Resour. Conserv. Recycl. 77, 13–21.
616 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2013.04.002>
- 617 14. Daddi, T., Magistrelli, M., Frey, M., Iraldo, F., 2011. Do environmental management
618 systems improve environmental performance? Empirical evidence from Italian companies.
619 Environ. Dev. Sustain. 13, 845–862. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-011-9294-8>
- 620 15. Damgaard, A., Riber, C., Fruergaard, T., Hulgaard, T., Christensen, T.H., 2010. Life-cycle-
621 assessment of the historical development of air pollution control and energy recovery in waste
622 incineration. Waste Manage., IWWG Task Group on “Thermal Treatments” 30, 1244–1250.
623 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2010.03.025>
- 624 16. de Titto, E., Savino, A., 2019. Environmental and health risks related to waste incineration.
625 Waste Manag. Res. J. Int. Solid Wastes Public Clean. Assoc. ISWA 37, 976–986.
626 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734242X19859700>

- 627 17. Delacre, M., Lakens, D., Leys, C., 2017. Why Psychologists Should by Default Use Welch's
628 t-test Instead of Student's t-test. *Int. Rev. Soc. Psychol.* 30, 92–101.
629 <https://doi.org/10.5334/irsp.82>
- 630 18. Di Marco, G., Manuzzi, R., 2018. The recovery of waste and off-gas in Large Combustion
631 Plants subject to IPPC National Permit in Italy. *Waste Manage.* 73, 313–321.
632 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2017.08.005>
- 633 19. Di Maria, F., Mastrantonio, M., Uccelli, R., 2021. The life cycle approach for assessing the
634 impact of municipal solid waste incineration on the environment and on human health. *Sci. Total*
635 *Environ.* 776, 145785. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145785>
- 636 20. Erkkö, S., Melanen, M., Mickwitz, P., 2005. Eco-efficiency in the Finnish EMAS reports—a
637 buzz word? *J. Clean. Prod.* 13, 799–813. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2003.12.027>
- 638 21. Erses Yay, A.S., 2015. Application of life cycle assessment (LCA) for municipal solid waste
639 management: A case study of Sakarya. *J. Clean. Prod.* 94, 284–293.
640 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.01.089>
- 641 22. European Commission, 2006. Regulation (EC) N. 1893/2006. Establishing the statistical
642 classification of economic activities NACE Revision 2 and amending Council Regulation (EEC)
643 No 3037/90 as well as certain EC Regulations on specific statistical domains. *Official Journal of*
644 *the European Union*.
- 645 23. European Commission, 2009. Regulation (EC) N. 1221/2009 of the European Parliament
646 and of the Council of 25 November on the voluntary participation by organizations in a
647 community eco-management and audit scheme (EMAS). *Official Journal of the European Union*.
- 648 24. Fet, A.M., Knudson, H., 2017. Environmental management from a systems perspective, in:
649 Martin A., A. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Sustainable Technologies*. Elsevier Inc., pp. 165–173.
650 <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-409548-9.10050-8>

- 651 25. Garai, A., Sarkar, B., 2022. Economically independent reverse logistics of customer-centric
652 closed-loop supply chain for herbal medicines and biofuel. *J. Clean. Prod.* 334, 129977.
653 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.129977>
- 654 26. Giannetti, B.F., Agostinho, F., Eras, J.J.C., Yang, Z., Almeida, C.M.V.B., 2020. Cleaner
655 production for achieving the sustainable development goals. *J. Clean. Prod.* 271, 122127.
656 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.122127>
- 657 27. Havukainen, J., Zhan, M., Dong, J., Liikanen, M., Deviatkin, I., Li, X., Horttanainen, M.,
658 2017. Environmental impact assessment of municipal solid waste management incorporating
659 mechanical treatment of waste and incineration in Hangzhou, China. *J. Clean. Prod.* 141, 453–
660 461. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.09.146>
- 661 28. Heras-Saizarbitoria, I., García, M., Boiral, O., Díaz de Junguitu, A., 2020a. The use of eco-
662 efficiency indicators by environmental frontrunner companies. *Ecol. Indic.* 115, 106451.
663 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2020.106451>
- 664 29. Heras-Saizarbitoria, I., Boiral, O., Díaz de Junguitu, A., 2020b. Environmental management
665 certification and environmental performance: Greening or greenwashing? *Bus. Strat. Environ.*
666 29, 2829–2841. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2546>
- 667 30. Iosifov, V., Ratner, S., 2019. Environmental Management Systems and Environmental
668 Performance: The Case of Russian Energy Sector. *J. Environ. Manag. Tour.* 9, 1377–1388.
669 [https://doi.org/10.14505//jemt.v9.7\(31\).02](https://doi.org/10.14505//jemt.v9.7(31).02)
- 670 31. ISO, 2015. ISO 14001:2015. Environmental management systems. Requirements with
671 guidance for use, 3rd ed.
- 672 32. ISPRA, 2021. List of organizations registered to EMAS [WWW Document]. Istituto
673 Superiore per la Protezione e la Ricerca Ambientale. URL
674 [https://www.isprambiente.gov.it/it/attivita/certificazioni/emas/elenco-organizzazioni-registrate-](https://www.isprambiente.gov.it/it/attivita/certificazioni/emas/elenco-organizzazioni-registrate-emas)
675 [emas](https://www.isprambiente.gov.it/it/attivita/certificazioni/emas/elenco-organizzazioni-registrate-emas) (accessed 8/11/2021). *In Italian.*

- 676 33. ISPRA, 2020. Report on the management of municipal solid waste- 2020 Edition
677 (331/2020). Istituto Superiore per la Protezione e la Ricerca Ambientale, Roma, IT. URL:
678 [https://www.isprambiente.gov.it/files2020/pubblicazioni/rapporti/rapportorifiutiurbani_ed-](https://www.isprambiente.gov.it/files2020/pubblicazioni/rapporti/rapportorifiutiurbani_ed-2020_n-331-1.pdf)
679 [2020_n-331-1.pdf](https://www.isprambiente.gov.it/files2020/pubblicazioni/rapporti/rapportorifiutiurbani_ed-2020_n-331-1.pdf) (accessed 8/11/2021). *In Italian*.
- 680 34. Istrate, I.R., Iribarren, D., Gálvez-Martos, J.L., Dufour, J. 2020. Review of life-cycle
681 environmental consequences of waste-to-energy solutions on the municipal solid waste
682 management system. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* 157, 104778, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2015.06.021
- 683 35. Jia, D., Li, X., Shen, Z., 2022. Robust optimization model of waste transfer station location
684 considering existing facility adjustment. *J. Clean. Prod.* 340, 130827.
685 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.130827>
- 686 36. Johnstone, L., Hallberg, P., 2020. ISO 14001 adoption and environmental performance in
687 small to medium sized enterprises. *J. Environ. Manage.* 266, 110592.
688 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.110592>
- 689 37. Khandelwal, H., Dhar, H., Thalla, A.K., Kumar, S., 2019. Application of life cycle
690 assessment in municipal solid waste management: A worldwide critical review. *J. Clean. Prod.*
691 209, 630–654. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.10.233>
- 692 38. Liu, Y., Xu, M., Ge, Y., Cui, C., Xia, B., Skitmore, M., 2021. Influences of environmental
693 impact assessment on public acceptance of waste-to-energy incineration projects. *J. Clean. Prod.*
694 304, 127062. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.127062>
- 695 39. Margallo, M., Taddei, M.B.M., Hernández-Pellón, A., Aldaco, R., Irabien, Á., 2015.
696 Environmental sustainability assessment of the management of municipal solid waste
697 incineration residues: a review of the current situation. *Clean Technol. Environ. Policy* 17, 1333–
698 1353. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10098-015-0961-6>
- 699 40. Marrucci, L., Daddi, T., 2022. The contribution of the Eco-Management and Audit Scheme
700 to the environmental performance of manufacturing organisations. *Bus. Strategy Environ.* 31,
701 1347–1357. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2958>

- 702 41. Martín-Peña, M.L., Díaz-Garrido, E., Sánchez-López, J.M., 2014. Analysis of benefits and
703 difficulties associated with firms' Environmental Management Systems: The case of the Spanish
704 automotive industry. *J. Clean. Prod.* 70, 220–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.01.085>
- 705 42. Moon, I., Yun, W.Y., Sarkar, B. 2022. Effects of variable setup cost, reliability, and
706 production costs under controlled carbon emissions in a reliable production system. *European J.*
707 *of Industrial Engineering (EJIE)*, Vol. 16, No. 4, 2022, doi: 10.1504/EJIE.2022.123748
- 708 43. Munir, M.T., Mohaddespour, A., Nasr, A.T., Carter, S., 2021. Municipal solid waste-to-
709 energy processing for a circular economy in New Zealand. *Renew. Sust. Energ. Rev.* 145,
710 111080. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2021.111080>
- 711 44. Murmura, F., Liberatore, L., Bravi, L., Casolani, N., 2018. Evaluation of Italian Companies'
712 Perception About ISO 14001 and Eco Management and Audit Scheme III: Motivations, Benefits
713 and Barriers. *J. Clean. Prod.* 174, 691–700. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.10.337>
- 714 45. Neuwahl, F., Cusano, G., Benadives, J.G., Holbrook, S., Serge, R., 2019. Best Available
715 Techniques (BAT) Reference Document for Waste Treatment Industries.
716 <https://doi.org/10.2760/761437>
- 717 46. Olofsson, J., Börjesson, P., 2018. Residual biomass as resource – Life-cycle environmental
718 impact of wastes in circular resource systems. *J. Clean. Prod.* 196, 997–1006.
719 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.06.115>
- 720 47. Petrosillo, I., De Marco, A., Botta, S., Comoglio, C., 2012. EMAS in local authorities:
721 Suitable indicators in adopting environmental management systems. *Ecol. Indic.* 13, 263–274.
722 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2011.06.011>
- 723 48. Pujara, Y., Pathak, P., Sharma, A., Govani, J., 2019. Review on Indian Municipal Solid
724 Waste Management practices for reduction of environmental impacts to achieve sustainable
725 development goals. *J. Environ. Manage.* 248, 109238.
726 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.07.009>

- 727 49. Rodrigues, A.P., Fernandes, M.L., Rodrigues, M.F.F., Bortoluzzi, S.C., Gouvea da Costa,
728 S.E., Pinheiro de Lima, E., 2018. Developing criteria for performance assessment in municipal
729 solid waste management. *J. Clean. Prod.* 186, 748–757.
730 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.03.067>
- 731 50. Russo, M.V., 2009. Explaining the impact of ISO 14001 on emission performance: a
732 dynamic capabilities perspective on process and learning. *Bus. Strategy Environ.* 18, 307–319.
733 <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.587>
- 734 51. Sarkar, B., Sarkar, M., Ganguly, B., Cárdenas-Barrón, L.E., 2021. Combined effects of
735 carbon emission and production quality improvement for fixed lifetime products in a sustainable
736 supply chain management. *Int. J. Prod. Econ.* 231, 107867.
737 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2020.107867>
- 738 52. Sarkar, M.; Chung, B.D. 2021. Effect of Renewable Energy to Reduce Carbon Emissions
739 under a Flexible Production System: A Step Toward Sustainability. *Energies*, 14, 215.
740 <https://doi.org/10.3390/en14010215>
- 741 53. Sarkar, M., Seo, Y.W., 2021. Renewable energy supply chain management with flexibility
742 and automation in a production system. *J. Clean. Prod.* 324, 129149.
743 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.129149>
- 744 54. Sarkar, B., Debnath, A., Chiu, A.S.F., Ahmed, W., 2022a. Circular economy-driven two-
745 stage supply chain management for nullifying waste. *J. Clean. Prod.* 339, 130513.
746 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.130513>
- 747 55. Sarkar, B., Mridha, B., Pareek, S., 2022b. A sustainable smart multi-type biofuel
748 manufacturing with the optimum energy utilization under flexible production, *Journal of Cleaner*
749 *Production*, 332, 129869, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.129869>
- 750 56. Sarkar, B., Ullah, M., Sarkar, M., 2022c. Environmental and economic sustainability
751 through innovative green products by remanufacturing. *J. Clean. Prod.* 332, 129813.
752 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.129813>

- 753 57. Sharma, H.B., Vanapalli, K.R., Samal, B., Cheela, V.R.S., Dubey, B.K., Bhattacharya, J.,
754 2021. Circular economy approach in solid waste management system to achieve UN-SDGs:
755 Solutions for post-COVID recovery. *Sci. Total Environ.* 800, 149605.
756 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.149605>
- 757 58. Sisani, F., Maalouf, A., Di Maria, F., 2022. Environmental and energy performances of the
758 Italian municipal solid waste incineration system in a life cycle perspective. *Waste Manag. Res.*
759 *J. Sustain. Circ. Econ.* 40, 218–226. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734242X211003946>
- 760 59. Smejkalová, V., Šomplák, R., Nevrlý, V., Burcin, B., Kučera, T., 2020. Trend forecasting
761 for waste generation with structural break. *J. Clean. Prod.* 266, 121814.
762 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.121814>
- 763 60. Somorin, T.O., Adesola, S., Kolawole, A., 2017. State-level assessment of the waste-to-
764 energy potential (via incineration) of municipal solid wastes in Nigeria. *J. Clean. Prod.* 164, 804–
765 815. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.06.228>
- 766 61. Subiza-Pérez, M., Marina, L.S., Irizar, A., Gallastegi, M., Anabitarte, A., Urbieta, N.,
767 Babarro, I., Molinuevo, A., Vozmediano, L., Ibarluzea, J., 2020. Explaining social acceptance of
768 a municipal waste incineration plant through sociodemographic and psycho-environmental
769 variables. *Environ. Pollut.* 263, 114504. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2020.114504>
- 770 62. Tait, P.W., Brew, J., Che, A., Costanzo, A., Danyluk, A., Davis, M., Khalaf, A., McMahon,
771 K., Watson, A., Rowcliff, K., Bowles, D., 2020. The health impacts of waste incineration: a
772 systematic review. *Aust. N. Z. J. Public Health* 44, 40–48. [https://doi.org/10.1111/1753-](https://doi.org/10.1111/1753-6405.12939)
773 [6405.12939](https://doi.org/10.1111/1753-6405.12939)
- 774 63. Testa, F., Rizzi, F., Daddi, T., Gusmerotti, N.M., Frey, M., Iraldo, F., 2014. EMAS and ISO
775 14001: the differences in effectively improving environmental performance. *J. Clean. Prod.* 68,
776 165–173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.12.061>

- 777 64. Tomić, T., Schneider, D.R., 2018. The role of energy from waste in circular economy and
778 closing the loop concept – Energy analysis approach. *Renewable Sustainable Energy Rev.* 98,
779 268–287. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2018.09.029>
- 780 65. Tsalis, T.A., Nikolaou, I.E., Konstantakopoulou, F., Zhang, Y., Evangelinos, K.I., 2020.
781 Evaluating the corporate environmental profile by analyzing corporate social responsibility
782 reports. *Econ. Anal. Policy* 66, 63–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eap.2020.02.009>
- 783 66. Yu, M., Bai, B., Xiong, S., Liao, X., 2021. Evaluating environmental impacts and economic
784 performance of remanufacturing electric vehicle lithium-ion batteries. *J. Clean. Prod.* 321,
785 128935. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.128935>
- 786 67. Zhang, J., Qin, Q., Li, G., Tseng, C.H., 2021. Sustainable municipal waste management
787 strategies through life cycle assessment method: A review. *J. Environ. Manage.* 287, 112238.
788 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2021.112238>
- 789

790 **Supplementary Materials**

791

792 **Figure I.** Geographical distribution of the Italian Waste to Energy plants: EMAS registered (in
793 blue) and the others (in grey).



794

795

796

797 **Table I.** List of the environmental indicators and related aspects reported in the Environmental
798 Statements (ES). The indicators marked with (*) are static parameters describing the characteristics
799 of the plants.

Aspect	Indicator	Unit	No. of ES
Emissions to Air	Mean monthly concentrations of pollutants emitted to air	mg/Nm ³	2
	- NO _x		2
	- SO ₂		2
	- Dust		2
	- HCl		2
	- HF		1
	- CO		3
	- TOC		2
	- NH ₃		2
	Total annual mass of pollutants emitted to air	t	14
	- NO _x		12
	- SO ₂		5
	- SO _x		7
	- Dust		12
	- HCl		12
	- HF		8
	- CO		12
	- TOC		12
	- NH ₃		6
	- Hg		5
	- Zn		1
	- Cd + Tl		3
	- Ni		1
	- Other metals		3
	- PCDD/F		7
	- PCB		1
	- PAH		6
	- PM _{2.5}		1
	Total annual CO ₂ mass emitted to air	t	12
	Total annual CO ₂ mass emitted to air by source	t	3
	- From burning fossil fraction of waste		1
	- From burning municipal waste's fossil fraction		1
- From burning municipal waste's biogenic fraction		1	
- From burning special waste's fossil fraction		1	
- From burning special waste's biogenic fraction		1	
- From auxiliary boiler		2	
Total annual greenhouse gas mass emitted to air	t	4	
Total annual greenhouse gas mass emitted to air by source	t	3	
- From auxiliary boiler		1	

- Due to N ₂ O		2
- Due to N ₂ O from the fossil fraction of the waste		1
- Due to N ₂ O from biogenic fraction of waste		1
- Due to N ₂ O from auxiliary boiler		1
- Due to CH ₄		1
- Due to CH ₄ from the fossil fraction of the waste		1
- Due to CH ₄ from biogenic fraction of waste		1
- Due to CH ₄ from auxiliary boiler		1
- Not due to CO ₂		2
Total annual mass of pollutants emitted to air per produced energy	t/MWh	6
- NO _x		6
- SO ₂		4
- SO _x		2
- Dust		6
- HCl		6
- HF		3
- CO		6
- TOC		6
- NH ₃		5
- Hg		2
- Cd + Tl		1
- Other metals		1
- PCDD/F		2
- DL PCB		1
- PAH		2
- PM ₁₀		1
- PM _{2.5}		1
Total annual CO ₂ mass emitted to air per produced energy	t/MWh	5
Total annual CO ₂ mass emitted to air per produced energy by source	t/MWh	1
- From burning fossil fraction of waste		1
CO ₂ emissions into the atmosphere avoided	t	2
Mean annual concentrations of pollutants emitted to air	mg/Nm ³	15
- NO _x		14
- SO ₂		9
- SO _x		5
- Dust		13
- HCl		14
- HF		11
- CO		14
- TOC		13
- NH ₃		14
- Hg		13
- Zn		4
- Cd + Tl		10
- Ni		1

- Other metals		10
- PCDD/F		14
- PCB		6
- DL PCB		3
- PAH		12
- PM ₁₀		2
- PM _{2.5}		1
N. of continuous monitoring campaigns	-	1
Flue-gas flow rate	Nm ³ /h	4
Mean oxygen concentration in the flue-gas	%	1
Mean water vapor content in the flue-gas	%	1
Mean annual CO ₂ concentration emitted to air	%	4
Total annual mass of pollutants emitted to air per treated waste	t/t	11
- NO _x		11
- SO ₂		7
- SO _x		4
- Dust		11
- HCl		11
- HF		5
- CO		11
- TOC		11
- NH ₃		8
- Hg		8
- Zn		1
- Cd + Tl		3
- Other metals		3
- PCDD/F		5
- PCB		1
- PAH		6
Total annual CO ₂ mass emitted to air per treated waste	t/t	7
Total annual CO ₂ mass emitted to air per treated waste by source	t/t	1
- From burning fossil fraction of waste		1
- From combustion biogenic fraction of municipal waste per treated municipal waste		1
- From combustion of the fossil fraction of special waste per treated special waste		1
- From combustion of the biogenic fraction of special waste per treated special waste		1
- From auxiliary boiler		1
Total annual greenhouse gas mass emitted to air per treated waste	t/t	4
Total annual greenhouse gas mass emitted to air per treated waste by source	t/t	2
- Due to N ₂ O		1
- Due to N ₂ O from the fossil fraction of the waste		1
- Due to N ₂ O from biogenic fraction of waste		1
- Due to CH ₄		1

- Due to CH ₄ from the fossil fraction of the waste		1
- Due to CH ₄ from biogenic fraction of waste		1
Total annual avoided greenhouse gas emissions per treated waste	t/t	3
Total annual avoided greenhouse gas emissions per produced energy	t/MWh	1
Total annual avoided greenhouse gas emissions	t	2
Total annual avoided greenhouse gas emissions by source	t	1
- For the production of electricity		1
- For district heating		1
- For disposal in landfills		1
N. of days of instrumentation unavailability per year	-	1
N. of unavailable half-hourly detections per year	-	1
N. of detections above the emission limit per year	-	4
N. of detections above the emission limit for each contaminant per year	-	1
- NO _x		1
- SO _x		1
- Dust		1
- HCl		1
- HF		1
- CO		1
- TOC		1
- Hg		1
- Other metals		1
- PCDD/F		1
- PAH		1
Mean annual concentrations of pollutants emitted to air as a percentage of the authorized limits	%	5
- NO _x		5
- SO ₂		4
- SO _x		1
- Dust		5
- HCl		5
- HF		2
- CO		5
- TOC		5
- NH ₃		5
- Hg		4
- Cd + Tl		1
- Other metals		2
- PCDD/F		4
- DL PCB		1
- PAH		2
Greenhouse gas emissions balance	t	1
Mean annual concentrations of pollutants emitted to air per flue-gas flow rate	kg/Nm ³ /h	1
- NO _x		1

- SO ₂			1
- Dust			1
- HCl			1
- HF			1
- CO			1
- TOC			1
- NH ₃			1
- Hg			1
- Cd + Tl			1
- Other metals			1
- PCDD/F			1
- PAH			1
Total annual avoided emissions of contaminants with high acidification potential per treated waste	kg/t		1
Total annual avoided emissions of contaminants with high acidification potential	t		1
Total annual mass of refrigerant gas topped up by type	kg		1
- R410 refrigerant gas topped up			1
- R470C refrigerant gas topped up			1
Waste	Total annual mass of waste produced	t	15
Production	Total annual mass of waste produced per typology	t	15
	- EWC 06 05 03		1
	- EWC 15 01 02		1
	- EWC 16 10 02		1
	- EWC 17 04 05		2
	- EWC 19 01 02		5
	- EWC 19 01 12		14
	- EWC 19 07 03		1
	- EWC 19 08 14		2
	- EWC 19 12 02		1
	- EWC 19 12 03		1
	- EWC 19 12 12		1
	- EWC 20 01 01		1
	- EWC 20 03 04		1
	- EWC 20 03 07		1
	- EWC 13 02 05*		1
	- EWC 13 02 08*		2
	- EWC 15 02 02*		2
	- EWC 16 11 05*		1
	- EWC 19 01 05*		8
	- EWC 19 01 06*		4
	- EWC 19 01 07*		2
	- EWC 19 01 11*		2
	- EWC 19 01 13*		7
	- EWC 19 01 15*		2
	- EWC 19 02 05*		1
	- EWC 19 08 13*		2

- Process waste		4
- Waste produced by maintenance or auxiliary activities		3
- Others dangerous		2
- Others not dangerous		3
Total annual mass of non-hazardous waste produced	t	5
Total annual mass of hazardous waste produced	t	7
Total annual mass of non-hazardous waste produced as a percentage of total annual mass of waste produced	%	1
Total annual mass of hazardous waste produced as a percentage of total annual mass of waste produced	%	1
Total annual mass of waste produced per produced energy	t/MWh	5
Total annual mass of waste produced per typology per produced energy	t/MWh	3
- EWC 19 01 12		3
- EWC 19 12 12		1
- EWC 19 01 05*		2
- EWC 19 01 11*		2
- EWC 19 01 13*		2
- EWC 19 01 15*		1
- Others dangerous		1
- Others not dangerous		1
Total annual mass of hazardous waste produced per produced energy	t/MWh	1
Total annual mass of waste produced per treated waste	t/t, m ³ /m ³	7
Mass of waste produced per typology per total annual mass of produced waste	t/t	11
- EWC 06 05 03		1
- EWC 17 04 05		1
- EWC 19 01 02		2
- EWC 19 01 12		8
- EWC 19 12 02		1
- EWC 19 12 03		1
- EWC 15 02 02*		1
- EWC 19 01 05*		3
- EWC 19 01 07*		1
- EWC 19 01 13*		4
- EWC 19 01 15*		1
- EWC 19 02 05*		1
- EWC 19 08 13*		2
- Process waste		3
- Waste produced by maintenance or auxiliary activities		1
Total annual mass of non-hazardous waste produced per treated waste	t/t	5

	Total annual mass of hazardous waste produced per treated waste	t/t	6
	Total annual mass of waste sent to recycling per treated waste	%	2
	Total annual mass of waste sent to disposal per treated waste	%	2
	Total annual mass of waste sent to recycling per produced energy	t/GWh	1
	Total annual mass of waste sent to recycling	t	12
	Total annual mass of waste recycled per typology	t	8
	- EWC 19 01 02		4
	- EWC 19 01 12		6
	- EWC 20 03 07		1
	- EWC 19 01 05*		3
	- EWC 19 01 06*		2
	- EWC 19 01 07*		1
	- EWC 19 01 13*		1
	- EWC 19 01 15*		1
	- Other waste		1
	Total annual mass of waste sent to disposal	t	8
	Total annual mass of waste disposed per typology	t	4
	- EWC 19 01 02		1
	- EWC 19 01 12		3
	- EWC 20 03 07		1
	- EWC 19 01 05*		2
	- EWC 19 01 06*		3
	- EWC 19 01 07*		1
	- EWC 19 01 13*		1
	- EWC 19 01 15*		1
	- EWC 19 02 05*		1
	Total annual mass of waste recycled per total annual waste produced	%	3
	Total annual mass of waste recycled per total annual waste produced per typology	%	1
	- EWC 19 01 12		1
	- EWC 19 01 05*		1
	Total annual mass of waste disposed per total annual waste produced	%	2
Raw	Total annual reagents consumption	t	15
Materials	- Hydrochloric acid		6
Consumption	- Sodium hydroxide		10
	- Sodium hydroxide for physical chemical plant		1
	- Ferric chloride		3
	- Acetic acid		1
	- Lime		8
	- Ammonia		9
	- Activated carbon		14
	- Sodium bicarbonate		12
	- Sulfuric acid		6
	- Flocculant		1

- Sorbalite	2	
- Sodium hypochlorite	4	
- Ferrous sulphate	1	
- Sulfamic acid	1	
- Phosphate and O ₂ reducer	1	
- Polymers	1	
- Antiscalant	1	
- Polyelectrolyte	1	
- Oils	2	
- Urea	7	
- Glycol	1	
- Anticorrosive	1	
- Antiscalants and anticorrosives	1	
- Deoxygenating	2	
- Alkalizing	1	
- Sequestering agent	1	
- Citric acid	1	
- Thermal cycle additives	1	
- Total	3	
Total annual reagents consumption per produced energy	t/MWh	6
- Hydrochloric acid	4	
- Sodium hydroxide	5	
- Ferric chloride	1	
- Acetic acid	1	
- Lime	3	
- Ammonia	5	
- Activated carbon	6	
- Sodium bicarbonate	4	
- Sulfuric acid	2	
- Flocculant	1	
- Sodium hypochlorite	1	
- Urea	3	
- Citric acid	1	
Total annual reagents consumption per treated waste	kg/t, l/t	10
- Hydrochloric acid	2	
- Sodium hydroxide	4	
- Ferric chloride	1	
- Lime	4	
- Ammonia	6	
- Activated carbon	9	
- Sodium bicarbonate	9	
- Sulfuric acid	3	
- Flocculant	1	
- Sorbalite	1	
- Phosphate and O ₂ reducer	1	
- Urea	4	
- Total	1	

Water	Total annual water consumption	m ³	14
Consumption	Total annual water consumption per source	m ³	10
	- Aqueduct		10
	- Well		6
	- Demineralization plant		1
	- Recovered from external plant		1
	- Rainwater		4
	- Shallow waters		1
	- Recovered		1
	- Total water withdrawn		1
	Total annual water consumption per use	m ³	2
	- Demineralized water		1
	- Industrial uses and fire-fighting services		1
	- Services		1
	- Evaporative towers		2
	- Irrigation and services		1
	Total annual water consumption per produced energy	m ³ /GWh	6
	Total annual water consumption per produced energy per source	m ³ /MWh	2
	- Aqueduct		2
	- Well		2
	- Demineralization plant		1
	- Recovered from external plant		1
	- Rainwater		1
	- Recovered		1
	- Total water withdrawn		1
	Total annual water consumption per treated waste	m ³ /t	11
	Total annual water consumption per treated waste per source	m ³ /t	3
	- Aqueduct		3
- Demineralization plant		1	
Percentage of annual water consumption per source	%	2	
- Aqueduct		1	
- Recovered		1	
Percentage of the recovered first flush from impermeable surfaces	%	1	
Percentage of annual water consumption per use	%	1	
- Services		1	
- Evaporative towers		1	
Waste Treated	Total annual amount of treated waste	t	14
	Total annual amount of treated waste per typology	t, %	11
	- Urban and special waste		2
	- Hazardous medical waste		1
	- Drugs		1
	- Urban waste and similar		2
	- Urban waste		3
	- Hazardous urban waste		1

- Non-hazardous municipal waste			1
- Special waste similar to urban waste			1
- Special hazardous waste			1
- Special non-hazardous waste			1
- Special waste			1
- Medical waste			3
- Sludge			1
- SRF			1
- Biomass waste			1
- Bulky waste			1
- Biodegradable waste			1
- Other special waste			1
- Plastic waste			1
- Cellulosic waste			1
- Inert			1
- Remains of sorting			1
- Organic material			1
- Metal waste			1
- Undercut			1
- Unusable rejects			1
- RDF			1
- RDF and SRF			1
- EWC 03 03 07			1
Total annual amount of waste diverted to other plants due to plant shutdown	t		1
Total annual amount of treated waste per produced energy	t/MWh		3
Total annual amount of treated waste per produced energy per typology	t/MWh		1
- RDF and SRF			1
Checked waste loads as a percentage of the total	%		1
Rejected waste loads as a percentage of the total	%		1
Energy Consumption	Total annual electricity consumption	MWh	10
	Total annual renewable electricity consumption	MWh	3
	Total annual electricity consumption per produced energy	MWh/MWh	7
	Total annual electricity consumption per treated waste	MWh/t	8
	Total annual renewable electricity consumption per treated waste	MWh/t	3
	Total annual renewable electricity consumption per produced energy	MWh/MWh	2
	Total annual energy savings	toe	2
	Total annual energy consumption	MWh	6
	Total annual renewable energy consumption	%	2
	Total annual energy consumption per treated waste	toe/t	1
	Energy efficiency index Directive 2008/98/EC	-	6
	Total annual self-produced electricity consumption	MWh	10
	Total annual electricity consumption from the grid	MWh	7
	Total annual heat consumption	MWh	1

Total annual heat consumption per produced energy	MWh/MWh	1
Total annual renewable heat consumption	MWh	1
Total annual renewable heat consumption per produced energy	MWh	1
Total annual self-produced heat consumption	toe	1
Total annual electricity consumption per total annual energy consumption	%	1
Total annual renewable electricity consumption per total annual energy consumption	%	1
Total annual self-produced electricity consumption per produced energy	%	1
Total annual self-produced electricity consumption per treated waste	MWh/t	1
Total annual energy savings per treated waste	toe/t	1
Total annual energy savings per produced energy	toe/MWh	1
Total annual energy losses	MWh	1
Total annual oil consumption	t	7
Total annual oil consumption by use	t	4
- Automotive		2
- Burners		2
- Warm up		1
- Generating set		1
- Vehicles		1
- Ovens		1
Total annual methane consumption	t, Sm ³	13
Total annual methane consumption by use	t	4
- Burners		2
- Catalyst		2
- Warm up		1
Total annual methane consumption per total introduced energy	-	1
Total annual methane consumption per produced energy	MWh/MWh	4
Total annual oil consumption per produced energy	MWh/MWh	1
Total annual methane consumption per treated waste	Sm ³ /t	4
Total annual methane consumption per treated waste by use	Sm ³ /t	2
- Burners		1
- Catalyst		1
- Warm up		1
Total annual methane consumption per produced energy	l/t	3
Total annual oil consumption per treated waste	l/t	2
Total annual oil consumption per treated waste by use	l/t	2
- Generating set		1
- Vehicles		1
- Ovens		1

	Total annual mass of combusted fossil fuel avoided by waste incineration	toe, t	2
	Total annual methane consumption per total annual energy consumption	%	1
	Total annual oil consumption per total annual energy consumption	%	1
	Total annual fuel consumption	toe	1
Impact on Biodiversity	Total site area (*)	m ²	13
	Total site area per use (*)	m ²	12
	- Total green spaces area		9
	- Total covered area		5
	- Total impermeable covered area		1
	- Total uncovered area		1
	- Total impermeable uncovered area		5
	- Total permeable uncovered area		1
	- Total impermeable area		5
	- Total built-up area		5
	- Total area subject to planting		1
	- Total site area dedicated to waste storage		1
	- Total site area dedicated to parking		1
	Total site area per produced energy	m ² /MWh	4
	Total site area per produced energy per typology	m ² /MWh	3
	- Total impermeable area per produced energy		1
	- Total built-up area per produced energy		2
	Total site area per treated waste	m ² /t	2
	Total site area per treated waste per typology	m ² /t	2
	- Total green spaces area per treated waste		1
	- Total green spaces area outside the site per treated waste		1
	- Total impermeable area per treated waste		2
	Specific areas per total site area (*)	%	4
	- Total green spaces area per total site area		3
	- Total impermeable area per total site area		2
	- Total area subject to planting per total site area		1
	- Total site area dedicated to waste storage per total site area		1
Releases to Water	Total annual wastewater volume produced	m ³	5
	Total annual municipal wastewater volume produced by source	m ³	1
	- For washing fumes, industrial and from well cleaning		1
	- From slag cooling		1
	Mean daily flow rate of the water discharges	m ³ /d	3
	- Mean daily flow rate of the water discharges per receptor		2
	- Sewer		2
	Total annual wastewater volume per produced energy	m ³ /MWh	1
	Total annual wastewater volume per treated waste	m ³ /t	2
	Total annual wastewater volume	m ³	4

Total annual wastewater volume per receptor	m ³	4
- Surface waters		3
- Sewer		3
Total annual industrial wastewater volume produced	m ³	2
Total annual municipal wastewater volume produced	m ³	1
Total annual industrial wastewater volume sent to treatment	m ³	1
Total annual industrial wastewater volume reused as process water	m ³	1
Total annual industrial wastewater volume entered in the district heating network	m ³	1
Annual blow-down volume from evaporative towers	m ³	1
Mean annual concentrations of pollutants released to water	Various	8
- pH		2
- Suspension solids		4
- BOD ₅		1
- COD		4
- Aluminum		1
- Arsenic		1
- Boron		1
- Cadmium		1
- Cyanides		1
- Chlorides		5
- Total chromium		3
- Chromium VI		1
- Iron		5
- Phosphorus		1
- Manganese		3
- Mercury		4
- N-Ammonia		5
- Nickel		3
- N-Nitric		4
- N-Nitrous		2
- Lead		2
- Copper		2
- Selenium		1
- Sulphates		4
- Sulphites		1
- Sulphides		1
- Zinc		2
- Total hydrocarbons		3
- PAH		1
- PCDD/F		1
- Chlorinated solvents		1
- Aromatic organic solvents		1
- Organic nitrogen solvents		1

- Surfactants		2
Mean annual concentrations of pollutants released to surface water	Various	2
- pH		1
- Temperature		1
- Color		1
- Coarse material		1
- Suspension solids		1
- BOD ₅		1
- COD		1
- Arsenic		1
- Barium		1
- Boron		1
- Cadmium		1
- Chlorides		1
- Total chromium		1
- Chromium VI		1
- Iron		1
- Phosphorus		1
- Manganese		1
- Mercury		1
- N-Ammonia		1
- Nickel		1
- N-Nitric		2
- N-Nitrous		1
- N-Total		1
- Lead		1
- Copper		1
- Selenium		1
- Tin		1
- Thallium		1
- Zinc		1
- Escherichia Coli count		1
- Fats and oils		1
- Total hydrocarbons		1
- Pesticides		1
- Toxicity Assay - Daphnia Magna		1
- Surfactants		1
Maximum annual concentrations of pollutants discharged to the drainage system	Various	1
- Cadmium		1
- Total chromium		1
- Nickel		1
- Lead		1
- Copper		1
- Zinc		1
Maximum annual concentrations of pollutants discharged to the drainage system as percentage of the authorized limits	%	3

- Suspension solids		1
- BOD ₅		1
- COD		1
- Chlorides		2
- Total chromium		1
- Iron		2
- Manganese		2
- Mercury		2
- N-Ammonia		3
- Nickel		2
- N-Nitric		2
- N-Nitrous		2
- Sulphates		2
- Total hydrocarbons		1
Mean annual concentrations of pollutants discharged with grey water	Various	1
- pH		1
- Suspension solids		1
- BOD ₅		1
- COD		1
- Chlorides		1
- N-Ammonia		1
- N-Nitric		1
- N-Nitrous		1
- Zinc		1
Mean annual concentrations of pollutants discharged with black water	Various	1
- pH		1
- Suspension solids		1
- BOD ₅		1
- COD		1
- Chlorides		1
- N-Ammonia		1
- N-Nitric		1
- N-Nitrous		1
- Zinc		1
Mean annual concentrations of pollutants discharged with grey water as percentage of the authorized limits	%	1
- pH		1
- Suspension solids		1
- BOD ₅		1
- COD		1
- Chlorides		1
- N-Ammonia		1
- N-Nitric		1
- N-Nitrous		1
- Zinc		1

	Mean annual concentrations of pollutants discharged with black water as percentage of the authorized limits	%	1
	- pH		1
	- Suspension solids		1
	- BOD ₅		1
	- COD		1
	- Chlorides		1
	- N-Ammonia		1
	- N-Nitric		1
	- N-Nitrous		1
	- Zinc		1
Risk of Env. Accidents	Total annual number of emergency events	-	8
	Total annual number of injuries	-	1
	Injury frequency index	-	1
	Days of absence of personnel due to accidents	d	1
	Injury severity index	-	1
Stakeholder Engagement	Total annual number of visits to the site	-	4
	Total annual number of organized initiatives	-	4
	N. initiatives per typology	-	3
	- Meetings		3
	- Conferences and events		3
	- Focus groups		3
	- Committee or work groups		3
	Total annual number of visitors	-	3
	Total annual number of visitors per typology	-	1
	- N. of students or teachers visitors		1
	- N. of other visitors		1
	Total annual number of surveys	-	3
	Total number of website views	-	1
	Total number of website views advanced	-	1
	- N. of unique page views		1
	- N. of accesses		1
	- Bounce rate		1
	Annual average time on website	min	1
	Annual increase in organized initiatives	%	1
	Annual increase in visits to the plant	%	1
	Total annual number of received complaints and reports	-	1
Noise	Maximum noise levels at the plant's boundaries	dB	7
	Maximum noise levels at sensitive receptors	dB	7
	Noise exposition levels per worker task	dB	1
Energy Production	Total annual electricity production per treated waste	MWh/t	7
	Total annual electricity entered into the grid per treated waste	MWh/t	4
	Total annual renewable electricity production per treated waste	MWh/t	2
	Total annual renewable electricity entered into the grid per treated waste	%	2

	Annual balance of total produced and consumed energy	toe	1
	Total annual produced energy per total annual consumed energy	%	1
	Total annual produced energy per treated waste	toe/t	1
Transport	Total daily number of vehicles entering and exiting from the plant	-	7
	Total daily number of vehicles entering and exiting from the plant per function	-	3
	- Delivery of reagents		2
	- Waste disposal		1
	- Disposal of the ashes		1
	- Disposal of the flue gas cleaning wastewater		1
	- Disposal of industrial wastewater		1
	- Cleaning		1
	- Delivery of fuel		1
	- Waste disposal		1
	- Inbound		1
	- Output		1
	- Move		1
	Percentage of the local traffic due to plant's activities	%	1
	Total monthly number of vehicles entering and exiting from the plant	-	1
	Maximum daily number of vehicles entering and exiting from the plant	-	1
Radiations	Magnetic field intensity inside the plant	nT	1
	Electric field intensity outside the plant	V/m	1
	Magnetic field intensity at the plant's boundary	nT	1
	Electric field intensity at the plant's boundary	V/m	1
	Total annual number of findings of radioactive material in incoming waste	-	2
Visual Impact	Chimney height (*)	m	3
	Distance from city center (*)	km	1
	Distance from towns (*)	km	1
Process Management	Total annual training hours	h	1
	Total annual training hours per receiver	h	1
	- Total annual training hours directed to the plant's personnel		1
	- Total annual training hours directed to external workers		1
	Total annual training hours per number of employees	h	1
	Total annual training hours per number of employees per receiver	h	1
	- Total annual training hours directed to the plant's personnel per number of employees		1
	- Total annual training hours directed to external workers per number of employees		1

801 **Table II.** Overview of the reporting of GHG emissions in the ES (M: measured; E: estimated; n.a.: not available).

Site	Positive emissions							Negative emissions			
	GHG emitted from waste incineration				Secondary sources			Considered	Energy production	Landfill disposal	
	CO ₂			N ₂ O	CH ₄	NaHCO ₃ (reagent)	Vehicles (fuel)				Process (fuel)
Total	Fossil	Biogenic									
Padova	M								✓		
Ferrara	M								✓		
Terni		E				E	E	E	✓		
Trezzo	M	E	E	E	E		E	E			
Silla2	na							E	✓	E	E
Piacenza	na			E					✓	E	
San Vittore											
Granarolo		E		E				E	✓	E	E
Pozzilli	M								✓		
Brescia		E							✓	E	E
Como	M			E	E						
Schio	M								✓	E	
Acerra		E					E	E	✓	E	E
Trieste	M								✓		
Gerbido	M			E					✓	E	

802

803 **Table III.** List of the objectives reported in the Environmental Statements (ES) and related aspects
804 and actions.

Aspect	Objective	Action	No. of ES
Energy Consumption	Electricity consumption reduction	Replacement of lighting with LED technology	12
		Components replacement	8
	Energy consumption reduction	Energy efficiency monitoring	2
	Reduction of electricity consumption	Improving the efficiency of the air conditioning system	1
		Optimization of the compressed air network	1
	Reduction of energy consumption	Implementation of ISO 50001	1
		Heat recovery from the DeNOx circuit	1
	Electrical system improvement	Replacing ACN DCS	1
	Reduction of electricity withdrawals from the grid	Using self-produced electricity for remote heating users	1
	Energy management improvement	Adaptation of measurement tools for calculating energy efficiency index	1
	Reduction in the use of natural gas	Implementing a predictive system for boiler maintenance	1
	Reduction in use of natural gas	Installing an exchanger for DeNOx SCR	1
	Reduction in the use of diesel fuel for burners	Use of methane gas	1
Emissions to Air	Emissions management improvement	Updating of emission monitoring systems	8
	Diffuse emissions reduction	Fly ashes discharge optimization	4
	NOx emissions reduction	DeNOx system installation	3
	Keeping emissions at current levels		2
	Greenhouse gas emissions reduction	Connection as a supplier to the district heating network	2
	Plant impact assessment	Air contaminants distribution	2
	Emissions management improvement	Installation of activated carbon dosage system	2
	NOx emissions reduction		1
	Reduction of NOx emissions	Installing a wet cleaning section	1
	Reduction of diffuse emissions	Staff training	1
	Reduction of CO2 emissions	Replacing vehicle	1
Reduction of indirect emissions	Improved contractor awareness	1	

	Plant impact assessment	Monitoring the air quality of the surrounding area	1
	Improvement of HF emissions management	Installing a lime dosing system	1
Water Consumption	Reduction of drawn water consumption	Use of groundwater as process water	3
		Use of recovered water	3
		Water leaks elimination	2
	Increased demineralized water production efficiency	Implementing reverse osmosis	1
	Reduction of water consumption	Installing an in-line condenser cleaning system	1
Waste Production	Bottom ashes management improvement	Implementation of an iron removal system	3
	Waste management improvement	Improvements to the temporary waste storage area	2
	Fly ashes management improvement	Transport optimization	2
	Improvement of waste management	Staff training	1
	Improvement of black water management	Creation of a ground dispersion system	1
	Improvement of waste management	Reuse for bituminous conglomerate	1
Raw Materials Consumption	Reagents consumption reduction	Improvement of the acid gas dry abatement system efficiency	3
		Computerized management	2
	Elimination of reagent storage	Modifying the demineralization system	1
	Reduction of reagent consumption	Software implementation for automatic control of the waste-to-energy process	1
		Recirculation optimization	1
Releases to Water	Sewer discharge management improvement	Water discharges separation improvements	3
		Increase in capacity of the purifier accumulation tank	2
	Improvement of sewer discharge management	Optimization of wastewater flow	1
	Improvement of the characteristics of discharges in the sewer	Improvements to the chemical-physical treatment plant	1
Process Management	Line performances improvement	Refurbishment	2

	Plant security improvement	Construction of a new perimeter fence	2
	Improvement of vapor generator reliability	Installation of a new superheater	2
	Improvement of the thermal cycle	Modifying the Teflon-coated circuit	1
	Process monitoring improvement	Implementing NFC technology	1
	Improvement of ENEL plant / cabin technical communication	Cabin management system automation	1
	Improvement of procurement	Acquiring a platform for the execution of tenders in electronic format	1
	Reduction of delays and disputes in the disbursement of payments to suppliers	Starting the passive cycle	1
	Increase in sludge and leachate treated	Increasing the storage system	1
	Reduction of waste deposits created during delivery	Replacing waste yard doors	1
	Improvement of incoming waste management	Implementation of documents management software	1
Risk of Env. Accidents	Fire management improvement in the waste storage bunker	Installation of thermal cameras for fire detection	2
	Improvement of the methane gas leak detection system		1
	Improvement in the management of fires in the waste pit	Modifications to extinguishing systems	1
	Reduction of fire risk in the turbine room	Increasing the level of protection	1
	Improvement of safety during the maintenance phase	Means of parapet and waste pit gates adjustment	1
	Improvement of seismic risk safety	Structural adjustment	1
	Stakeholder Engagement	Increased awareness	External initiatives
Improvement of communication		Creating ES in video format	1
Improvement of communication		Revising the visitor path	1
Communication improvement		Website restructuring	1
Transport	Traffic circulation improvement	Construction of a new waste scale	2
	Improvement of roads	Construction of a new external axis	1
Radiations	Radioactive waste detection improvement	Installation of a new radioactive detection system	2

Energy Production	Increase of combustion efficiency	Implementation of optimization system	1
	Increased combustion efficiency	Modifying the oven grids	1
	Improvement of heat transfer	Installing an automatic boiler channel washing system	1
	Improved heat transfer	Adjusting the boiler walls	1
		Increasing the surface of the heat exchanger	1
	Increased steam generation efficiency	Replacing the generator	1
	Increase of thermal energy produced	Installing heat pumps in the flue gas treatment system	1
Installing an additional heat exchanger		1	
Visual Impact	Improvement of visual perception of the plant	Arranging green areas	1
	Improvement of the mitigation zone	Creating green areas near the flue gas purification system	1
	Check plantation conservation status		1
Biodiversity	Reclamation of the area outside the site		1
	Forest requalification		1
	Wildlife monitoring		1
Odor Emissions	Reduction of disturbance to the community	Carrying out olfactometric surveys to identify odorous sources	1
	Reduction of odor emissions	Improvement of the waste pit air deodorization system	1
Soil Contamination	Improvement of spill containment systems	Creating NH ₃ tank escape	1
		Modernizing the HCl basin	1
Noise Emissions	Reduction of disturbance to the community	Installing sound-absorbing barriers on machinery	1

806 **Table IV.** Overview of the compliance to the BAT mentioned in the BREF for WI related to emissions to air. The sub header of each contaminant
807 reports the monitoring frequency requested in BAT 4 (C = continuous, D = discontinuous) and the applicable BAT numbers. "All" refers to BAT
808 concerning emissions to air in general.

809

Plant	All	Diffuse	NO _x	NH ₃	N ₂ O	CO	SO ₂	HCl	HF	Dust	Metals	TVOC	Hg	PCDD/F	BaP
	na 5 15	na 21 24	C 20 29	C 29	D 29	C 29	C 27 28	C 27 28	C D 27 28	C 24 25 26	D 25	C 30	C D 31	D 30	D 30
Acerra	na -	na -	C 29	C 29	- 29	C 29	C 27	C 27	C 27	C 25	- 25	C -	- 31	D -	D -
Gerbido	na 15	na 24	C 29	C 29	- 29	C 29	C 27 28	C 27 28	C 27 28	C 24 25	D 25	C -	D 31	D -	D -
Padova	na -	na -	C 20 29	C 29	- 29	C 29	C 27	C 27	C 27	C 25	D 25	C -	C 31	D -	- -
Piacenza	na -	na 21	C 29	C 29	- 29	C 29	C 27	C 27	C 27	C 25	D 25	C -	C D 31	D -	D -
Schio	na -	na 21	C 29	C 29	- 29	C 29	C 27 28	C 27 28	C 27 28	C 25	C 25	C -	D 31	D -	C -
Como	na 15	na -	C 29	C 29	D 29	C 29	C 27	C 27	D 27	C 25	D 25	C -	D 31	D -	D -
Trieste	na -	na -	C 29	C 29	- 29	C 29	C 27	C 27	C 27	C 25	D 25	C -	D 31	D -	D -
Silla2	na -	na 21 24	C 20 29	C 29	- 29	C 29	C 27	C 27	D 27	C 25	D 25	C -	D 31	D -	D -
Granarolo	na 15	na 21	C 20 29	C 29	- 29	C 29	C 27	C 27	C 27	C 25	- 25	C 30	D 31	D 30	D 30
Trezzo	na 15	na 21	C 29	C 29	- 29	C 29	C 27	C 27	C 27	C 25	D 25	C -	D 31	D -	D -
Brescia	na 15	na 24	C 20 29	C 29	- 29	C 29	C 27 28	C 27 28	D 27 28	C 24 25	D 25	C 30	D 31	C D 30	D 30
Ferrara	na 15	na 21	C 29	C 29	- 29	C 29	C 27	C 27	C 27	C 25	D 25	C -	C D 31	D -	D -
San Vittore	na -	na -	C 20 29	C 29	- 29	C 29	C 27	C 27	C 27	C 25	D 25	C -	D 31	D -	D -
Pozzilli	na -	na 21	C 20 29	C -	- 29	C 29	C 27	C 27	- 27	C 25	D 25	C -	C D 31	D -	D -
Terni	na -	na -	C 29	C -	- 29	C 29	C 27	C 27	C 27	C 25	D 25	C -	D 31	D -	D -

810

Table V. Overview of the data collected about energy consumption, waste production, and materials consumption and related BAT compliance. The indicators with performance ranges in the BREF were present (P) or derived (D) from other data. The first indicator was normalized by the produced energy, the following by the treated waste (Energy Consumption: E = Electricity; H = Heat, T = Total energy. Waste Production and Management: 5 = EWC 19 01 05*; 7 = EWC 19 01 07*; 13 = EWC 19 01 13*; 15 = EWC 19 01 15*. Chemicals Consumption: H = Sodium hydroxide; L = Lime; B = Sodium bicarbonate. Only reagents used for flue-gas cleaning are considered)

Site	Energy Consumption				Waste Production			Materials Consumption				
	Energy MWh/MWh	Electricity MWh/t	Heat MWh/t	BAT	Bottom Ashes t/t	Other Ashes t/t	BAT	Oil l/t	Methane m3/t	Neutralizers kg/t	Ammonia kg/t	BAT
Padova	D(E, T)	P		20	P	P(13)	35		D	P(L, B)	P	
Ferrara	D(T)	D		20	P	D(5)	35, 36			P(L, B)	P	
Terni					D	D(13)	35		D	D(B)	D	
Trezzo	P(E)	D		2, 20	P	P(5)	35	D	D	D(H, L, B)	D	
Silla2	P(E)	P		20	P	P(5, 15)	35	D	D	P(B) D(L)	P	
Piacenza	D(E)	P			P	P(5, 13)	35, 36	P	D	P(L, B)	P	
San Vittore	P(E)	D		20	D	D(5, 7, 13)	35		D	D(B)	D	
Granarolo	P(E) D(T)	P		20	D	D(5)	35, 36	D	P	D(H, L)	D	
Pozzilli	D(E, T)	P		20	D	D(13)	35, 36		D	P(B)	P	
Brescia	P(E) D(H, T)	D	D	20	D	D(5)	35, 36		D	D(L)	D	28
Como	P(E) D(T)	P		20	D	D(7)	35, 36	P	P	P(L, B)	P	
Schio	D(E)	D		20	D	D(13)	35,36	P	P	P(B)	P	28
Acerra	P(E)	D		20	P	D(5, 15)	35	D	D	D(L)	D	
Trieste	D(E, T)	P		20	P	P(13)	35		D	P(H, B)	P	
Gerbido	D(E)	P		20	P	P(13)	35, 36			P(B)	P	28




Figure II. Comparison of the performance scores (PS) of the plants and the budget allocated to the improvement of the respective aspect. For emissions to air, the ordinate values refer to the average performance score related to the HCl, NO_x, CO and dust concentrations in the FG.

2

3