POLITECNICO DI TORINO Repository ISTITUZIONALE

Material flow, economic and environmental assessment of municipal solid waste incineration bottom ash recycling potential in Europe

Original

Material flow, economic and environmental assessment of municipal solid waste incineration bottom ash recycling potential in Europe / Bruno, M.; Abis, M.; Kuchta, K.; Simon, F. -G.; Gronholm, R.; Hoppe, M.; Fiore, S. - In: JOURNAL OF CLEANER PRODUCTION. - ISSN 0959-6526. - STAMPA. - 317:(2021), p. 128511. [10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.128511]

Availability: This version is available at: 11583/2936952 since: 2021-11-10T19:01:39Z

Publisher: Elsevier Ltd

Published DOI:10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.128511

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

© 2021. 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.2021.128511

(Article begins on next page)

1	Material flow, economic and environmental assessment of municipal solid
2	waste incineration bottom ash recycling potential in Europe
3	Martina Bruno ¹ , Marco Abis ² , Kerstin Kuchta ² , Franz-Georg Simon ³ , Raul Grönholm ⁴ , Michel
4	Hoppe ⁵ and Silvia Fiore ^{1,*}
5	¹ DIATI (Department of Engineering for Environment, Land and Infrastructures), Politecnico di
6	Torino, corso Duca degli Abruzzi 24, 10129 Torino, Italy
7	² SRWM (Sustainable Resource and waste management), Hamburg University of Technology,
8	Blohmstr. 15, 21079 Hamburg, Germany
9	³ BAM Bundesanstalt für Materialforschung und -prüfung, Unter den Eichen 87, 12205 Berlin,
10	Germany
11	⁴ Sysav Utveckling AB, Malmö, Sweden
12	⁵ Heidemann Recycling GmbH, Bremen, Germany
13	
14	Corresponding author: Silvia Fiore (silvia.fiore@polito.it)
15	
16	Abstract
17	In 2018 municipal solid waste (MSW) incineration in Europe produced nearly 19 Mt of bottom
18	ash (BA); only 46 %-wt. was treated, often in poorly performing plants, leaving behind 10 Mt
19	of untreated and unrecovered BA, destined to landfill. This work was based on the inventory of
20	BA across Europe, and on the hypothesis to achieve complete BA valorisation through two
21	assumptions: treating 100 % BA and minimizing the loss of valuable fractions due to technical
22	limitations of state-of-the-art processes in comparison to advanced innovative processes. The
23	research involved three phases: characterization of potential secondary raw materials (metals
24	and mineral fraction) currently lost from untreated (the surplus compared to treatment capacity)
25	and unrecovered BA (the fine fraction) through material flow analysis; environmental

26	assessment (energy balance and net GHG emissions) of complete BA valorisation; investigation
27	of the economic feasibility of complete BA valorisation through state-of-the-art technologies.
28	The resulting 2.14 Mt loss of valuable materials included 1 Mt mineral fraction and 0.97 Mt
29	ferrous metals, mostly from untreated BA, and 0.18 Mt non-ferrous metals, mostly from
30	unrecovered BA. The energy balance and GHGs emissions required by the treatment of the
31	currently untreated and unrecovered fractions of BA resulted in energy and GHGs emissions
32	savings. Economic profitability was driven by iron and copper recycling and avoided landfill
33	fees. Profitability was achieved by two thirds of considered countries (average values: NPV 83
34	M€, ROI 20 %, payback time 11 years) with BA mass flow exceeding 0.02 Mt.

- **Keywords**: bottom ash; circular economy; municipal solid waste; recycling; thermal treatment;
- 36 waste-to-energy.

37 List of abbreviations

Abbreviation	Meaning
MSW	Municipal Solid Waste
BA	Bottom Ash
GHGs	Green House Gasses
NPV	Net Present Value
ROI	Return On Investment
EU	European Union
EFTA	European Free Trade Association
LCA	Life Cycle Assessment
W-t-E	Waste to Energy
D10	Incineration on land; according to EU Waste Framework Directive 2008/98
D1	Use principally as a fuel or other means to generate energy; according to
KI	EU Waste Framework Directive 2008/98
FA	Fly Ash
GB	Great Britain
BREF	Best Available Technique (BAT) Reference Document
WFD	Waste Framework Directive
EC	European Commission
PTEs	Potentially Toxic Elements
RQ	Research Question
MFA	Material Flow Analysis
MSWI	Municipal Solid Waste Incineration
I _E ,untreated	GHGs emissions Index for untreated bottom ash

I _E ,unrecovered	GHGs emissions Index for unrecovered bottom ash
IGHGs, untreated	Energy consumption Index for untreated bottom ash
IGHGs,unrecovered	Energy consumption Index for unrecovered bottom ash
Capex	CAPital EXpenses
Α	Amortization
Co	Initial capital
i	Interest
n	Numbers of years
OPEX	OPErational EXpenses

38 **1. Introduction**

The generation of municipal solid waste (MSW) in Europe in 2018 exceeded 300 Mt (in average 39 489 kg per capita) (Eurostat, 2020), with different contributions: 219.69 Mt from EU-27 40 member states, 38.42 Mt from EU candidates (Turkey, Montenegro, Macedonia, Serbia, 41 Albania), 12.71 Mt from the European free trade association members (EFTA, Liechtenstein, 42 Iceland, Norway, Switzerland) and 30.79 Mt from the former EU member Great Britain. Data 43 about MSW production in Cyprus, Greece, Iceland, and Ireland in 2018 are not available on 44 Eurostat yet, thus 2017 values were accounted. It is well known that demographic and socio-45 economic development strongly influence MSW production and management among the 46 member states (Giannakitsidou et al., 2020). The combination of recycling and thermal 47 recovery was proposed as best option for MSW management from a life cycle analysis (LCA) 48 perspective (Cherubini et al., 2009), also together with the reduction of MSW production rate 49 and limitation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (Behzad et al., 2020). The key role for the 50 European context of coupling MSW enhanced recycling practices with thermal treatments 51 according to Circular Economy principles was already analysed (Abis et al., 2020). Considering 52 the classification of MSW management operations defined by the Waste Framework Directive 53 (WFD) 2008/98/EC, incineration (D10) and thermal valorisation (R1) accounted for over 75 54 55 Mt of MSW in Europe in 2018 (Eurostat, 2020), leading to the supply of electricity and heat to respectively 18 M and 15.2 M end-users from waste-to-energy (WtE) plants, and to 90 % waste 56 volume reduction (CEWEP, 2017a). The physical outcome of D10 and R1 are bottom ash (BA, 57

accounting for about 25 %-wt of municipal solid waste incinerated, MSWI) (Enzner et al., 58 2017), and fly ash (FA, accounting for about 3 %-wt of MSWI) (Morf et al., 2002). Residues 59 from 75 Mt of incinerated MSW in Europe during 2018 (58 Mt in EU-27, 12 Mt in GB, less 60 than 5 Mt in EFTA) (Eurostat, 2020) are 18.75 Mt of BA and 2.25 Mt of FA. BA treatment is 61 common in EU, though processes are specifically designed to recover metals (iron, aluminium, 62 copper, zinc) (Astrup et al., 2016; Šyc et al., 2020), which are the most valuable components 63 (Bunge, 2018). However, BA not only encompass recyclable metals; the inert fraction, mostly 64 consisting of the oxides of of silicon (Si), calcium (Ca), aluminium (Al) and iron (Fe) (Astrup 65 et al., 2016), whether not directly sent to landfill has ready-to-market options as sub-base road 66 67 filling material, replacing mineral aggregates (Minane et al., 2017; Tang et al., 2015) and also 68 perspectives in ceramic manufacturing (Rincon Romero et al., 2018) and as sorbent material (Fontseré Obis et al., 2017). Worth to be mentioned is the potential recovery for glass cullet 69 e.g. as abrasive medium (lowest open loop recycling possibility) (Silva et al., 2017). However, 70 comparing the above-mentioned estimate of BA produced in Europe calculated from Eurostat 71 (18.75 Mt in 2018) with the 8.4 Mt/y BA treatment capacity reported by the new Best Available 72 Techniques Reference Document (BREF) on Waste Incineration (Neuwahl et al., 2019), it 73 becomes clear that less than 50% of the BA produced in Europe undergo any treatment. A 74 common EC legislation on BA management does not exist at the moment, thus restrictions for 75 material recovery, if existing, are currently set by each country (Blasenbauer et al., 2020). 76 Alongside profits from metals recovery, one of the main drivers towards the optimization of 77 BA treatment is the necessity to comply with WFD targets and to reduce management costs due 78 to landfill tax (Blasenbauer et al., 2020; Bourtsalas, 2012). 79

Therefore, the actual framework appears highly complex, considering on one side MSW management practices across EU-27 (in 2018: 49%-wt recycling, 27%-wt incineration and WtE and 24%-wt landfilling) (Eurostat, 2020), and on the other side the further efforts urgently

required to member states to fulfil the ambitious Circular Economy targets defined by the EC 83 for the next decade. Improving BA management could be, without any doubts, a key issue. 84 Complete and detailed characterisation of BA and of their management was already performed 85 referring to specific countries, as Belgium (Joseph et al., 2018), Denmark (Allegrini et al., 86 2014), Germany (Enzner et al., 2017), Italy (Funari et al., 2016), The Netherlands (Loginova et 87 al., 2019), Spain (Del Valle-Zermeño et al., 2017) and for EU, Asian and other countries in a 88 review article (Dou et al., 2017). Most applied utilisation pathways are landfill construction, 89 road construction, concrete aggregate, and cement clinker. Long-term experience exists for 90 application of BA in road construction (Di Gianfilippo et al., 2018; Hysk et al. 2019). In the 91 92 production of cement clinker BA replaces natural, mined material but still requires firing the rotary kiln (Clavier et al., 2020). Compared to previous studies, this work focused on the 93 quantification and characterisation of BA across all Europe (e.g., instead of in specific 94 countries), comparing countries with different attitudes toward MSWI and BA management. 95 Moreover, to our knowledge, two fundamental aspects were not yet analysed from the technical, 96 environmental, and economic viewpoints, considering state-of-the-art technologies and the 97 whole European context: 1. enhancing the amount of treated BA aiming at reaching 100 % 98 production, and 2. minimizing the losses of potential secondary raw materials from treated BA 99 100 due to technical limitations of state-of-the-art processes in comparison to advanced innovative processes. Considering the first issue, BA treatment allows in average the recovery of 6.3 %-101 wt ferrous metals and 1.7 %-wt non-ferrous metals (CEWEP, 2017), therefore 0.8 Mt metals 102 lost were estimated in 2017 from untreated BA (Abis et al., 2020). Considering the second 103 issue, BA fine fractions (dimensions below 2-5 mm, accounting for up to 40-50 %-wt) (Enzner 104 et al., 2017) are usually unrecovered and landfilled to avoid any PTEs release, implying the loss 105 of valuable residual materials (metals and mineral fraction). Therefore, this work aims to 106 answer the following research questions (RQ): RQ1. Quantify and qualify through material 107

flow analysis (MFA) the potential secondary raw materials actually lost from BA, considering 108 both the untreated and the unrecovered fractions (respectively the surplus compared to 109 treatment capacity and the fine fraction); RQ2. Assess the environmental consequences of the 110 potential complete valorisation of BA, accounting energy consumption and savings and net 111 GHG emissions; RQ3. Assess the economic profitability of the potential complete valorisation 112 of BA through state-of-the-art technologies (e.g., the technologies implemented in current full-113 scale plants treating BA). The economic analysis included capital and operational costs, market 114 value of recovered materials, net present value, return of investment and payback time. 115 Research question 1 derives from the hypothesis of treating 100% of produced BA. Research 116 questions 2 and 3 derive from the need to evaluate not only the technical feasibility of the 117 proposed solution, but also its environmental consequences and economic feasibility. The 118 analyses presented in this work refer to 2018 data, the most recent available on Eurostat and in 119 the scientific literature on MSWI. 120

121 **2.** Methodology

122 2.1. Quantification of the actual loss of potential secondary raw materials

The quantitative assessment of the actual loss of potential secondary raw materials from 123 untreated (i.e. surplus compared to treatment capacity) and unrecovered (i.e. fine fraction) BA 124 was performed according to material flow analysis (MFA) approach through STAN2WEB open 125 access software (version 2.6.801, http://www.stan2web.net) developed by Technische 126 Universität of Wien according to the Austrian standard ÖNorm S 2096 (Material flow analysis-127 application in waste management). The MFA was based on the following assumptions: amounts 128 of total available BA in specific countries were calculated as 25 %-wt of MSWI in 2018 129 (Eurostat, 2020), then compared with current national BA treatment capacity (Blasenbauer et 130 al., 2020) to obtain the amount of untreated BA; unrecovered BA amounts were calculated 131 considering the cut-off particle size of recoverable fraction in each country (Enzner et al., 2017), 132

then multiplied to the corresponding cumulative percentage from a characteristic BA particle-133 size distribution curve (Šyc et al., 2020) and to the amount of BA treated in the same country. 134 If data about minimum recoverable particle-size were missing for a certain country, the average 135 value 4 mm (50 % cumulative percentage on BA granulometric distribution curve) was 136 considered as technological limit. The result of this evaluation, here-in-after named 137 "unrecovered fraction", assumed that BA treatment plants in Europe (Neuwahl et al., 2019) 138 worked at 100 % capacity (the BREF reports two values for each plant: one referred to the 139 average capacity of each plant and another to 100 % capacity). The material recovery efficiency 140 of BA treatment technologies was assumed 100 %, to estimate the overall theoretical amount 141 of potentially recoverable secondary raw materials. Finally, the hypothesized recovery of 142 potential secondary raw materials involved mineral aggregates or glass recycling (mineral 143 fraction) and secondary smelters (metal fractions), because the technical feasibility of these 144 perspectives was already proven (Buekens, 2013; Bunge, 2018; Clavier et al., 2020; Lam et al., 145 2010; Neuwahl et al., 2019; Verbinnen et al., 2017). 146

147

148 2.2. Characterization of untreated and unrecovered BA

BA quality was described in terms of macro-components (Neuwahl et al., 2019; CEWEP, 149 2017a) as follows: 85-90 %-wt mineral fraction, 5-10 %-wt ferrous metals and 2-5 %-wt non-150 ferrous metals. Several studies (Allegrini et al., 2014; Del Valle-Zermeño et al., 2017; Astrup 151 et al., 2016) highlighted the presence of glass cullet in BA, whose recycling could increase the 152 market value of the mineral fraction. The amount of glass cullet in BA mineral fraction was 153 estimated 11.9 %-wt in 0-2 mm quota (Del Valle-Zermeño et al., 2014) and 8.6 %-wt in above 154 2 mm fraction (BASH TREAT, 2020)- Ferrous metals were all assumed steel scrap; the 155 amounts of non-ferrous metals were estimated 68 %-wt aluminium and 28 % copper in 156

untreated BA (CEWEP, 2017), and 45 %-wt aluminium and 50 %-wt. copper in unrecovered
BA, referring to the amounts detected in fines below 5 mm (Neuwahl et al., 2019).

159

160 2.3. Environmental assessment

The environmental assessment of BA valorization was based on two viewpoints (energy balance and GHG emissions), in comparison with extraction and manufacture of construction aggregates, glass and metals from raw materials. In VDI guideline 3925 (VDI, 2016) it was shown that these two viewpoints have highest relevance to the environmental performance of BA treatment whereas other impact categories used for example in life cycle assessment (LCA) such as acidification potential, human toxicity potential or else are negligible (Gehrmann et al., 2017).

168

169 2.3.1. Energy demand and savings

Specific energy demand of BA treatment (kWh/t) was calculated multiplying the energy 170 required by treatment plants (kWh) published on the new BREF on waste incineration 171 (Neuwahl et al., 2019) to the amounts of BA treated (t) in single countries in 2018 according to 172 the same reference document (see Supplementary Material, Table I). Each treatment plant was 173 174 fed by different energy sources, categorized as electricity, natural gas, steam (all expressed in MWh) and liquid fossil fuel, reported in liters and converted to MWh (1 L = 9.1 kWh). Energy 175 consumption values of single plants were referred to the corresponding amount of BA treated, 176 obtaining a weighted average value of 8.28 kWh/t, which was comparable with the value (10 177 kWh/t) obtained by previous studies (Bunge, 2018). The net energy potentially saved, i.e., the 178 difference between the energy necessary for the primary production of materials from natural 179 resources and the energy necessary for materials manufacturing from secondary production, 180 was derived from literature (Appendix, Tables IIa-IId). In details, we considered a saving of 181

energy demand between primary production and recycling equal to 4.11 kWh/t for aggregates 182 (Marinković et al., 2010), 527.8 kWh/t for glass cullet (Larsen et al., 2009), 2166.7 kWh/t for 183 Fe, 51216.7 kwh/t for Al and 4138.9 kWh/t for Cu (Grimes et al., 2008; Norgate and Haque, 184 2010; Norgate et al., 2007). We assumed that BA treatment results in recycled aggregates ready 185 to use, thereby the potential energy and GHGs emissions savings refer to the energy saved from 186 primary aggregates' production, without considering any further treatments. The literature 187 values employed for the calculation of the net energy potentially saved were published in 2005-188 2010; we based our analysis, referred to 2018, to the mentioned references in absence of more 189 recent ones. Net energy consumption values were obtained, both for untreated BA and for 190 191 unrecovered BA, by difference between energy consumption of BA treatment and potential energy savings because of avoided raw materials production (i.e., aggregates, glass, metals). 192 We considered positive an energy balance in which the energy demand necessary to process 193 untreated and unrecovered BA was lower than the energy savings related to the avoided 194 production of corresponding raw materials. To compare different countries, net energy 195 consumption was referred to the specific amounts of untreated BA, through a specific index of 196 energy consumed I_{E untreated} (eq. 1), and to the specific amounts of unrecovered BA, through a 197 specific index of energy consumed $I_{E unrecovered}$ (eq. 2). 198

199
$$I_{E \text{ untreated}} = \frac{\text{energy consumed} - \text{energy saved}}{\text{untreated material}} \left[\frac{kWh}{t}\right]$$

200
$$I_{E \text{ unrecovered}} = \frac{\text{energy consumed} - \text{energy saved}}{\text{unrecovered material}} \left[\frac{kWh}{t}\right]$$

201 *2.3.2. GHG emissions*

GHG emissions were calculated as: produced emissions over 100 years related to BA treatment (values were between 0.007 and 1.13 kg $CO_{2 eq}/kWh$, the analysis considered specific values for each country) (Fruergaard et al., 2009). A country-specific analysis was performed considering the specific GHG emission factors of energy production for non-household consumers (EEA, 2020) (Appendix, Table III). Since emission factors of Albania, Montenegro, Serbia, Turkey, Liechtenstein, Iceland, Norway and Switzerland were missing, an average emission factor 0.569 kg $CO_{2 eq}$ /kWh (Fruergaard et al., 2009) was accounted.

On the other hand, avoided GHG emissions related to raw materials production has been considered as the difference between the emissions due to primary and secondary production, as following: -1.50×10^{-3} kg CO_{2 eq}/kg for aggregates, 0.50 kg CO_{2 eq}/kg for glass, 1.06 kg CO₂ eq/kg for Fe, 12.72 kg CO_{2 eq}/kg for Al and 0.97 kg CO_{2 eq}/kg for for Cu (Appendix, Tables IVa-IVd). As the mineral components of the fine fraction were considered inert, no GHG emissions related to their landfill disposal were accounted.

Specific GHG emission indexes were defined for the amount of currently untreated BA, $I_{GHG,untreated}$ (eq. 3) and for the specific amounts of currently unrecovered BA, through a specific index of energy consumed $I_{GHG,unrecovered}$ (eq. 4).

218
$$I_{GHG.untreated} = \frac{GHG \text{ emissions} - GHG \text{ saving}}{\text{untreated material}} \left[\frac{t \ CO_2}{t}\right]$$
 (3)

219
$$I_{GHG.unrecovered} = \frac{GHG \text{ emissions} - GHG \text{ saving}}{\text{unrecovered material}} \left[\frac{t \ CO_2}{t}\right]$$
 (4)

220

221 2.4. Economic assessment

A cost-benefit analysis compared capital and operational costs with potential benefits (e.g. revenues from potential secondary raw materials sale and savings from avoided landfilling and primary raw material extraction) in order to determine profitability. The total amounts of untreated and unrecovered BA were assumed as operational units. Capital investment costs (CAPEX, eq. 5) (Bunge, 2018) included plant installation and equipment (Appendix, Figure I). The cost of land for new treatment plants was neglected, due to the high variability within Europe and to perform a non-country-based analysis.

$$CAPEX [\mathbf{\epsilon}] = 10000 \cdot troughtput [t]^{0.5}$$
(1)

Five years amortization with 10 % interest (Bunge, 2018) was assumed for the investment cost (eq. 6):

$$A[\mathbf{\epsilon}] = C_0 \cdot \frac{i \cdot (1+i)^n}{(1+i)^n - 1}$$
(2)

where A is the amortization cost, C_0 is the initial capital, i is the interest and n the number of years considered for amortization.

The operational costs (OPEX) involved the sum of labour (eq. 7), plant maintenance (eq. 8) and energy (eq. 9) costs (Bunge, 2018):

$$labour \cos t [\mathbf{f}] = 6 \cdot throughput [t]$$
(3)

plant maintenance cost
$$[\mathbf{\epsilon}] = 0.08 \cdot \text{CAPEX} [\mathbf{\epsilon}]$$
 (4)

energy cost
$$[\mathbf{\epsilon}] = \text{energy price}\left[\frac{\mathbf{\epsilon}}{\mathrm{kWh}}\right] \cdot \text{energy consumption [kWh]}$$
 (5)

The national prices for non-household electric energy (€kWh) derived from Eurostat 235 (Appendix, Table V); for the countries not included in the database (Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, 236 Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Slovenia, Albania, Montenegro, Serbia; Liechtenstein, Iceland 237 238 and Switzerland) the average value 0.117 €kWh was accounted. Among the operational costs, landfill expenses for the disposal of the mineral part of the fine fraction (considered, according 239 240 to literature, too contaminated to be recovered) were accounted (Appendix, Table VI) (CEWEP, 2017). Landfill costs for most countries were defined by European Environment Agency 241 (European Environmental Agency, 2014), while for Switzerland landfill tax was 50 €t 242 (CEWEP, 2017). 243

Potential incomes from secondary raw materials sale were estimated assigning a specific market
value to each fraction. In detail, BA mineral fraction was compared to construction aggregates

(average value 9 USD/t per metric ton, USGS, 2020), accounted as 8.2 \notin t. The market value assigned to recycled glass was 20 \notin t (Rincon Romero et al., 2018). Commercial values of 100 \notin t, 500 \notin t and 3600 \notin t were assigned to iron scrap and non-ferrous metals (aluminium and copper) respectively (Bunge, 2018). Increased BA recovery also implied savings related to reduction of landfilling and primary raw materials extraction. Profitability of untreated and unrecovered BA valorisation was assessed through net present value (NPV), return of investment (ROI) and payback time (Appendix, Table VII).

253

254 **3. Results and discussion**

255 3.1. Quantification of the actual loss of potential secondary raw materials

MSWI plants are not homogenously spread across across Europe, with only few countries 256 owning three quarters of incineration capacity (Eurostat, 2020). Regulations related to BA 257 recovery are not consistent and uncertainties occur within reported data possibly due to a not 258 univocal definition of recovery, which for mineral materials can imply metal separation either 259 followed by landfilling or recovery as aggregates (Blasenbauer et al., 2020). Specifically 260 considering BA management (Figure 1), the countries where BA production exceeded 261 treatment capacity were: Finland, France, Luxembourg, Portugal, Spain and Sweden. In France 262 and Portugal, the surplus corresponded respectively to 6 % and 15 % of produced BA, whereas 263 in Finland and Luxembourg it was 31 % and the countries with even higher surplus were 264 Sweden (46 %) and Spain (72 %). 265

■Untreated ■Unrecovered



267

Figure 1. Bottom ash management in Europe in 2018: treatment capacity and untreated and
unrecovered fractions (calculated from Eurostat, 2020; Neuwahl et al., 2019) (red: untreated;
yellow: unrecovered).

No correlation appeared between the amount of produced BA and the untreated surplus 271 exceeding national treatment plant capacity ($R^2 = 0.0307$), nor between BA production and 272 installed treatment capacity ($R^2 = 0.5216$) (Appendix, Figure II). As for unrecovered BA, whose 273 under-exploitment represented the main loss in terms of secondary raw materials, its amount 274 seemed to be related to the amount of produced BA ($R^2 = 0.9605$) (Appendix, Figure III). This 275 means that the largest contribution to unrecovered BA was associated to the top four producers 276 (Germany, France, Great Britain and Italy), despite them being among the best performing 277 countries in terms of BA treatment, being able to recover BA with particle size down to 2 mm 278 (4 mm in Italy) (Enzner et al., 2017). Nevertheless, although the technological levels reached 279 by each country showed lesser influence, minor BA producers, as Spain and Portugal, were 280 responsible for the production of considerable amounts of unrecovered BA, due to their inability 281 to recover fractions respectively below 5 and 10 mm grain size (Enzner et al., 2017). 282

Although the main aim of MSWI is energy recovery, it also plays a key role in reducing the amount of landfilled waste (up to 90 % by volume and 75 %-by weight) (CEWEP, 2019). However, the results of MFA performed on MSWI in Europe in 2018 (Appendix, Figure IV) showed that 54 %-wt (10.24 Mt out of 18.82 Mt) of BA was landfilled, mainly due to underperforming treatment facilities, and 46 %-wt was destined to material recovery.

288

289 3.2. Characterization of untreated and unrecovered bottom ash

290 Several studies analysed BA composition in order to identify potential barriers that could hinder recovery, as content of hazardous substances or leaching behaviour (Kalbe and Simon, 2020; 291 Alam et al., 2019; Schafer et al., 2019; Verbinnen et al., 2017), or to investigate new recovery 292 perspectives (among others: Dou et al., 2017; Šyc et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2018). The 293 knowledge of BA average composition (section 2.2) allowed to estimate specific material losses 294 in European countries related to untreated and unrecovered BA. Considering untreated BA 295 (Figure 2A), it was clear that higher BA production did not necessarily imply larger material 296 losses, since the technological limit that defined the smallest recoverable particle size was 297 essential. As an example, France showed larger material loss than Germany, despite the latter 298 is the European country with largest MSWI capacity and thereby BA production; similarly, 299 Spain, Sweden, and Poland, which produced lesser amounts of BA, contributed to a greater 300 301 material loss due to their inefficient BA treatment infrastructures. The treatment of unrecovered BA is crucial to reduce pollution potential in case of landfilling and to recover metals to make 302 the process profitable (Allegrini et al., 2014). Management of unrecovered BA could be 303 challenging because of high concern on PTEs. Copper, zinc and other metals showed increasing 304 concentration in BA fine portions (Loginova et al., 2019), however the mineral components of 305 BA fine fraction exhibited high superficial contamination, precluding their recovery. For this 306 reason, this work estimated potential loss of secondary raw materials from unrecovered BA 307

considering only metals (iron, aluminium and copper) (Figure 2B), and presumed landfilling of
the remaining mineral fraction.

The overall 2.14 Mt material loss, resulting from untreated and unrecovered BA (without the 310 mineral fine fraction, destined to landfill) (Figure 2A and B) consisted of about 1 Mt mineral 311 fraction (of which 0.9 Mt glass cullet), 0.97 Mt ferrous metals (steel scrap) and 0.18 Mt non-312 ferrous metals. The main losses were related to unrecovered mineral fraction (42 %-wt of 313 potentially available amount) and steel scrap (45 %-wt of potentially available amount). Worst 314 results were observed for Spain (45 %-wt mineral fraction lost) and for France (18 %-wt ferrous 315 and non-ferrous metals lost). Spain was the only country where, because of the huge gap 316 317 existing between BA production and treatment capacity and of the different composition of larger and fine BA fractions (see section 2.2), the amount of copper lost within untreated BA 318 (0.0051 Mt) was higher than the amount in unrecovered BA (0.0039 Mt) (Figure 2B). Iron 319 recovery efficiencies reached in standard-level BA treatment facilities were generally medium 320 to high (Bunge, 2018), however, being iron the main metal component in BA (Astrup et al., 321 2016), the lack of treatment plant capacity caused material loss up to 75 % of available amount 322 because of landfilling of untreated and unrecovered BA (Figure 3A). Besides, despite 323 aluminium is separated from MSW through separate collection, still a considerable amount is 324 325 found in BA (see section 2.2). Only 0.04 Mt out of total 0.25 Mt present in BA (16%) was recycled in 2018 (Figure 3B). Similarly, only 40 % (0.02 Mt out of 0.05 Mt) of copper present 326 in BA was recycled (Figure 3C). In this last case the major loss was due to unrecovered BA 327 fine fraction, where copper concentrates, and it could be prevented by upgrading the existing 328 BA treatment infrastructures. 329



331



Figure 2. Characterization of: A) untreated bottom ash (in 6 countries, where BA production exceeded treatment capacity) (blue: mineral fraction, green: glass, red: iron, orange: aluminium, brown: copper) and B) unrecovered bottom ash in Europe in 2018 (pink: iron, orange: aluminium, brown: copper)

А

В



Figure 3. Results of Material Flow Analysis of: A) iron, B) aluminium and C) copper in bottom
ash management in Europe in 2018 (MSW: municipal solid waste, BA: bottom ash)

342

Some general statements about the significance in the European context of the above-mentioned losses of potential secondary raw materials could be formulated. Although being one of the most common metals in earth crust, iron mining in Europe barely accounts 12 %-wt. global production, despite the presence of important steel manufacturing industries in Germany, Italy and France (European Commission, 2017). Copper concentration in BA fine fractions is
noteworthy and although it is not currently listed as critical raw material, the only European
country in which copper is mined is Poland, accounting only for 2.6 %-wt. global production.
Therefore Europe relies almost completely on copper imported from South America (27.6 %
Peru, 22.1 % Chile, 9.5 % Brazil and 9.1 % Argentina) and Indonesia (10.9 %), and copper
recycling from end-of-life products is highly encouraged (European Commission, 2017).

353 *3.3. Results of environmental analysis*

354 *3.3.1. Energy balance*

355 The energy demand values estimated for the complete treatment of BA, considered as sum of the currently untreated and unrecovered fractions, in all European countries are shown in Figure 356 4A. Whereas, energy savings were estimated calculating the energy required for the extraction 357 and processing of natural resources to produce aggregates, glass, iron, aluminium, and copper. 358 The fine fraction, which was part of the untreated BA and thus contributed to the energy 359 360 demand, was excluded from energy savings from unrecovered BA because destined to landfill, and due to this issue, it was not possible to obtain a real estimate of the energy balance of the 361 complete BA valorisation scenario. 362



■Aggregates ■Glass ■Fe ■Al ■Cu









Therefore, the net energy consumption (i.e. the difference between the energy consumption of 372 the treatment minus the energy savings related to materials' recovery) (Figure 4B), calculated 373 as defined in section 2.3.1, appeared a more reliable indicator. The net energy consumption was 374 slightly related to the amount of recovered material ($R^2 = 0.52$), mainly because of the 375 correlation ($R^2 = 0.54$) observed between the amount of recovered material and the energy 376 savings (Appendix, Figure V). Finland, Sweden, and Spain were furthest away from the trend 377 observed for other countries, showing a much smaller net energy consumption compared to 378 what should be expected from their national amount of recoverable material. The rationale of 379 this behaviour could be found in the fact that these countries were among the top producers of 380 untreated BA (Figure 2A), thereby their BA potential recovery was characterised by a 381 considerable amount of mineral and glass components in the coarser fraction, which, being 382 recoverable, entailed energy saving that drastically reduced the net energy consumption. 383

384

385 *3.3.2. GHG emissions*

GHG emissions were evaluated comparing the avoided emissions related to materials recovery (compared to production from natural resources, in kg $CO_{2 eq}/t$) (see section 2.3.2), with the emissions produced by the treatment of untreated and unrecovered BA, in t/year (Figure 2).







Figure 5. Bottom ash recycling in Europe in 2018: A) GHG emissions for bottom ash management in Europe in 2018 (t $CO_{2 eq}$); B) GHG emissions avoided detailed for the different materials (t $CO_{2 eq}$) (pink: aggregates, blue: glass; red: iron; violet: aluminium; green: copper); C) Specific GHG emissions related to untreated and unrecovered bottom ash in Europe in 2018 (t $CO_{2 eq}/$ t) (dark green: IGHG untreated, light green: IGHG unrecovered)

398

Considering GHG emissions avoided by specific materials' recycling (Figure 5B), consistently 399 for almost all European countries, iron recovery seemed related to the highest absolute GHG 400 emission saving, as it is the dominant metal in untreated BA and its recovery is usually followed 401 by mineral components recovery. Copper, despite being less common than aluminium in BA, 402 showed higher specific GHG emission saving. Since metals recycled from BA should anyway 403 undergo a series of refining treatments, the potential GHG emission savings considered in this 404 study were referred only to the concentration from mineral ore, and in that case copper had a 405 larger impact than aluminium, as demonstrated by several studies (Simon and Holm, 2016; 406 Hanle et al., 2006; Jeswiet and Szekeres, 2016; Norgate and Haque, 2010; Norgate et al., 2007; 407 408 Nuss and Eckelman, 2014). Net GHG emissions values, calculated considering country-specific GHG emissions (deriving from energy production and the amount of energy required to process 409 untreated and unrecovered BA, see section 2.3.2), showed that material recovery from BA 410 resulted in a far less impacting process than raw materials mining and production, thereby the 411 412 difference between GHG emissions generated by the two perspectives resulted negative values for all countries. 413





415

В



417

Figure 6. Country-specific details of bottom ash valorisation: A) operational costs (yellow:
labour, blue: maintenance, green: energy, white: landfill expenses, orange: depreciation) and
B) potential incomes (mineral fraction, glass, Fe, Al, Cu) and savings (saved landfill expenses)
(light blue: mineral fraction, dark blue: glass, turquoise: iron, green: aluminium, red: copper,
purple: saved landfill expenses)

423

424 *3.4. Results of the economic analysis*

Total capital costs related to untreated and unrecovered BA (Appendix, Figure VI) were 425 426 obviously dependent from mass throughput, as the highest values were attributed to France, Germany, Great Britain, and Spain, which are among the major BA producers. However, the 427 amount of the required investment did not depend specifically on whether BA belonged to the 428 untreated or unrecovered category. Contrarily, if specific capital costs were considered, the 429 countries with the lowest throughput were characterised by the highest values. Assessing the 430 operational costs more factors were involved; despite the inverse correlation observed between 431 operational cost and treated mass flow, the overall operational cost depended also on country-432 specific parameters as energy cost and landfill tax. Considering country-specific detailed 433 operational costs (Figure 6A), the main contribution for most countries was the landfill tax 434

related to the disposal of the fine mineral fraction. However, the framework was not 435 homogeneous; countries such as Hungary, Albania and Czech Republic imposed low landfill 436 tax on waste management operators, and in Austria residual waste from WtE plants are 437 exonerated from landfill fees (CEWEP, 2019). The operational costs due to energy 438 consumption appeared strongly dependent on the amount of energy required rather than on the 439 national fee set for non-household energy consumers (Appendix, Table IV). Assessing the 440 incomes from the sale of recovered materials and the savings from avoided landfilling (Figure 441 6B), copper recovery was the main economic driver because of its high market value; however, 442 countries such as Finland, France, Spain, Sweden, and Great Britain, where landfill disposal is 443 more expensive than the European average, did benefit from the saving of landfill fees. It is 444 445 worth noting that iron recovery implied incomes larger than aluminium, notwithstanding its lower market value. This was due to the fact that, compared to aluminium, iron content in BA 446 was higher and its recovery requires less effort from the technical and therefore economic 447 viewpoint. Iron can be recovered easily with magnets whereas for aluminium (with much lower 448 concentration in BA than Fe) highly efficient eddy current separators (discrete ECS for different 449 grain size fractions, (Enzner, 2017) usually are necessary. Copper and copper alloys are 450 separated with the eddy current separators as well. The higher effort is justified because 451 452 secondary Al requires much less energy than primary Al (more <90% savings) and, besides energy savings also for secondary Cu, natural Cu resources are conserved (Simon and Holme, 453 2016). 454

From the simple comparison of overall country-specific costs and incomes and savings related to BA valorisation, it appeared that in countries with lower BA mass throughput, costs exceeded potential incomes and saving. Thereby countries as Hungary, Cyprus, Latvia, and Iceland would record a negative cash flow. The potentially necessary plant size was not the only element determining the positive outcome of the investment, as among the countries with

negative cash flows are also listed Denmark and Ireland, despite their respective BA potential 460 of 0.2 Mt and 0.11 Mt, which are one order of magnitude higher than Estonia or Lithuania and 461 two higher than Greece, where the cash flows was instead positive. The justification of this 462 apparent contradiction was found pointing out that Denmark and Ireland adopted the highest 463 landfill fees throughout Europe, thereby the expenses due to the management of BA 464 unrecoverable fraction did not justify other operational costs. Except for Great Britain, where a 465 discounted landfill fee for the disposal of processed BA is applied, in all other countries landfill 466 taxes played a dual role on the economic analysis performed in this study, as they represented 467 a potential saving generated by the recovery of untreated BA and metal components of 468 unrecovered BA, but still needed to be listed as costs related to the management of mineral fine 469 unrecovered fraction. Hence, the economic feasibility of BA valorisation was mainly dictated 470 by how much other factors, such as cost of energy and valuable metals concentration, can shift 471 the balance to a positive outcome. 472

Considering profitability, net present value (NPV) of the treatment plant exhibited average 473 value of 83.36 M€(Appendix, Figure VIIA) and was negative in 25 % European countries. The 474 worst performances were observed among the countries with lower BA production (Bulgaria, 475 Hungary, Cyprus, Estonia, Ireland, and Iceland), which returned negative NPV after 20 years. 476 Whereas the highest NPV values were reported among the countries previously identified as 477 major European BA producers (Great Britain, Germany, Spain, France, Sweden, Italy, Finland, 478 Norway, and Switzerland). The average return on investment (ROI) was 20 % (Appendix, 479 Figure VIIB) and the highest values (> 50 %) were observed for Germany, Spain, Sweden, and 480 Great Britain. Hungary, Cyprus, Ireland, and Latvia were characterised by negative ROI; thus, 481 the investment was not profitable. Payback time was evaluated for the countries characterised 482 by positive NPV and ROI values (Appendix, Figure VIIC), and they all met payback time 483 before 20 years. The average time required by the investment to break even on income-outcome 484

trade-off was 11 years, however, for most countries (67 % of the ones with payback time below 485 20 years) payback time was shorter. Estonia, Greece, Slovenia, and Albany, despite a consistent 486 positive outcome with NVP and ROI were characterised by a payback time higher than the 20 487 years useful plant lifetime, thereby the economic assessment for these countries was defined 488 not profitable. The countries with profitable scenarios were the ones with the higher amount of 489 produced BA plus Hungary, Czech Republic, and Luxembourg, which accounted for relatively 490 lower amounts of produced BA but were characterized by lower-than-average operational costs, 491 which did justify the investment in improving BA recovery. 492

The economic analysis resulted positive (NPV and ROI >0 and payback time < 20 years) for 493 66 % of the analysed European countries: Austria, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, 494 495 Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherland, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, and Great Britain. The minimum BA mass flow among 496 the countries with positive economic analysis was 0.02 Mt and this was consistent with the 497 maximum mass flow among the countries where investment was marked unprofitable, except 498 for Belgium and Denmark where the high landfill tax fees leaded to a negative economic 499 profitability. 500

501 *3.5. Policy implications*

The positive effects of BA recycling economically and environmentally have also been recognized by politicians. E.g., in Switzerland, where utilization of the mineral fraction is not applied, non-ferrous metals must be separated to less than 1% (Schweizerischer Bundesrat, 2015). In the BREF document on waste incineration BAT conclusion 36 lists the best available technologies to increase the resource efficiency (Neuwahl et al., 2019). These BAT conclusions are the basis for future legislation on waste management in the EU countries. The present investigation clearly shows that the extension of BA treatment has positive effects.

510 **4.** Conclusions

This work addressed three research questions associated to the assessment of MSWI BA recycling potential in Europe, as follows.

RQ1. Quantify and qualify through material flow analysis (MFA) the potential secondary raw
materials lost from BA, considering both the untreated and the unrecovered fractions.

In 2018, 75 Mt of incinerated MSW in Europe generated almost 19 Mt of BA; 54 %-wt,
related both to untreated BA and to technical limitation of treatment facilities (e.g., cut-off
particle size for eliminated fines), was landfilled and 46 %-wt. was processed for material
recovery.

A country-specific inventory at European level of untreated (surplus) and unrecovered (fine
fraction) BA was the first phase of this research. Considering untreated BA, the countries
exhibiting relevant surplus in BA production exceeding local treatment capacity were
Finland and Luxembourg (+31 %), Sweden (+46 %) and Spain (+72 %). Considering
unrecovered BA, its quantity was related to the amount of treated BA (largest contribution
was associated with Germany, France, Great Britain, and Italy), despite the performance
level of BA treatment.

The estimated loss of potential secondary raw materials (2.14 Mt in total) comprised 1 Mt 526 mineral fraction (0.9 Mt glass cullet), 0.97 Mt ferrous metals and 0.18 Mt non-ferrous metals. 527 The loss, compared to available amounts of each material in the specific fractions, was 528 related both to untreated BA (42 % mineral fraction and 45 % ferrous metals) and to 529 unrecovered BA (84 % aluminum and 60 % copper). Worst results were observed in Spain 530 (45 %-wt loss of mineral fraction) and France (18 %-wt. loss of ferrous and non-ferrous 531 metals). The results of MFA showed clearly how higher BA production did not necessarily 532 imply larger material losses, since the main driver was the technological performance level 533 that defined the smallest recoverable particle size. 534

RQ2. Assess the environmental consequences of the potential complete valorization of BA,
accounting energy consumption and savings and GHG emissions.

Country-specific energy balances and (net) GHG emissions were calculated comparing
 complete BA valorization with the extraction and processing of natural resources to produce
 aggregates, glass, iron, aluminum, and copper. The energy balance resulted in energy savings
 due to the recovery of secondary raw materials from BA.

The evaluation of GHGs emissions showed that the recovery of secondary raw materials
 from BA has a much lower environmental impact than mining and processing of natural
 resources, with iron implying the highest absolute emission savings and copper the highest
 specific emission saving.

545 *RQ3.* Assess the economic profitability of the potential complete valorization of BA through
546 state-of-the-art technologies.

While CAPEX was subject to the amount of untreated and unrecovered BA (without any 547 specific dependence to any of the two quotas), country specific OPEX values were mainly 548 driven by landfill fees regarding the disposal of fine mineral fraction. Incomes were mainly 549 due to copper and iron recycling and savings to the avoided landfilling of valuable materials. 550 Economic profitability was achieved by 66 % European countries (Austria, Czech Republic, 551 Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherland, Poland, 552 Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, and Great Britain) with 553 BA mass flow exceeding 0.02 Mt per year, and average values of economic indicators were: 554 NPV 83 M€ ROI 20 % and payback time 11 years. 555

This work confirmed the strategic significance of optimizing material recovery from MSWI BA and demonstrated that BA could play a key role in fulfilling European policies based on Circular Economy. However, country-specific parameters exhibited great influence on the outcomes of the economic analysis, due to the lack of common legislation across Europe on whether reuse of material recovered from BA is permitted and to the considerable standarddeviation existing among the local landfill fees.

562 Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge ERA-MIN2 program (under the ERA-NET Cofund 563 scheme on Raw Materials) for the project "BASH-TREAT. Optimization of bottom ash treatment 564 for an improved recovery of valuable fractions" (ERA-MIN ID 157), and the support given by 565 the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) and the Italian Ministry of 566 Education, University and Research (MIUR) to the project. The authors declare no conflict of 567 interest. Authors' contributions: data elaboration, conceptualization, original draft writing: M. 568 Bruno; conceptualization, methodology, supervision, manuscript writing and review: S. Fiore; 569 manuscript review: M. Abis, K. Kuchta; F. G. Simon, R. Grönholm, M. Hoppe. 570

571 **References**

1. Abis, M., Bruno, M., Kuchta, K., Simon, F.-G., Grönholm, R., Hoppe, M., Fiore, S., 2020. 572 Assessment of the Synergy between Recycling and Thermal Treatments in Municipal Solid 573 Waste Management in Europe. Energies 13, 6412. https://doi.org/10.3390/en13236412 574 2. Alam, Q., Schollbach, K., Rijnders, M., van Hoek, C., van der Laan, S., Brouwers, H.J.H., 575 2019. The immobilization of potentially toxic elements due to incineration and weathering 576 of bottom ash fines. J. Hazard. Mater. 379. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2019.120798 577 3. Allegrini, E., Maresca, A., Olsson, M.E., Holtze, M.S., Boldrin, A., Astrup, T.F., 2014. 578 Ouantification of the resource recovery potential of municipal solid waste incineration 579 bottom ashes. Waste Manag. 34, 1627–1636. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2014.05.003 580

4. Astrup, T., Muntoni, A., Polettini, A., Pomi, R., Gerven, T. Van, Van Zomeren, A., 2016.

582 Treatment and Reuse of Incineration Bottom Ash Chapter 24 -, Environmental Materials and

583 Waste. Elsevier Inc. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-803837-6.00024-X

- 5. BASH TREAT, 2020. "BASH-TREAT Optimization of bottom ash treatment for an
 improved recovery of valuable fractions" ERA-MIN ID 157, financed by the German
 Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) and the Italian Ministry of Education,
 University and Research (MIUR).
- 6. Bayuseno, A.P., Schmahl, W.W., 2011. Characterization of MSWI fly ash through
 mineralogy and water extraction. Resour. Conserv. Recycl. 55, 524–534.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2011.01.002
- 591 7. Blasenbauer, D., Huber, F., Lederer, J., Quina, M.J., Blanc-Biscarat, D., Bogush, A.,
- Bontempi, E., Blondeau, J., Chimenos, J.M., Dahlbo, H., Fagerqvist, J., Giro-Paloma, J.,
- Hjelmar, O., Hyks, J., Keaney, J., Lupsea-Toader, M., O'Caollai, C.J., Orupõld, K., Pająk,
- 594 T., Simon, F.G., Svecova, L., Šyc, M., Ulvang, R., Vaajasaari, K., Van Caneghem, J., van
- Zomeren, A., Vasarevičius, S., Wégner, K., Fellner, J., 2020. Legal situation and current
- 596 practice of waste incineration bottom ash utilisation in Europe. Waste Manag. 102, 868–883.
- 597 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2019.11.031
- 8. Bourtsalas, A., 2012. Review of WTE ash utilization processes under development in
 northwest Europe 1–25.
- Buekens, A., 2013. Waste incineration, SpringerBriefs in Applied Sciences and Technology.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-5752-7_3
- 10. Bunge, R., 2018. Recovery of metals from waste incinerator bottom ash. in Holm, O. Thome-
- Kozmiensky, E. (Editors). Removal, Treatment and Utilisation of Waste Incineration
 Bottom Ash, TK Verlag, Neuruppin, pp 63-143.
- 605 11. CEWEP 2017a. Bottom ash Fact Sheet 19–20. <u>https://www.cewep.eu/wp-</u> 606 content/uploads/2017/09/FINAL-Bottom-Ash-factsheet.pdf
- 607 12. CEWEP 2017b. Landfill tax overview. url: <u>https://www.cewep.eu/wp-</u>
 608 content/uploads/2017/12/Landfill-taxes-and-bans-overview.pdf

- 13. Clavier, K.A., Paris, J.M., Ferraro, C.C., Townsend, T.G., 2020. Opportunities and
- 610 challenges associated with using municipal waste incineration ash as a raw ingredient in

611 cement production – a review. Resour. Conserv. Recycl. 160, 104888.

- 612 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.104888
- 14. del Valle-Zermeño, R., Giró-Paloma, J., Formosa, J., C.J., 2014. Glass content in MSWI
- bottom ash: effectiveness assessment of recycling over time. Second Symp. Urban Min.

15. del Valle-Zermeño, R., Gómez-Manrique, J., Giro-Paloma, J., Formosa, J., Chimenos, J.M.,

616 2017. Material characterization of the MSWI bottom ash as a function of particle size.

- Effects of glass recycling over time. Sci. Total Environ. 581–582, 897–905.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.01.047
- 619 16. Di Gianfilippo M, Hyks J, Verginelli I, Costa G, Hjelmar O, Lombardi F (2018) Leaching
 620 behaviour of incineration bottom ash in a reuse scenario: 12years-field data vs. lab test
 621 results. Waste Manage 73:367-380. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2017.08.013
- ⁶²² 17. Dou, X., Ren, F., Nguyen, M.Q., Ahamed, A., Yin, K., Chan, W.P., Chang, V.W.C., 2017.
- Review of MSWI bottom ash utilization from perspectives of collective characterization,
 treatment and existing application. Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev. 79, 24–38.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.05.044
- 18. Enzner V, Holm O, Abis M, Kuchta K: The characterisation of the fine fraction of MSWI
- bottom ashes for the pollution and resource potential. In: Cossu R, He P, Kjeldsen P,
- 628 Matsufuji Y, Reinhart D, Stegmann R (eds.) Sixteenth International Waste Management and
- 629 Landfill Symposium, Cagliari, Italy 2017. CISA Publisher
- European Commission, 2017. Report on critical raw amterials for the EU non-critical rawmaterials profiles.
- 632 20. European Environmental Agency, 2014. Typical charge (gate fee and landfill tax) for legal
- landfilling of non-hazardous municipal waste in EU Member States and regions European

- 634 Environment Agency (EEA).
- 635 21. Eurostat, 2020. Municipal Solid Waste generation and management in Europe [WWW
- 636 Document]. URL https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-
- 637 explained/index.php/Municipal_waste_statistics#Municipal_waste_generation
- 638 22. Fontseré Obis, M., Germain, P., Bouzahzah, H., Richioud, A., Benbelkacem, H., 2017. The
- effect of the origin of MSWI bottom ash on the H2S elimination from landfill biogas. Waste
- 640 Manag. 70, 158–169. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2017.09.014
- 641 23. Fruergaard, T., Astrup, T., Ekvall, T., 2009. Energy use and recovery in waste management
- and implications for accounting of greenhouse gases and global warming contributions.
- 643 Waste Manag. Res. 27, 724–737. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734242X09345276
- 644 24. Funari, V., Bokhari, S.N.H., Vigliotti, L., Meisel, T., Braga, R., 2016. The rare earth
 645 elements in municipal solid waste incinerators ash and promising tools for their prospecting.
- 646 J. Hazard. Mater. 301, 471–479. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2015.09.015
- Even 547 25. Funari, V., Braga, R., Bokhari, S.N.H., Dinelli, E., Meisel, T., 2015. Solid residues from
 Italian municipal solid waste incinerators: A source for "critical" raw materials. Waste
- 649 Manag. 45, 206–216. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2014.11.005
- 650 26. Gehrmann, H.-J., Hiebel, M., & Simon, F. G. (2017). Methods for the Evaluation of Waste
- Treatment Processes. Journal of Engineering, 2017, 3567865 (3567861-3567813). doi:
 10.1155/2017/3567865
- 653 27. Grimes, S., Donaldson, J., Gomez, G.C., 2008. Report on the Environmental Benefits of
 654 Recycling. October 49.
- Huber, F., Laner, D., Fellner, J., 2018. Comparative life cycle assessment of MSWI fly ash
 treatment and disposal. Waste Manag. 73, 392–403.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2017.06.004

- ⁶⁵⁸ 29. Hyks J, Syc M (2019) Utilisation of Incineration Bottom Ash in Road Construction. In:
 ⁶⁵⁹ Thiel S, Thomé-Kozmiensky E, Winter F, Juchelkova D (eds.) Waste Mangement, Vol. 9,
 ⁶⁶⁰ Waste-to-Energy. TK-Verlag, Nietwerder, pp. 731- 741
- 30. Joseph AM, Snellings R, Van den Heede P, Matthys S, De Belie N (2018) The Use of
- Municipal Solid Waste Incineration Ash in Various Building Materials: A Belgian Point of
- View. Materials 11:141.Kalbe, U. and Simon, F. G., 2020. Potential use of incineration
- bottom ash in construction: evaluation of the environmental impact. Waste Biom. Valor. 11,
 7055-7065. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12649-020-01086-2
- 666 31. Lam, C.H.K., Ip, A.W.M., Barford, J.P., McKay, G., 2010. Use of incineration MSW ash:
- 667 A review. Sustainability 2, 1943–1968. https://doi.org/10.3390/su2071943
- 32. Larsen, A.W., Merrild, H., Christensen, T.H., 2009. Recycling of glass: accounting of
 greenhouse gases and global warming contributions. Waste Manag. Res. 27, 754–762.
 https://doi.org/10.1177/0734242X09342148
- 33. Loginova, E., Volkov, D.S., van de Wouw, P.M.F., Florea, M.V.A., Brouwers, H.J.H., 2019.
- 672 Detailed characterization of particle size fractions of municipal solid waste incineration
- bottom ash. J. Clean. Prod. 207, 866–874. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.10.022
- Marinković, S., Radonjanin, V., Malešev, M., Ignjatović, I., 2010. Comparative
 environmental assessment of natural and recycled aggregate concrete. Waste Manag. 30,
 2255–2264. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2010.04.012
- 677 35. Minane, J.R., Becquart, F., Abriak, N.E., Deboffe, C., 2017. Upgraded Mineral Sand
 678 Fraction from MSWI Bottom Ash: An Alternative Solution for the Substitution of Natural
- Aggregates in Concrete Applications. Procedia Eng. 180, 1213–1220.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2017.04.282
- 681 36. Morf, L., Brunner, P., Spaun, S., 2002. Effect of operating conditions and input variations
- on the partitioning of metals in a municipal solid waste incinerator. Waste Manag. Res. 18,

- 683 4–15. https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1399-3070.2000.00085.x
- 37. Neuwahl, F., Cusano, G., Benadives, J.G., Holbrook, S., Serge, R., 2019. Best Available
 Techniques (BAT) Reference Document for Waste Treatment Industries.
 https://doi.org/10.2760/761437
- 38. Norgate, T., Haque, N., 2010. Energy and greenhouse gas impacts of mining and mineral
 processing operations. J. Clean. Prod. 18, 266–274.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2009.09.020
- 39. Norgate, T.E., Jahanshahi, S., Rankin, W.J., 2007. Assessing the environmental impact of
 metal production processes. J. Clean. Prod. 15, 838–848.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2006.06.018
- 40. Quina, M.J., Bontempi, E., Bogush, A., Schlumberger, S., Weibel, G., Braga, R., Funari, V.,

Hyks, J., Rasmussen, E., Lederer, J., 2018. Science of the Total Environment Technologies

for the management of MSW incineration ashes from gas cleaning : New perspectives on

recovery of secondary raw materials and circular economy. Sci. Total Environ. 635, 526–

697 542. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.04.150

- 41. Rincon Romero, A., Salvo, M., Bernardo, E., 2018. Up-cycling of vitrified bottom ash from
 MSWI into glass-ceramic foams by means of 'inorganic gel casting' and sintercrystallization. Constr. Build. Mater. 192, 133–140.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2018.10.135
- 42. Schafer, M.L., Clavier, K.A., Townsend, T.G., Kari, R., Worobel, R.F., 2019. Assessment
 of the total content and leaching behavior of blends of incinerator bottom ash and natural
 aggregates in view of their utilization as road base construction material. Waste Manag. 98,
 92–101. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2019.08.012
- 43. Schweizerischer Bundesrat: Verordnung über die Vermeidung und die Entsorgung von
 Abfällen (Abfallverordnung, VVEA). (2015)

- 44. Simon FG, Holm O (2016) Exergetic Considerations on the Recovery of Metals from
 Waste. International Journal of Exergy 19:352-363. doi: 10.1504/IJEX.2016.075668
- 45. Song, G.J., Kim, K.H., Seo, Y.C., Kim, S.C., 2004. Characteristics of ashes from different
- locations at the MSW incinerator equipped with various air pollution control devices. Waste
- 712 Manag. 24, 99–106. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0956-053X(03)00073-4
- 46. Sorlini, S., Abbà, A., Collivignarelli, C., 2011. Recovery of MSWI and soil washing residues
 as concrete aggregates. Waste Manag. 31, 289–297.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2010.04.019
- 716 47. Šyc, M., Simon, F.G., Hykš, J., Braga, R., Biganzoli, L., Costa, G., Funari, V., Grosso, M.,
- 2020. Metal recovery from incineration bottom ash: State-of-the-art and recent
 developments. J. Hazard. Mater. 393. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2020.122433
- 48. U.S. Geological Survey, 2020. Mineral commodity summaries 2020, U.S Department OF
 The Interior, U.S Geological Survey. https://doi.org/10.3133/ mcs2020
- 49. VDI, Verein Deutscher Ingenieure. (2016). VDI 3925, Part 1: Methods for evaluation of
 waste treatment processes. Berlin: Beuth Verlag.
- 50. Verbinnen, B., Billen, P., Van Caneghem, J., Vandecasteele, C., 2017. Recycling of MSWI
- Bottom Ash: A Review of Chemical Barriers, Engineering Applications and Treatment
 Technologies. Waste and Biomass Valorization 8, 1453–1466.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s12649-016-9704-0
- 51. Yang, Z., Ji, R., Liu, L., Wang, X., Zhang, Z., 2018. Recycling of municipal solid waste
- incineration by-product for cement composites preparation. Constr. Build. Mater. 162, 794–
- 729 801. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2017.12.081