

Plastic Recycling-Value Preservation and Carbon Avoidance

PEP Review 2020-13

August 2020



RJ Chang
Vice President

Jamie Lacson
Associate Director

Process Economics Program

PEP Review 2020-13

Plastic Recycling-Value Preservation and Carbon Avoidance

RJ Chang, Vice President

Jamie Lacson, Associate Director

Abstract

Plastic recycling is a complex issue that requires a systematic analysis of the issue. PEP Review 2019-15 *Plastic Recycling- a Process Economics Framework* [1] proposed a quantitative way of examining various recycling options, including mechanical (physical) recycling back to polymers, chemical recycling to monomers, molecular recycling to feedstocks, and energy recycling. Each recycling option will have a different re-entry point in the circular economy with impact on future demand of prime materials at plastic, monomer, feedstock, and natural resource level, respectively. At each level of recycling, we identified three key factors that will determine the future growth of each recycling option: (1) recycle quality; (2) comparative production economics; and (3) relative carbon footprint of recycled versus competing prime material.

While the most urgent goal for plastic recycling is to reduce pollution to the environment, PEP Review 2019-15 indicated that there is a need to examine the issue holistically from the value preservation and sustainability perspectives. Not all recycling technologies are created equal, hence quantitative measures are required to compare the relative merits of each proposed recycling technology. This review introduces two quantitative yardsticks: value preservation (VP) and carbon (emission) avoidance (CA) to assess the relative sustainability of each level of recycling.

The goal of each recycling option is to bring back a post-consumer plastic to reusable polymer. The total circular economics need to be considered, which are defined as the total cost of the recycling step plus all the process costs required to bring the recycle back to the polymer state. For example, chemical recycling to monomer(s) needs to include additional costs of converting monomers back to polymer. Likewise, molecular recycling to feedstock needs to include all additional steps and associated costs of converting feedstocks back to monomers and then to polymers. The circular economics are then compared with the integrated economics of prime polymer—from natural resource(s) to feedstock(s), to monomer(s) and then to polymer. Value preservation (VP) is defined as:

$$VP = \text{product value per ton of prime plastic} - \text{product value of recycled product}$$

Product value is defined as the total production cost + 15% ROI (return of investment). Product value is a measurement of the product's worth to a producer on a per ton basis. To produce one ton of product by any process, a producer must be able to cover all production costs plus a reasonable rate of return, which PEP assumes to be 15%. Value preservation (VP) is trying to answer the question that when one ton of plastic is recycled to replace one ton of prime plastic production, how much value does it preserve? Value preservation measures the economic sustainability of a recycling process.

The environmental sustainability of each level of recycling should be taken into consideration as well. The accumulated carbon footprint of each recycling option back to polymer is a good yardstick for comparison. Apart from the fact that carbon footprint impacts climate change and every company is

trying to reduce it, carbon footprint is heavily related to the energy (fuel and electricity) consumption of a process and thus, a good measure of sustainability. The accumulated carbon footprint of each recycling option is then compared with the accumulated carbon footprint of integrated prime polymer production from natural resources up to polymer production. The environmental sustainability can be measured by carbon (emission) avoidance (CA), which is defined as:

CA= (cumulative carbon footprint of integrated prime polymer production - accumulated carbon footprint of recycling option

CA is trying to answer the question that when one ton of plastic is recycled to replace one ton of prime plastic production, how much carbon emission does it avoid?

To develop the two yardsticks, this review first presents the integrated economics and carbon footprint of prime PET, HDPE, LLDPE, and LDPE as benchmarks, with each plastic starts from either ethane or wide-range naphtha steam cracking to produce ethylene. The review then presents the circular economics and accumulated carbon footprint of PET and HDPE mechanical recycling, PET chemical recycling, and mixed-polyolefin molecular recycling to feedstock to be compared with corresponding integrated-prime polymer production using VP and CA as metrics.

Other than recycling back to polymer, converting waste plastic to electricity and heat in an incinerator are other options. In this review, we also compare the value preservation and carbon emission per ton of waste PET, HDPE, and mixed olefins with three monetization options: recycling to reusable plastic, converting to heat, and generating electricity.

The comparison is made based on USGC location first, and then the comparison is extended to Germany and China based on the production economics and carbon footprint of the same recycling and prime plastic processes in each region.

Recently, there have been a large number of new recycling processes proposed and a flurry of investments by major plastic producers in incipient new recycling processes. The VP and CA expounded in this review are good yardsticks for all players to quantitatively measure the merit of each recycling process before making major investment decisions.

Contents

1	Executive summary	8
	PET recycling	8
	HDPE recycling	9
	Mixed polyolefin recycling	10
2	Introduction	11
	2.1 Process economics framework for plastic recycling	11
	2.2 Yardsticks for value preservation and sustainability comparison	12
	Mechanical recycling	13
	Chemical recycling	14
	Molecular recycling to feedstocks	14
	Recycling by gasification	15
	Energy recycling to electricity	16
3	Production cost methodology	19
4	Carbon footprint methodology	21
	4.1 Carbon emissions of chemical production processes	21
	4.2 Carbon emissions of natural resources excavation and transportation	22
5	PET	24
	5.1 Prime PET production	24
	5.2 Value preservation (VP) of recycled PET	30
	5.3 Carbon avoidance (CA) of PET recycling	34
	5.4 Comparison of PET recycling options including energy and electricity	38
6	HDPE (High Density Polyethylene)	43
	6.1 Prime HDPE production	43
	6.2 Value preservation (CA) of recycled HDPE	46
	6.3 Carbon avoidance of HDPE recycling	48
	6.4 Comparison of HDPE recycling options including energy and electricity	50
7	LLDPE and LDPE—Linear Low and Low Density Polyethylene	55
	7.1 Prime LLDPE production	55
	7.2 Value preservation of recycling mixed plastics by pyrolysis	61
	7.3 Carbon avoidance of recycling mixed plastics by pyrolysis	64
	7.4 Comparison of mixed plastics recycling options including energy and electricity	65
8	Comparison of plastic recycling value preservation in carbon avoidance in three global regions: USGC, Germany, and China	68
	8.1 Value preservation and carbon avoidance comparisons in three regions per ton of recycled plastic	68
	8.2 Value preservation and carbon avoidance comparisons in three regions per ton of waste PET	71
	8.3 Value preservation and carbon avoidance comparisons in three regions per ton of waste HDPE	72
	8.4 Value preservation and carbon avoidance comparisons in three regions per ton of waste mixed polyolefins	74

Tables

Table 2.1 Heating value of waste plastics in GJ/ton	17
Table 2.2 Value preservation and carbon footprint for converting waste plastics to heat or electricity in US (Value in Q4 2019)	18
Table 4.1 Carbon footprint of natural resources to plant	22
Table 5.1.1 Capex of individual processes in the PET value chain starting from ethane and WR naphtha steam cracking	25
Table 5.1.2 Carbon footprint of individual processes in the PET value chain starting from ethane and WR naphtha steam cracking	26
Table 5.1.3 Capex of integrated Capex in the PET value chain integrated to ethane and WR naphtha steam cracking	28
Table 5.1.4 Carbon footprint of integrated PET value chain integrated to ethane and WR naphtha steam cracking	28
Table 5.4.1 Value preservation (VP) based on monetizing one ton of waste PET	39
Table 5.4.2 Carbon avoidance (CA) based on monetizing one ton of waste PET	40
Table 6.1.1 Capex of individual processes in the HDPE value chain starting from ethane cracking	44
Table 6.1.2 Capex of HDPE value chain starting from ethane and naphtha steam cracking	45
Table 6.1.3 Carbon footprint of HDPE value chain starting from ethane and naphtha steam cracking	45
Table 6.4.1 Value preservation (VP) based on monetizing one ton of waste HDPE	50
Table 6.4.2 Carbon avoidance (CA) based on monetizing one ton of waste HDPE	52
Table 7.1.1 Capex of individual processes in the LLDPE value chain starting from ethane cracking	56
Table 7.1.2 Carbon footprint of individual processes in the LLDPE and LDPD value chains starting from ethane or naphtha steam cracking	57
Table 7.1.3a Capex of integrated LLDPE value chain integrated to ethane and WR naphtha steam cracking	57
Table 7.1.3b Capex of integrated LDPE value chain integrated to ethane and WR naphtha steam cracking	58
Table 7.1.4a Carbon footprint of LLDPE value chain integrated to ethane and WR naphtha steam cracking	59
Table 7.1.4b Carbon footprint of LDPE value chain integrated to ethane and WR naphtha steam cracking	60
Table 7.4.1 Value preservation (VP) based on monetizing one ton of waste mixed polyolefin	65
Table 7.4.2 Carbon avoidance (CA) based on monetizing one ton of waste LLDPE	66

Figures

Figure 2.1 Plastic recycling—a process economics framework	11
Figure 2.2 Plastic recycling—circular economics and carbon footprint	13
Figure 2.3 Syngas as a versatile intermediate	15
Figure 3.1 PEP production cost structure	20
Figure 5.1a PET value chain—unit consumption of individual processes starting from ethane cracking	24
Figure 5.1b PET value chain—unit consumption of individual processes starting from wide range naphtha steam cracking	25
Figure 5.1c Carbon footprint of individual processes along PET value chain from ethane and WR naphtha steam cracking	26
Figure 5.1d PET value chain—unit consumption of integrated process to ethane based on 1 ton of PET	27
Figure 5.1e PET value chain—unit consumption of integrated process starting from WR naphtha steam cracking based on 1 ton of PET	27
Figure 5.1f Production economics of integrated PET value chain from ethane and WR naphtha steam cracking	29
Figure 5.1g Production economics of integrated prime PET production from ethane and naphtha steam cracking	29
Figure 5.2.1 Schematic of PET mechanical recycling	31
Figure 5.2.2 Block flow diagram of PET chemical recycling	32
Figure 5.2.3 Economics of mechanically and chemically recycled rPET vs. ethane based prime PET	33
Figure 5.2.4 Economics of mechanically and chemically recycled rPET vs. WR naphtha based prime PET	34
Figure 5.3.1 Carbon avoidance of mechanically and chemically recycled rPET vs. prime PET from ethane steam cracking	35
Figure 5.3.2 Carbon avoidance of mechanically and chemically recycled rPET vs. prime PET from WR naphtha steam cracking	36
Figure 5.3.3 Carbon avoidance of mechanically and chemically recycled rPET vs. prime PET from ethane integrated to natural gas (NG) and oil wells	37
Figure 5.3.4 Carbon avoidance of mechanically and chemically recycled rPET vs. prime PET from WR naphtha integrated to oil well.	38
Figure 5.4.1a Value preservation of waste PET monetization options vs. vPET via ethane	39
Figure 5.4.1b Value preservation of waste PET monetization options vs. vPET via WR naphtha	40
Figure 5.4.2a Carbon avoidance of waste PET monetization options vs. vPET via ethane	41
Figure 5.4.2b Value preservation of waste PET monetization options vs. CAET via WR naphtha	41
Figure 6.1.1 HDPE value chain—unit consumption of individual processes starting from ethane cracking	43
Figure 6.1.2 HDPE value chain—unit consumption of individual processes starting from wide range naphtha steam cracking	43
Figure 6.1.3 HDPE value chain—unit consumption of key raw materials starting from ethane cracking	44
Figure 6.1.4 HDPE value chain—unit consumption of key raw materials starting from WR naphtha steam cracking	44
Figure 6.1.5 Production economics of integrated HDPE value chain from ethane or WR Naphtha steam cracking	45
Figure 6.1.6 Carbon footprint of HDPE value chain starting from ethane and WR naphtha steam cracking	46
Figure 6.2.1 Schematic of HDPE mechanical recycling	47
Figure 6.2.1 Economics comparison between mechanically recycled HDPE vs. prime HDPE from ethane and WR naphtha	48
Figure 6.3.1 Carbon avoidance of mechanically recycled rHDPE vs. prime HDPE from ethane and WR naphtha steam cracking	49

Figure 6.3.2 Carbon avoidance of mechanically recycled rHDPE vs. prime HDPE integrated to natural gas and oil wells	49
Figure 6.4.1a Value preservation of waste HDPE monetization options vs. vHDPE via ethane	51
Figure 6.4.1b Value preservation of waste HDPE monetization options vs. vHDPE via WR naphtha	52
Figure 6.4.2a Carbon avoidance of waste HDPE monetization options vs. vHDPE via ethane	53
Figure 6.4.2b Value preservation of waste HDPE monetization options vs. vHDPE via WR naphtha	54
Figure 7.1.1a LLDPE value chain—unit consumption of individual processes starting from ethane cracking	55
Figure 7.1.1b LLDPE value chain—unit consumption of individual processes starting from wide range naphtha steam cracking	55
Figure 7.1.2a LDPE value chain—unit consumption of individual processes starting from ethane cracking	56
Figure 7.1.2b LDPE value chain—unit consumption of individual processes starting from wide range naphtha steam cracking	56
Figure 7.1.3a Production economics of integrated LLDPE prime plastic starting from ethane and wide range naphtha steam cracking	58
Figure 7.1.3b Production economics of integrated LDPE prime plastic starting from ethane and wide range naphtha steam cracking	59
Figure 7.1.4a Carbon footprint of integrated LLDPE prime plastic starting from ethane and wide range naphtha steam cracking	60
Figure 7.1.4b Carbon footprint of integrated LDPE prime plastic starting from ethane and wide range naphtha steam cracking	61
Figure 7.1.2 Schematic of mixed plastics recycling by pyrolysis	62
Figure 7.2.2 Economics comparison pyrolysis recycling process vs. prime LLDPE production	63
Figure 7.3.1 Carbon footprint of mixed polyolefin recycling by pyrolysis vs. integrated prime LLDPE production from WR naphtha or oil well	64
Figure 7.4.1 Value preservation of waste mixed polyolefin monetization options vs. vLLDPE via ethane (WR naphtha)	66
Figure 7.4.2 Carbon avoidance of waste mixed polyolefins monetization options	67
Figure 8.1a Value preservation per ton of recycled plastic comparison in three major regions	68
Figure 8.1b % Value preservation per ton of recycled plastic comparison in three major regions	69
Figure 8.1c Carbon avoidance per ton of recycled plastic in three major regions	70
Figure 8.1d % Carbon avoidance per ton of recycled plastic in three major regions	70
Figure 8.2a Value preservation per ton of Waste PET in three major regions	71
Figure 8.2b Carbon emission per ton of waste PET in three major regions	72
Figure 8.3a Value preservation per ton of waste HDPE in three major regions	73
Figure 8.3b Carbon emission per ton of waste HDPE in three major regions	73
Figure 8.4a Value preservation per ton of waste mixed polyolefins in three major regions	74
Figure 8.4b Carbon emission per ton of waste mixed polyolefins in three major regions	75

IHS Markit Customer Care:

CustomerCare@ihsmarkit.com

Americas: +1 800 IHS CARE (+1 800 447 2273)

Europe, Middle East, and Africa: +44 (0) 1344 328 300

Asia and the Pacific Rim: +604 291 3600

Disclaimer

The information contained in this presentation is confidential. Any unauthorized use, disclosure, reproduction, or dissemination, in full or in part, in any media or by any means, without the prior written permission of IHS Markit Ltd. or any of its affiliates ("IHS Markit") is strictly prohibited. IHS Markit owns all IHS Markit logos and trade names contained in this presentation that are subject to license. Opinions, statements, estimates, and projections in this presentation (including other media) are solely those of the individual author(s) at the time of writing and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of IHS Markit. Neither IHS Markit nor the author(s) has any obligation to update this presentation in the event that any content, opinion, statement, estimate, or projection (collectively, "information") changes or subsequently becomes inaccurate. IHS Markit makes no warranty, expressed or implied, as to the accuracy, completeness, or timeliness of any information in this presentation, and shall not in any way be liable to any recipient for any inaccuracies or omissions. Without limiting the foregoing, IHS Markit shall have no liability whatsoever to any recipient, whether in contract, in tort (including negligence), under warranty, under statute or otherwise, in respect of any loss or damage suffered by any recipient as a result of or in connection with any information provided, or any course of action determined, by it or any third party, whether or not based on any information provided. The inclusion of a link to an external website by IHS Markit should not be understood to be an endorsement of that website or the site's owners (or their products/services). IHS Markit is not responsible for either the content or output of external websites. Copyright © 2019, IHS Markit™. All rights reserved and all intellectual property rights are retained by IHS Markit.

