

Muslemani, Hasan; Struthers, Iain; Herraiz, Laura; Thomson, Camilla;
Lucquiaud, Mathieu

Working Paper

Waste not, want not: Europe's untapped potential to generate valuable negative emissions from waste-to-energy (WtE) using carbon capture technology

OIES Paper: CM, No. 01

Provided in Cooperation with:

The Oxford Institute for Energy Studies, Oxford

Suggested Citation: Muslemani, Hasan; Struthers, Iain; Herraiz, Laura; Thomson, Camilla; Lucquiaud, Mathieu (2023) : Waste not, want not: Europe's untapped potential to generate valuable negative emissions from waste-to-energy (WtE) using carbon capture technology, OIES Paper: CM, No. 01, ISBN 978-1-78467-219-5, The Oxford Institute for Energy Studies, Oxford

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/270537>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:


Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.


You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

March 2023

**Waste Not, Want Not:
Europe's untapped potential to generate valuable
negative emissions from waste-to-energy (WtE)
using carbon capture technology**





Copyright © 2023

Oxford Institute for Energy Studies

(Registered Charity, No. 286084)

This publication may be reproduced in part for educational or non-profit purposes without special permission from the copyright holder, provided acknowledgement of the source is made. For the purpose of open access, the authors have applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising.


ISBN 978-1-78467-219-5

*Hasan Muslemani^{1,2}, Iain Struthers³, Laura Herraiz³, Camilla Thomson³, Mathieu Lucquiaud²

¹ Oxford Institute for Energy Studies, Oxford, UK

² Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK


³ School of Engineering, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK



Acknowledgement


The authors acknowledge the financial support provided by the NEWEST-CCUS project (Project No. 299683), funded through the ACT programme (Accelerating CCS Technologies) with financial contributions from: The Research Council of Norway (RCN), Norway; The Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (BMWi), Germany; Netherlands Enterprise Agency (RVO), Netherlands, and the UK Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BIS). Without this support this work could not have been undertaken. We also thank the participating stakeholders and their organisations whose inputs through project workshops and personal communications proved invaluable to this study. Special thanks to Fabio Poretti from CEWEP for his revisions of this study's data and manuscript and the contribution of MSc graduate Khaled El-Hariri at the University of Edinburgh towards data collection. Note that this study is also available on the NEWEST-CCUS project webpage: <https://www.newestccus.eu/about-project/work-packages/wp5-results>





Abbreviations

ADEME	French Environment Agency
CAPEX	Capital Expenditure
CCS	Carbon Capture and Storage
CCUS	Carbon Capture, Utilisation and Storage
CDR	Carbon Dioxide Removal
CEWEP	Confederation of European Waste-to-Energy Plants
CH ₄	Methane Gas
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide
CO ₂ StoP	CO ₂ Storage Potential in Europe Project
EGDI	European Geological Data Infrastructure
EU	European Commission
FID	Final Investment Decision
GCCSI	Global CCS Institute
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GWP	Global Warming Potential
ICW	Industrial and Commercial Waste
IEA	International Energy Agency
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LHV	Low Heating Value
MEA	Monoethanolamine
MSW	Municipal Solid Waste
Mt	Mega Tonne
NbS	Nature-based Solutions
NCCC	National Carbon Capture Centre
NETs	Negative Emission Technologies
tCO ₂	Tonnes of CO ₂
tCO ₂ e	Tonnes of CO ₂ -equivalent
TCM	Technology Centre Mongstad
tMSW	Tonnes of Municipal Solid Waste
WtE	Waste-to-Energy
ZEP	Zero Emissions Platform



Contents

Acknowledgement	ii
Abbreviations	iii
Contents	iv
Figures	iv
Tables	v
1. Introduction	6
2. Background	7
3. Methodology	9
3.1. Waste resource, composition and climate impact	11
3.2. Identification of WtE facilities and CCS clusters	16
3.3. Distance between WtE facilities and CCS clusters/hubs.....	17
3.4. Availability of space for CO ₂ capture retrofit	18
3.5. Economic feasibility of CO ₂ retrofit based on capture capacity.....	20
4. Results & Discussion	21
4.1. Distribution of European WtE facilities and CCS clusters	21
4.2. On-site space availability for CO ₂ capture retrofit	24
4.3. Assessment of negative emissions.....	26
5. Limitations of this study	28
References	30

Figures

Figure 1: The Waste Hierarchy	7
Figure 2: Destination of different waste streams in Europe.	8
Figure 3: Stepwise approach to identify which EU WtE plants are likely to be retrofittable with CCS.	10
Figure 4: Percentage biogenic content in 10 WtE plants in France.	12
Figure 5: An illustrative Sankey diagram showing the projected fate of municipal, industrial and commercial waste in Europe in 2035.	14
Figure 6: Variation in power consumption and CO ₂ avoidance costs with different capture rates.....	16
Figure 7: Map of Europe's geological storage sites.	18
Figure 8: Land footprint as a function of capture capacity of existing capture facilities globally.	19
Figure 9: Examples of a WtE plant with no space limitation for CO ₂ capture retrofit (AVG KG Tornesch plant in Germany, left) and a plant with insufficient space for retrofit (Berlin City Cleaning WtE plant, right).....	19
Figure 10: Location and installed capacities of European WtE facilities.	21
Figure 11: Map of European CCS clusters and hubs.	22
Figure 12: WtE plants falling within 100km (light green), 200km (dark green) and 300km (orange) from a CCS cluster or hub.....	22
Figure 13: Cumulative installed WtE capacity as a function of distance from a CCS cluster/hub.	23
Figure 14: WtE plants within 300km (green) and outside the 300km range (red) of a CCS cluster or hub. Coastal WtE facilities for which transport by ships is possible are denoted in yellow.....	23
Figure 15: WtE plants which are outside a 300km range from a CCS cluster/hub and are not coastal. Plants in red are within 100km of a storage site, while those in black are further than 100km from a storage site. Plants in white are in Finland and Sweden, where storage data is not available.	24
Figure 16: WtE plants with no space limitations (white), further site-specific analysis is required (blue) and insufficient space for CO ₂ capture retrofit (purple).	25
Figure 17: Distribution of WtE plants based on space availability for CO ₂ capture retrofit.	25





Figure 18: Assessment of the range of negative emissions under each scenario, assuming 1 tCO₂/t waste (above) and 1.7 tCO₂/t waste (below)..... 28

Tables

Table 1: List of 22 European CCS clusters and hubs included in the analysis.....	17
Table 2: Scenarios for assessing retrofit potential of existing plant, assuming a number of limiting factors.	20
Table 3: Negative emissions assessment under different scenarios.	27



1. Introduction


In its 2021 Climate Change report, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) put forth a number of scenarios for the deployment of climate mitigation solutions that will be needed to keep global temperature rise within 1.5°C relative to pre-industrial levels (IPCC, 2021). Future trajectories of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions will depend on the choice, scale and impact of solutions deployment; however, one thing was made clear: a 1.5°C world will require large-scale deployment of negative emission technologies (NETs).

NETs – often interchangeably referred to as carbon dioxide removal (CDR) technologies – are solutions that physically remove CO₂ from the atmosphere, reducing the overall stock of legacy emissions that have been emitted since the industrial revolution, but also countering the current flow of anthropogenic emissions which are projected to rise drastically over the next decades (Gidden et al., 2019; Pires et al., 2019; Haszeldine et al., 2018). CDR solutions come in a number of different forms ranging from nature-based solutions (NbS) – some of which have been mainstream practice for as long as humans have been around such as planting trees –, to deploying breakthrough technical solutions for the specific purpose of addressing global warming (Keith, 2000). Technical solutions can include capturing CO₂ from point sources (e.g., bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS)), or directly from the atmosphere (direct air capture with carbon storage (DACCS)) (Vaughan and Lenton, 2011). One promising solution to reducing both fossil and biogenic CO₂ emissions involves capturing emissions from the conversion of waste to energy (waste-to-energy).

Waste-to-energy (WtE) is a waste treatment process that incinerates residual waste after re-use, recycling and composting to produce energy in the form of electricity and/or heat (Kumar and Samadder, 2017; Brunner and Rechberger, 2015; Kothari et al., 2010). WtE is considered a more environmentally-friendly method of dealing with residual waste (CEWEP, 2022a) than its alternative: waste dumping or landfilling. Waste dumping and landfilling lead to long-term adverse impacts on the environment: these include the use of large spaces of land and the release of highly detrimental pollutants as the waste decomposes over time, particularly as the carbon embedded in waste converts into methane gas with a much higher global warming potential [GWP] than CO₂ (Krautwurst et al., 2017).

WtE plays a key role in mitigating such impacts and produces valuable by-products (i.e. heat and electricity); however, if not retrofitted with carbon capture technology, the practice also leads to CO₂ emissions itself – albeit at an even faster rate than dumping or landfilling. For this reason, the capture of CO₂ from WtE plants has received increasing attention over the past decade. Particularly, waste contains a substantial amount of biogenic carbon content, i.e. carbon which is part of the natural carbon cycle, the capture and permanent storage of which effectively removes CO₂ from the atmosphere, leading to ‘carbon-negative emissions’. This is the case when more CO₂ is captured and permanently removed from the system than what would have been emitted from the waste’s non-biogenic content (Lomax et al., 2015). Waste-to-energy also addresses other issues created by population growth, including the rise in energy demand and mounting pressures to reduce landfilling around major cities (Grazhdani, 2016).

Considering the important role of carbon-negative solutions in achieving ambitious decarbonisation goals, retrofitting WtE plants with CCS will be a major starting point (IPCC, 2022). This report assesses the potential for generating negative emissions from WtE+CCS with focus on the European waste sector as a case study. Section 2 provides an overview of relevant existing literature. Section 3 details a novel methodology developed by the authors to assess overall negative emissions from the sector, taking into account three overarching factors which may enable or prohibit carbon capture retrofit at the WtE plant level: i) viability of carbon capture retrofit based on plant proximity to CCS clusters, hubs or storage sites, ii) viability of capture retrofit based on space availability at the plant site, and iii) economic viability of carbon capture based on emissions intensity of plants. Section 4 presents and discusses results while Section 5 concludes.




2. Background

In 2022, around 2,600 WtE plants were operational globally (Ecoprog, 2023). Of these, around 500 plants, processing a total of 100Mt of residual waste, were operating in Europe (CEWEP, 2022a). Eurostat (2022) reports that 2,153 million tonnes of waste (4,813 kg per capita) were generated by all economic activities and households in Europe in 2020, while 1,971 million tonnes were treated the same year.¹ Of the total waste treated in the EU, more than half was treated in recovery operations (59.1%) including recycling (39.9%), backfilling (12.7%) and energy recovery (6.5%). The remaining waste was either landfilled (32.2%), incinerated without energy recovery (0.5%) or disposed of (8.2%) (Eurostat, 2022).

Calling for higher resource efficiency, the EU Waste Framework Directive (European Commission, n.d.) aims to prevent and reduce the adverse impacts caused by waste generation. The Directive's five-step waste hierarchy makes clear that preventing waste generation, where possible, is a preferred option while waste disposal, especially landfilling, comes as a last resort (Figure 1). The EU's Circular Economy Package (2018) also sets recycling targets on municipal solid waste (MSW) generated by EU Member States where, by 2035, a minimum of 65% by waste weight shall be prepared for re-use and recycling and a maximum of 10% can be landfilled (EC, n.d.). This target directly affects the scale of development of the waste-to-energy sector, as it is waste that is not recyclable that will be eventually used for energy recovery.


Figure 1: The Waste Hierarchy



Note that no equivalent recycling targets currently exist for commercial and industrial waste (ICW). Using these targets in its 2019 Sustainability Roadmap, the Confederation of European Waste-to-Energy Plants (CEWEP) estimates the amount of residual waste which would be diverted to WtE facilities in 2035, after separation of waste at source and sorting and pre-treatment before recycling: this is reported for MSW, but also for ICW under the assumption that recycling and landfilling targets similar to those of MSW would be implemented. Respecting the waste hierarchy, CEWEP (2019) approximates that 142Mt of residual waste would be generated annually in Europe by 2035 (Figure 2).

¹ Note that the waste treatment figure includes waste imported from outside the EU, so not comparable with the reported waste generated.

Figure 2: Destination of different waste streams in Europe




Source: CEWEP's 2019 Sustainability Roadmap.

A large proportion of this residual waste is currently treated in WtE plants (90Mt fleet capacity in 2017, currently at around 100Mt), so retrofitting plants with CCS will be crucial to negate the respective emissions. In fact, many European WtE operators are already retrofitting plants with CCS (GCCSI, 2019): notable examples include the Hafslund Oslo Celsius plant in Norway (CCS Norway, n.d.), the Twence plant in the Netherlands (Aker Carbon Capture, 2021), the Amager Bakke plant in Denmark (Bisinella et al., 2022) and the Cory WtE plant in the UK (Cory, 2022). Note that only the first of these had reached a final investment decision (FID) as of the time of writing.

As CCS will be a major technology to decarbonize this sector, CEWEP's recent Climate Roadmap (CEWEP, 2022a) evaluated the climate benefits which can be captured with CCUS² retrofit: these include the direct capture and removal of CO₂, but also indirect benefits such as avoiding emissions due to landfill diversion, energy substitution in the grid and bottom ash material recovery. In its analysis, CEWEP (2022a) assumed that one tonne of waste treated emits one tonne of CO₂-equivalent (CO_{2e}). It also undertook different sensitivity analyses using different capture rates (50% and 90%) and integration levels (i.e., overall fleet capacity to which CCUS is retrofitted, also assumed 50% and 90% levels). Results show a range between -20 MtCO₂/year (for 50% capture, 50% integration) and -75 MtCO₂/year (for 90% capture, 90% integration) (CEWEP, 2022a). These calculations were based on hypothetical assumptions without considering specific factors which may limit CC(U)S applications in WtE, such as plant size, plant location and availability of a CO₂ transport network and storage opportunities.

This study builds on existing research to investigate the possible range of negative emissions achievable from European WtE+CCS, through a detailed and comprehensive plant-by-plant analysis. Results are reported both for present and future fleet capacities as the waste resource and its

² Note that CEWEP's study focused on CCUS rather than only CCS, assuming CO₂ utilisation with a permanent storage component. This study only focusses on geological storage rather than other possible utilization routes, as discussed later.



management evolve over time. This implicitly assumes that enough WtE capacity will exist to treat all residual waste generated in Europe, including from municipal, commercial and industrial wastes, yet this may not be realistically feasible. CEWEP's 2022 Climate Roadmap shows that this has not historically been the case, where a capacity gap of 41Mt existed in 2017 (Figure 2) and may well not be the case in the future (discussed below). As such, the total negative emissions which can be captured from all European residual waste remains a mere theoretical maximum and is here only reported for representative purposes, while a more in-depth assessment of the negative emissions which can be realistically achieved is undertaken.

3. Methodology

This analysis focuses on the current European WtE fleet and its total capacity, and further assumes a set of criteria to determine whether and which WtE facilities can be retrofitted with CCS. These factors include i) an acceptable distance for CO₂ transport between plants and CCS clusters, hubs³ and geological CO₂ storage sites, ii) availability of on-site space for CCS retrofit and iii) an appropriate plant capacity to ensure that CO₂ capture is economically viable. Specifically, a top-down approach consisting of three stages is adopted and is delineated in the following sections.

In a first stage, proximity of WtE plants to a CCS cluster or hub via pipeline is assessed, assuming an appropriate/acceptable distance for pipeline transport (an acceptable distance is assumed to be 300km, see Section 3.3). Plants not meeting this criterion but are coastally-located are retained in the analysis, assuming CO₂ transport via ships is a site-specific feasible option. For plants not meeting either of the two criteria, proximity to a geological storage site is instead investigated (with a 100km assumed range).

In a second stage, all plants retained are analysed based on capacity, the footprint of a post-combustion CO₂ capture facility and the availability of land in the proximity of the plant to accommodate space for a CO₂ capture retrofit: plants with limited space in their vicinity for the footprint of a capture facility are excluded from the analysis. In the third and final stage, the remaining plants are analysed on the basis of their yearly total emissions, with WtE plants producing more than 100,000 tCO₂ per year considered more likely to be retrofitted with CCS. Figure 3 depicts this stepwise elimination process.

³ A CCS hub collects CO₂ from different emission sources and transport and stores it using common infrastructure, while a cluster represents the different sources from which CO₂ are collected, usually in close geological proximity to one another.






Figure 3: Stepwise approach to identify EU WtE plants that are likely to be retrofittable with CCS





3.1. Waste resource, composition and climate impact

3.1.1. Waste resource

Waste generation and its composition are widely regarded a function of income levels, population growth, and evolving recycling rates (World Bank, 2018). These factors are naturally bound to change over time: as a rule of thumb, the higher the GDP per capita of a country, the higher the consumption and hence waste generated, and the lower its biogenic content as recycling rates are expected to increase over time (IEAGHG, 2020).

However, as reported by CEWEP (2022b), the amount of waste to be treated in WtE facilities in the future is difficult to predict or model. Despite expected increases in waste generation due to population and GDP growth, and the diversion of waste away from landfilling, the evolution of waste prevention policies, enhanced eco-design, increased environmental awareness and environmentally friendly consumption patterns are expected to offset to a certain extent the increase in waste generation. Moreover, analysing the future fate of the proportion of waste currently not incinerated in WtE plants is also important, as part of or all waste in some EU countries is currently landfilled and may be diverted to waste incinerators in the future.

Shown in Figure 2, CEWEP's (2019) analysis is based on Eurostat data on the amounts of waste in individual European Member States: Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) calculations in the 28 EU States involved summing up the municipal waste streams in each country (bottom-up approach), while aggregated data on commercial and industrial waste at the EU-28 level is used to estimate European Industrial and Commercial Waste (ICW) (top-down approach). CEWEP's study was peer-reviewed by Prognos (2019) who acknowledged that the assumptions made, i.e. higher recycling and waste prevention and lower landfilling rates, are admittedly optimistic and the figure for residual, non-recycled waste treatment capacity in 2035 could be higher than what is presented in Figure 2.


Note here that this estimate was based on 2017 EU waste data and is therefore outdated: for instance, in 2017, 246 million tonnes of MSW was generated in Europe; a figure which had risen to around 300Mt in 2021 (Eurostat, 2021). As noted earlier, this projection was based on a number of assumptions, namely that waste generation rates in Europe would remain constant over that period and that a similar 2035 recycling target would be implemented by the EU for ICW (assumed target of 68%) as the 2035 recycling target which currently exists for MSW (65%).

Based on these assumptions and on 2017 WtE fleet capacity, CEWEP (2019) estimated that 41Mt of residual waste remains untreated in 2035 in either WtE plants or co-incinerated in cement kilns. As noted earlier, the WtE fleet capacity has grown to around 101Mt so, assuming the overall capacity for cement kiln co-incinerators has not changed (i.e. 11Mt)⁴, a total of around 30Mt of yearly residual waste would remain untreated by 2035.

3.1.2. Waste composition


Based on data collected from the literature, the composition of European waste is investigated with the objective of assessing its biogenic content, which would ultimately lead to negative emissions with CO₂ capture and permanent storage. However, despite an existing Eurostat database on the waste streams that constitute MSW (Eurostat, 2021), the database has missing data and is therefore not fit for purpose in this analysis. Moreover, detailed MSW data is not available for all European countries, and where available, data from different countries is reported differently due to variance in measurement methods and the waste stream categories reported. Similarly, ICW data on a country-by-country basis is not available. Due to this limitation, estimates from real-life data reported by a 2020 study by the French Environment Agency (ADEME) are instead adopted here.

⁴ Up-to-date data on cement kiln co-incinerator capacities is lacking.



Through measurements of the ratio of Carbon 14 to Carbon 12 in flue gas streams (called the Carbon-14 method), ADEME (2020) investigated the composition of waste streams from 10 WtE plants in France using 148 samples, covering around 2 million tonnes of waste. These plants were equipped with CO₂ samplers and, over a one-year period, monthly CO₂ samples were collected and analysed to determine the percentage of biogenic and fossil CO₂ in the exhaust flow gas. The results were later used by CEWEP in its 2022 Climate Roadmap to approximate the proportion of biogenic content of waste across Europe. These are shown in Figure 4.

Figure 4: Percentage biogenic content in 10 WtE plants in France




Source: ADEME (2020)

The analysed samples show a minimum biogenic content of 53% and maximum of 63%, with an assumed average of 60% on a European level, which is consistent with data from other sources in the literature and findings of other studies of the NEWEST-CCUS project (Herraiz et al., 2022). For specific countries, this average may be lower, such as in the Netherlands where it has been reported to be in the range of 50% (Palstra & Stoffregen, 2010), or higher, such as in Denmark (68%) (Astrup et al., 2009). To accommodate these values, and as a conservative measure, this study undertakes a sensitivity analysis assuming a wider range of 50-70% biogenic content on a European level.

3.1.3. From waste to climate impact

Based on the different destinations of waste streams, the fate of waste from its generation to its eventual impact on the climate (i.e. contribution to greenhouse gas emissions in the atmosphere) is presented in Figure 5. As far as this study is concerned, the climate impacts of waste specifically treated in WtE plants are of particular interest. Here, two overarching factors affect the type of climate impact: 1) whether WtE is retrofitted with carbon capture, and if so, whether the resulting CO₂ is destined for long-term storage or is temporarily utilised, and 2) whether it is the biogenic or non-biogenic (fossil) content of waste that is in question. The analysis of these different WtE-based scenarios yields 6 different combinations, which lead to different climate impacts:

- 1) WtE with carbon capture and long-term storage (whether in geological storage sites or another form of permanent utilisation, such as in long-lived construction materials):
 - a. For the non-biogenic content, the resulting climate impact is **emissions reduction**, as man-made fossil carbon content present in waste (e.g. plastics) would have ended up in the atmosphere otherwise.
 - b. For the biogenic content, the resulting climate impact is the generation of **negative emissions**, as CO₂ which is already in the biosphere is eliminated and locked out of the system. **The investigation of this scenario is the objective of this study.**
- 2) WtE with carbon capture and short-term storage or non-permanent utilisation (such as in the production of food, beverages, fuels or agricultural products):



- a. For the non-biogenic content, the resulting climate impact is the generation of **direct emissions** into the atmosphere, as man-made carbon content is released to the atmosphere.
 - b. For the biogenic content, the resulting climate impact is '**zero-flow emissions**', i.e. emissions which would have resulted from the biogenic content of waste anyway, leading to a neutral impact (no net negative or positive) on the atmosphere.
- 3) WtE without carbon capture and storage:
- a. For the non-biogenic content, the resulting climate impact is the generation of **direct emissions** into the atmosphere, as in scenario 2a.
 - b. For the biogenic content, the resulting climate impact is **zero-flow emissions**, as in scenario 2b.

Similarly, there are climate impacts for other scenarios not involving waste-to-energy. For instance, some of the residual waste remains untreated and ends up being dumped or landfilled. As in scenarios 2a and 3a, the non-biogenic carbon content of dumped waste leads to direct emissions into the atmosphere, while the biogenic content of dumped waste leads to zero-flow emissions (e.g. in 2b and 3b). For landfilled waste, assessing climate impacts is more complicated. Specifically, landfilled carbon may be converted to methane gas in time, creating higher direct emissions to the atmosphere; this is even the case for the biogenic proportion of waste which would have otherwise resulted in zero-flow emissions if incinerated. However, the analysis of these scenarios remains beyond the scope of this study.






Figure 5: An illustrative Sankey diagram showing the projected fate of municipal, industrial and commercial waste in Europe in 2035



Source: Developed by the authors, based on 2017 waste data by CEWEP (2019), where 65% of municipal solid waste is assumed to be recycled and a maximum of 10% landfilled. Note that original waste data was reported in Mt per year and that the weighing of arrows corresponding to each waste stream (i.e. recycling & composting, residual and landfill) are proportionate to the data reported by CEWEP. Weighing of arrows corresponding to CO₂ emissions are not based on actual data and are for illustration only. Emissions generated from landfill (in brown) are out of the scope of this study.



3.1.4. CO₂ capture rates

For post-combustion CO₂ capture, amine-based technology remains the most widely adopted and economically-feasible option and has been applied in large-scale commercial use since 2014 (e.g. at SaskPower's coal fired power plant in Boundary Dam, Canada) (Stéphenne, 2014). Monoethanolamine (MEA) aqueous solvents are suitable for atmospheric CO₂ containing gases over a wide range of CO₂ concentrations (Husebye et al., 2012) and are being developed commercially as an open art technology by some vendors. As such, post-combustion CO₂ capture with MEA is the technology assumed in this study to be used for capture from WtE plants.

There is a growing body of evidence suggesting that ultra-high capture rates, typically defined as CO₂ capture rates equal to or higher than 99%, can be technically and economical feasible. Feron et al. (2019) finds that increasing CO₂ capture rate from 90% to zero-direct emissions with an amine-based system leads to a 1.5 percentage point reduction in thermal efficiency for an ultra-supercritical coal-fired power plant (34.5% to 33% LHV) and a 2.2 percentage point reduction in thermal efficiency of a gas-fired combined cycle (48.6% to 46.4 LHV). Danaci et al. (2021) also reports that increasing the capture rate from 90% to 99% for three different flue gas flow rates of 4%, 10% and 20%vol CO₂ concentrations leads to an increase in overall capture costs of 7%, 10% and 13%, respectively. Similarly, pilot testing at the National Carbon Capture Centre (NCCC) showed that increasing the CO₂ capture rate from 90% to 99% in a coal-fired power plant results in an increase in specific reboiler duty of lower than 5% (Gao et al., 2019), while Mitsubishi Heavy Industries Engineering Ltd tested with 99.5% CO₂ capture on a reference coal-fired power plant and reported that near zero emissions could be achieved with a 3% increase in the total annualised cost of CO₂ capture (\$/tCO₂).

Su et al (2023) uses operating data from literature and operating data from an unspecified WtE UK plant to examine configurations '*representative of the WtE facilities in operation in Europe*'. They report power and heat output for a power-only WtE plant and CHP WtE plant before and after the retrofit of open art 35%wt MEA CO₂ capture system. Two capture rates are examined: a 95% capture rate and a 99.7% capture, corresponding to 100% capture of fuel CO₂. They find that 100% capture of fuel CO₂ in a WtE plant requires an additional 6m of packing height in the CO₂ absorber column (18m at 95% capture) and increases the electricity output penalty in the power-only configuration by 7 kWh_e/tCO₂ (from 297 kWh_e/tCO₂ at 95% capture). For the CHP plant, the power and heat output are 4.9MW_e and 31.4MW_{th}, respectively, and 5MW_e and 32.2MW_{th} at 95% capture.

In addition to the aforementioned studies, UK Government's guidance on best available amine-based technologies for post-combustion carbon capture, published in July 2021, states that an operator should aim to achieve a design CO₂ capture rate of at least 95%, although operationally this can vary up or down (UK Government, 2021). Although this guidance only applies to gas-fired and biomass power plants at the time of writing, it is expected that similar expectations on capture rates will apply when specific guidance for waste-to-energy plants is released in the UK.

In this context, Su et al. (2022) conducted specific analysis for WtE plants on the impact of different capture rates – namely 90%, 95% and 100%⁵ – on power consumption (i.e. total electricity output penalty) and the avoidance costs of CO₂. They show that there is limited variation in both metrics with capture rates rising from 90 to 100% (Figure 6).

⁵ It is important to note that the 100% capture rate reported in Su et al (2022, 2023) applies to CO₂ originating from the combustion of waste. When accounting for combustion air, the equivalent capture rate is 99.7%.





Figure 6: Variation in power consumption and CO₂ avoidance costs with different capture rates



Source: Su et al. (2022).


3.2. Identification of WtE facilities and CCS clusters

To assess whether WtE plants can be retrofitted with CCS, existing WtE plants in Europe are first identified through personal communications with CEWEP, including coordinates and installed capacities (2021 data). Second, future CCS clusters and hubs are identified from a number of industrial reports, recent government policy reports, academic publications, and CC(U)S-specific projects and webinars, including GCCSI (2016), ALIGN CCUS project (2017), REALISE CCUS project (2020), and International Association of Oil & Gas Producers (2021). The coordinates of each cluster/hub are then collated using Google Earth, with the exact location corresponding to a central reference point within each cluster.⁶ Overall, a total of 22 clusters were identified and are listed in Table 1.

The focus on a WtE plant's proximity to a CCS cluster or hub is justified by the fact that a CCS cluster/hub will already have a storage outlet in place, including an existing or planned transport infrastructure (whether through pipelines or ships). That said, it is important to note that the inaccessibility of a WtE plant to a CCS cluster does not eliminate the possibility of capturing CO₂ from that facility, as it could still have direct access to a geological storage site, granted it has its own transport routes, as discussed below. Similarly, coastal WtE facilities which are not close to a CCS cluster/hub can capture CO₂ for transport via ships and are thus retained for further analysis.

It is also noteworthy that, if a WtE plant is not located near a CCS cluster/hub or a geological storage site, it may be close to large industrial users of CO₂ where the captured CO₂ can be utilised. However, generating negative emissions involves the storage of the captured CO₂ away from the atmosphere for timescales consistent with climate change mitigation, e.g., hundreds or thousands of years. Examples of permanent CO₂ utilisation applications are mineralization in long-lived materials, e.g., in concrete or in construction aggregates. As these industries are not yet developed at scale, and the likely areas of

⁶ Coordinates and identified central points provided as supplementary material.



production cannot be accurately located, these utilisation routes are currently not included in the scope of this study. The authors recognise that they may directly contribute to negative emissions in the future.

Table 1: List of 22 European CCS clusters and hubs included in the analysis

Country	Cluster/Hub
France	Le Havre (COCATE)
	Marseille (VASCO)
	Pycasso
	Dartagnan
UK	Teesside
	Yorkshire & Humber
	Merseyside
	Firth of Forth
Norway	Klemestrud/Northern Lights
	Skagerrak/Kattegat
Sweden	Skagerrak/Kattegat
Denmark	Skagerrak/Kattegat
	C4 Carbon Capture Cluster Greenport Scandinavia CCS
Netherlands	Porthos
	Rotterdam
Germany	Duisburg
	Hamburg
Belgium	Antwerp
Ireland	Ervia Cork
Italy	Ravenna CCS Hub
Poland	EU CCS Interconnector

3.3. Distance between WtE facilities and CCS clusters/hubs

Subsequently, distances between WtE plants and CCS clusters/hubs are calculated using their coordinates. In this analysis, transport via straight-line pipelines is assumed, which may admittedly not be possible in certain cases (e.g. mountainous topology, crossing cities or rivers, etc.) but remains a best approximation and a subject for further investigation at the facility level. The distances were determined using the equation:

$$D = 6371 * \text{acos}(\cos(\text{radians}(90 - \text{Lat}1)) * \cos(\text{radians}(90 - \text{Lat}2)) + \sin(\text{radians}(90 - \text{Lat}1)) * \sin(\text{radians}(90 - \text{Lat}2)) * \cos(\text{radians}(\text{Lon}2 - \text{Lon}1)))$$


where Lat 1 refers to the latitude of a WtE facility and Lon 1 to its longitude, while Lat 2 refers to the latitude of a CCS cluster/hub and Lon 2 to its longitude.

Here, distance from a cluster or hub is assumed to be more relevant for CO₂ transport via pipelines than through shipping, where costs of pipeline transport are more sensitive to pipeline length as CAPEX constitutes more than 90% of overall transport costs; this is less so the case for shipping of CO₂ where costs are mainly operational (ZEP, 2019). As such, and as far as transport via pipelines is concerned, cumulative capacity of the European WtE fleet is reported as a function of distance from CCS clusters/hubs. It is also assumed that facilities falling within 300km from a cluster would likely transport CO₂ via onshore or offshore pipelines while those falling outside this range may either 1) be coastal and hence likely to transport CO₂ via ships, 2) be closer to a CO₂ storage site than the cluster/hub itself, or 3) be considered 'stranded' for geological storage if neither of the former two options apply. As

previously discussed, plants stranded for geological storage may be able to prevent CO₂ from the atmosphere and create negative emissions, via some forms of CO₂ utilisation compatible with climate change mitigation.

Ultimately, WtE plants are categorised into four groups: 1) plants located within an acceptable distance range to CCS cluster/hubs, 2) coastal plants not within an acceptable distance to a CCS cluster/hub, 3) plants not within an acceptable distance to a cluster/hub nor coastally located, but within range to a geological storage site, and 4) plants without any identified means of geological CO₂ disposal. Mapping of geological storage sites is based on data provided by the CO₂StoP (CO₂ Storage Potential in Europe) project and is publicly available through the European Geological Data Infrastructure (EGDI) database (Figure 7).⁷

Figure 7: Map of Europe's geological storage sites




Source: CO₂StoP project.

3.4. Availability of space for CO₂ capture retrofit


For all plants, the potential for a CO₂ capture retrofit is assessed based on availability of land to accommodate the footprint of a capture facility. In this stage, the geographical attributes of the area surrounding the identified plants are explored using satellite imagery (e.g. Google Earth): as a rule of thumb, the larger a WtE plant, the larger the land footprint of the corresponding capture facility needed. In its Climate Roadmap, CEWEP (2022a) reports that a tonne of MSW treated has an emission intensity of one tonne of CO_{2e}. However, this estimate varies between countries and different plants within each country: for instance, the UK Environment Agency (2020) reports a range of 0.7-1.7 tCO₂ per tonne of waste treated. To provide higher certainty to this analysis, a sensitivity analysis is conducted, assuming CEWEP's average emissions intensity (i.e. 1 tCO₂/t) as a lower end, and the UK environment Agency's maximum of 1.7 tCO₂/t as an upper end: more space will be required when assuming the latter. This allowed the identification of i) WtE plants with no space limitation (i.e., where enough space is available when assuming 1.7 tCO₂/t), ii) WtE plants stranded for space (i.e., space not available with the assumption of 1 tCO₂/t) and 3) WtE plants where further site-specific assessment would be required (i.e. space available with the assumption of 1 tCO₂/t, but not 1.7 tCO₂/t).

⁷ Note that state participants to the CO₂StoP project did not include Sweden and Finland and so analysis for corresponding WtE plants in these regions is not included in this study, except when they are closer to storage sites located outside both countries.



The footprint of 7 amine-based post-combustion CO₂ capture facilities from public domain studies or Google Earth imaging is used to estimate space requirements for a CO₂ capture retrofit (US Department of Energy, 2020; AECOM, 2020; Gassnova, 2019; International CCS Knowledge Centre, 2018; World Bank 2016), and then develop a correlation of footprint in m² as a function of CO₂ capture capacity (tonnes of CO₂ per year), as shown in Figure 8.⁸

Figure 8: Land footprint as a function of capture capacity of existing capture facilities globally



As noted, this work assumed the use of amine technology for CO₂ capture which is technically capable of achieving ultra-high capture rates of CO₂ of 100% of CO₂ from waste combustion. Further details on the design and operation of the post-combustion CO₂ capture process are available in Su et al (2023). Figure 9 shows examples of two WtE plants, one with enough on-site space for CO₂ capture retrofit (the AVG KG Tornesch WtE plant in Germany) and another without space (Berlin City Cleaning WtE plant).

Figure 9: Examples of a WtE plant with no space limitation for CO₂ capture retrofit (AVG KG Tornesch plant in Germany, left) and a plant with insufficient space for retrofit (Berlin City Cleaning WtE plant, right)

⁸ Note that the capture facility at AVR Netherlands WtE plant has an area of around 2400m² but does not contain a compression component. The total area needed for a full capture facility at the plant including compression was assumed to be 1.5x larger than without compression (i.e. 3600m²), based on the land footprint ratio of the compression component to total capture facility size at a reference plant, the Shand power station in Saskatchewan, Canada.



3.5. Economic feasibility of CO₂ retrofit based on capture capacity

The majority of commercial CCS projects currently have a capture capacity higher than 100,000 tCO₂/year. Small scale WtE emitters could possibly be retrofitted with CCS, under the right conditions. This analysis reports potential negative emissions by distinguishing between plants based on CO₂ capacity, with the assumed cut-off capacity being 100,000 tCO₂/year. This is equivalent to a waste processing capacity of around 58,800 tonnes, if the higher end of the UK Environment Agency's emissions intensity estimate of 1.7 tCO₂/tonne is assumed, or a waste processing capacity of 100,000 tCO₂/year, if CEWEP's average estimate of 1 tCO₂/t is adopted.

Overall, this methodology yields different selections of WtE plants from which negative emissions can be generated, based on three main factors: 1) distance from CCS clusters/hubs and from storage sites, 2) on-site space for capture retrofit and 3) plant emissions capacity (Table 2). Total negative emissions under each scenario are then evaluated by multiplying the overall WtE capacity of the plants included in that scenario by a biogenic content range of 50-70%, as discussed earlier in Section 3.1.2.

Table 2: Scenarios for assessing retrofit potential of existing plants, assuming a number of limiting factors

Scenarios	Limiting factor(s)	Condition(s)	WtE plants included
Scenario 1	No restriction to deploying CCS	N/A	All existing WtE plants (but excluding any new capacity)
Scenario 2	Transport	Access to geological storage via proximity to a CCS clusters/hubs, or via shipping	WtE facilities falling within a 300km distance from a CCS cluster/hub, in addition to coastally-located ones
Scenario 3	Transport	Access to geological storage	As Scenario 2, with the addition of WtE facilities located within 100km of CO ₂ storage capacity
Scenario 4	Capture	Space availability for retrofit	WtE facilities with space availability for CCS retrofit according to the relationship between land footprint and capture capacity presented in Figure 8. Analysis includes two sets of WtE plants: those with enough space if


			assuming 1 tCO ₂ /t of waste combusted and those with enough space if assuming 1.7 tCO ₂ /t (i.e. more conservative)
Scenario 5	Capture and plant size	Plant size large enough for the economic viability of carbon capture	WtE facilities producing more than 100,000 tCO ₂ /year and with enough on-site space for capture retrofit
Scenario 6	Transport, capture and plant size	All of the above	

4. Results & Discussion

4.1. Distribution of European WtE facilities and CCS clusters

Using 2021 CEWEP database, data was collected for 498 WtE facilities from 23 European countries. With a total overall fleet installed capacity of 100.9Mt of waste per year, the average processing capacity of a WtE plant across Europe is around 200,000 tonne of waste per year. Figure 10 shows the geographical distribution and installed capacities of these facilities.


Figure 10: Location and installed capacities of European WtE facilities



Source: CEWEP (2021)


Germany is the country with the highest WtE installed capacity, processing around 24.7Mt of waste (2018 figures) in 85 facilities, followed by France and the UK, both with installed capacities of around 15.8Mt each, processed in 132 and 52 WtE facilities respectively. Using a number of data sources, 22 CCS clusters and hubs in construction or planning in Europe are identified from the literature and plotted in Figure 11.

Figure 11: Map of European CCS clusters and hubs⁹




Investigating the closest CCS cluster or hub to a WtE plant, the analysis shows that around a third of overall installed capacity (32.9 Mt waste/year, 118 plants) falls within a 100km range, while more than half (57.9 Mt/year, 241 plants) falls within 200km, and more than two-thirds (76.4 Mt/year, 351 plants) within a 300km range (Figures 12 and 13).

Figure 12: WtE plants falling within 100km (light green), 200km (dark green) and 300km (orange) from a CCS cluster or hub




⁹ This and all subsequent maps were generated using the online mapping tool Map Maker (available at <http://maps.co>) for which a license was acquired.


Figure 13: Cumulative installed WtE capacity as a function of distance from a CCS cluster/hub



For plants falling outside this predetermined range, transport via ships is considered. Here, 61 WtE facilities with an overall installed capacity of 11.3 Mt/year are found to be located along a coast and from which CO₂ could be potentially captured and shipped. These plants are identified in Figure 14.


Figure 14: WtE plants within 300km (green) and outside the 300km range (red) of a CCS cluster or hub. Coastal WtE facilities for which transport by ships is possible are denoted in yellow





For plants that are further than 300km from a CCS cluster or hub and are not coastal, proximity to geological CO₂ storage sites was appraised. Of the 102 plants which did not satisfy either of the first two criteria, 97 were within 100km distance to a storage site (total capacity of 16.5 Mt/year) while only 5 plants did not satisfy any of the three criteria. These are identified in Figure 15.

Figure 15: WtE plants which are outside a 300km range from a CCS cluster/hub and are not coastal. Plants in red are within 100km of a storage site, while those in black are further than 100km from a storage site. Plants in white are in Finland and Sweden, where storage data is not available



4.2. On-site space availability for CO₂ capture retrofit

For plants qualifying on the basis of distance to clusters, hub or storage sites or those that are coastally located, further analysis is conducted based on the emissions footprint at the plant level: plants which emit more than 100,000 tCO₂ per year are retained. However, as emissions intensity of the waste treated can vary, two different scenarios are assumed: plants emit 1.7 tCO₂/tonne of waste (conservative scenario, as larger space will be needed for a capture facility) or 1 tCO₂/tonne (average scenario):

- The first scenario limits capture retrofit to plants with a processing capacity of 58,800 tonnes of waste per year¹⁰, and
- The second scenario includes WtE plants with a processing capacity of 100,000 tonnes of waste per year.

For plants included in the first scenario, no spatial restrictions exist for CO₂ capture retrofit: 333 plants with a total capacity of 58.6 Mt/year satisfy this condition. The second scenario includes plants for which there are possible spatial constraints for capture retrofit and further site-specific analyses are required: this applies to 27 plants with a total capacity of 8.5 Mt/year. For the remaining 132 plants with an overall

¹⁰ 100,000 (tCO₂/y)/1.7 (tCO₂/t) ≈ 58,800 t/year

capacity of 33.5 Mt/year, it is certain that even when assuming 1 tCO₂/tonne of waste, there is insufficient space for capture retrofit (Figures 16 and 17).

Figure 16: WtE plants with no space limitations (white), further site-specific analysis is required (blue) and insufficient space for CO₂ capture retrofit (purple)






Figure 17: Distribution of WtE plants based on space availability for CO₂ capture retrofit



However, it is important to note here that the possibility of capturing CO₂ from WtE plants with space requirement limitations is not disregarded. This is because the analysis assumes the use of amine technology, while CO₂ capture process intensification – that is the introduction of capture technologies with much smaller footprints – is already underway in other sectors, such as oil refineries and offshore platforms and may become available in the WtE sector in the future (GCCSI, 2022).



Examples include the use of rotating packed beds (Yu et al., 2012; Zhao et al., 2014; Xie et al., 2017) or technology using CO₂ liquefaction (e.g. Seo et al., 2016; Muhammad et al., 2020). Sites with limited footprint which are unsuitable for conventional amine technology retrofit may nonetheless be suitable for the addition of more compact CO₂ capture technology. Finally, other major barriers to CO₂ capture retrofit include access to water resources, access and suitability of the power cycle for steam extraction or a necessary corridor for CO₂ transport in the vicinity of the plant. The authors recognise that these barriers must be further examined on a case-by-case basis but remain beyond the scope of this work.

4.3. Assessment of negative emissions

This study shows that, if all of the existing European WtE fleet (i.e. 100.9 Mt of installed capacity) was retrofitted with CCS technology, negative emissions in the range of **-50.5 to -70.6 MtCO₂/y** would be generated per year, assuming a capture rate of 100% using recent evidence on ultra-high capture levels.

CEWEP (2019) anticipates a total of 142Mt of residual waste generated in 2035 when meeting the thresholds for recycling (minimum of 65%) and landfilling (maximum of 10%) in accordance with the EU Circular Economy Package. It may admittedly not be possible to bridge the current ~30Mt gap in WtE capacity needed to treat all this residual waste, as some existing WtE plants come to the end of their life and others are newly commissioned. Yet, in theory, if enough WtE capacity were to be built and is retrofittable with CO₂ capture, a range of **-71 to -99.4 MtCO₂/y** of negative emissions can be achieved.

When CCS limitations are considered, such as distance of WtE plants to CCS clusters/hubs and storage sites or space availability for retrofit, these ranges are naturally reduced. On distance, as presented earlier, 32.9 Mt of waste is treated yearly in WtE plants which fall within a 100km radius from a CCS cluster/hub, while 57.9 Mt/year is processed in plants within 200km and 76.4 Mt/year within 300km. In a scenario where all plants within these ranges are retrofitted with CCS (i.e. disregarding availability of on-site space for retrofit), negative emissions in the ranges of - 16.5 to -23 MtCO₂/year (corresponding to a 100km radius), -29 to -40.5 MtCO₂/year (200km) and -38.2 to -53.5 MtCO₂/year (300km) can be generated. Moreover, additional negative emissions in the range of -5.6 to -7.9 MtCO₂/year could be generated from coastal WtE plants which are outside the 300km range (corresponding to total installed capacity of 11.3 Mt/year).

Table 3 summarises the results of this study, including an assessment of the overall number of plants and corresponding potential for negative emissions under each scenario. Figure 18 further depicts these results under two different assumptions: the generation of 1 tCO₂ and 1.7 tCO₂ per tonne of waste treated.





Table 3: Negative emissions assessment under different scenarios.


Scenarios	Limiting factor(s)	Condition	Number of plants (total processing capacity)	Potential for negative emissions (MtCO ₂ per year)
<i>Negative emissions in all non-recycled residual waste (as in Figure 2). This includes waste going to the existing WtE fleet and residual waste currently going to landfill (the WtE capacity gap).</i>				
N/A	No CCS restriction	N/A	Unknown in the future	-71 to -99.4
<i>Analysis of the existing WtE fleet only</i>				
Scenario 1	No CCS restriction	N/A	492	-50.5 to -70.6
Scenario 2	Transport (distance to CCS clusters/hubs)	within 100km	118 (32.9 Mt)	-16.5 to -23
		within 200km	241 (57.9 Mt)	-29 to -40.5
		within 300km	351 (76.4 Mt)	-38.2 to -53.5
Scenario 3	Capture (enough on-site space availability)	If 1.7tCO ₂ emitted per tonne of waste	333 (58.6 Mt)	-29.2 to -40.9
		If 1.0tCO ₂ emitted per tonne of waste	360 (67.1 Mt)	-33.4 to -46.8
Scenario 4	Capture and plant size (enough on-site space + plant size > 100,000 tCO ₂ /y)	If 1.7tCO ₂ emitted per tonne of waste	274 (56.5 Mt)	-28.1 to -39.4
		If 1.0tCO ₂ emitted per tonne of waste	207 (51 Mt)	-25.4 to -35.6
Scenario 5	Transport (including to storage sites) and capture	N/A	249 (46.1 Mt)	-23 to -32.1
Scenario 6	All of the above (transport, capture and plant size)	If 1.7tCO ₂ emitted per tonne of waste	203 (44.5 Mt)	-22.1 to -31
		If 1.0tCO ₂ emitted per tonne of waste	154 (40.5 Mt)	-20.1 to -28.2

Figure 18: Assessment of the range of negative emissions under each scenario, assuming 1 tCO₂/t waste (above) and 1.7 tCO₂/t waste (below)



5. Limitations of this study

For waste-specific analyses, this study was limited by the uncertainty regarding the waste resource - both in magnitude and composition - and uncertainties regarding the evolution in future waste management policy, which in turn creates an uncertainty in the residual waste resource, again both in magnitude and composition. Limitations concerning the possibility for CCS retrofit were broadly encountered at three stages: i) when selecting WtE plants to be included in this analysis, and when conducting analyses on ii) distance and iii) space requirements. On the former, this study adopted a bottom-up approach that was limited to WtE grate-fired boilers (there are additional negative emissions




which can be captured in the waste sector from landfill gas recovery, anaerobic digestion, etc., which are not included in this study that focused on WtE). It was also limited to the existing WtE fleet in Europe and did not account for negative emissions which can be generated from untreated residual waste, the estimation of which remains highly uncertain. Moreover, this work did not account for plant (un)availability, which could reduce the number of plants from which CO₂ capture is economically viable.

On distance, this work assumed CO₂ transport by straight-line pipelines from WtE plants to CCS clusters, hubs or storage sites, without regard to surrounding topology: in practice, it may not always be feasible to transport CO₂ by pipelines if rivers, cities or mountains need to be crossed. The analysis also did not assume CO₂ transport by barges along fluvial transport axes (e.g. Rhine, Danube, Rhone rivers), which may increase the number of plants from which CO₂ can be transported, especially from the innermost part of Europe.


It is also worth noting that the calculation of distance from WtE plants to surrounding storage sites was approximated based on existing maps of storage sites (from the CO₂StoP project), rather than by using specific coordinates. It is difficult to assign coordinates to large surface areas covering storage sites, so the distance was measured from WtE plants to the closest boundary of storage sites. Moreover, the CO₂StoP project database does not include storage sites in Finland and Sweden, which were eventually missing from this analysis: it is worth noting however that all plants within or in proximity to both countries were close to clusters, hubs or storage sites in surrounding regions anyway, and were hence included in the ultimate analysis.

Lastly, on space requirements, this work assumed that WtE plant owners/operators can acquire the plant's surrounding land for CO₂ capture retrofit, which may not always be the case. The authors also only assumed the use of conventional post-combustion capture technology, whereas other less-intensive options may become commercially viable in the future (e.g. rotating packed beds and hot potassium carbonate), which would increase the number of plants which can be retrofitted with CO₂ capture technology, and hence increase the range of negative emissions achievable.



References

- AECOM (2020). Keadby 3 low-carbon gas power station. Available at: <https://www.ssethermal.com/media/Ordjekdm/peir-01-volume-i-cover-contents-and-glossary.pdf> [Accessed February 27, 2023]
- ADEME (2020). Determination of the biogenic and fossil contents of residual household waste and of CSR using ^{14}C analysis of CO_2 in post-combustion gases (*in French*). Available at: https://bibliothèque.ademe.fr/cadic/4593/determination_contenus_biogene_et_fossile_omr_et_csr_rapport.pdf [Accessed December 16, 2022]
- Aker Carbon Capture (2021). Aker Carbon Capture ready to start using CCUS project at Twence's waste-to-energy plant in the Netherlands. Available at: https://akercarboncapture.com/?cision_id=9DDF1859C78B5320 [Accessed January 3, 2023]
- Align-CCUS (2017). Project results. Available at: <https://www.alignccus.eu/our-results> [Accessed December 16, 2022]
- Astrup, T., Møller, J., & Fruergaard, T. (2009). Incineration and co-combustion of waste: accounting of greenhouse gases and global warming contributions. *Waste Management & Research*, 27, 789–799.
- Bisinella, V., Nedenskov, J., Riber, C., Hulgaard, T., & Christensen, T. H. (2022). Environmental assessment of amending the Amager Bakke incineration plant in Copenhagen with carbon capture and storage. *Waste Management & Research*, 40(1), 79-95.
- Brunner, P. H., & Rechberger, H. (2015). Waste to energy—key element for sustainable waste management. *Waste management*, 37, 3-12.
- CCS Norway (n.d.). Carbon capture: Hafslund Oslo Celsio. Available at: <https://ccsnorway.com/capture-hafslund-oslo-celsio/> [Accessed January 3, 2023]
- CEWEP (2019). Waste-to-Energy Sustainability Roadmap – Towards 2035. Available at: [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2018/614766/EPRS_BRI\(2018\)614766_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2018/614766/EPRS_BRI(2018)614766_EN.pdf) [Accessed December 16, 2022]
- CEWEP (2022a). Waste-to-energy Climate Roadmap – The Path to Carbon Negative. Available at: <https://www.cewep.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/CEWEP-WtE-Climate-Roadmap-2022.pdf.pdf> [Accessed December 16, 2022]
- CEWEP (2022b). Waste-to-Energy Climate Roadmap – Technical Annex. Available at: https://www.cewep.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/TA-Technical-Annex_CEWEP-Climate-Roadmap_June22.pdf [Accessed December 16, 2022]
- Corner, A., & Pidgeon, N. (2010). Geoengineering the climate: the social and ethical implications. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, 52(1), 24-37.
- Cory (2022). Cory and Northern Lights announce pioneering international carbon partnership. Available at: <https://www.corygroup.co.uk/media/news-insights/cory-and-northern-lights-announce-pioneering-international-carbon-partnership/> [Accessed January 3, 2023]
- Danaci, D., Bui, M., Petit, C., & Mac Dowell, N. (2021). En route to zero emissions for power and industry with amine-based post-combustion capture. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 55(15), 10619-10632.
- Ecoprog (2023). Waste to Energy 2022/2023. Available at: <https://www.ecoprog.com/publikationen/abfallwirtschaft/waste-to-energy.htm> [Accessed January 12, 2023]



Environment Agency (2020). Pollution inventory reporting – incineration activities guidance note.

Available at:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/923125/Pollution-inventory-reporting-incineration-activities-guidance-note.pdf [Accessed December 16, 2022]

European Parliament (2018). Circular economy package – Four legislative proposals on waste.

Available at:

[https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2018/614766/EPRS_BRI\(2018\)614766_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2018/614766/EPRS_BRI(2018)614766_EN.pdf) [Accessed December 16, 2022]

Eurostat (2021). Municipal waste by waste management operations. Available at:

https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/env_wasmun/default/table?lang=en [Accessed December 16, 2022]

Eurostat (2022). Waste statistics. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Waste_statistics#Waste_treatment [Accessed January 4, 2023]

[Accessed January 4, 2023]

European Commission (n.d.). Waste Framework Directive. Available at:

https://environment.ec.europa.eu/topics/waste-and-recycling/waste-framework-directive_en [Accessed January 11, 2023]

Feron, P., Cousins, A., Jiang, K., Zhai, R., Thiruvengkatachari, R., & Burnard, K. (2019). Towards zero emissions from fossil fuel power stations. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 87, 188-202.

Gao, T., Selinger, J. L., & Rochelle, G. T. (2019). Demonstration of 99% CO₂ removal from coal flue gas by amine scrubbing. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 83, 236-244.

Gassnova (2019). CO₂ capture facility at Karsto, Norway – Front-End Engineering and Design (FEED) Study Report. Available at: https://ukccsrc.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/8.5-x-11-Full-Karsto-FEED-Study-Report-Redacted-Updated_OCR-1.pdf [Accessed February 27, 2023]

GCCSI (2016). Global status of CCS: Special report – Understanding industrial CCS hubs and clusters. Available at: <https://www.globalccsinstitute.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Understanding-Industrial-CCS-hubs-and-clusters.pdf> [Accessed December 16, 2022]

GCCSI (2019). Waste-to-energy with CCS: A pathway to carbon-negative power generation.

Available at: https://www.globalccsinstitute.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Waste-to-energy-with-CCS_A-pathway-to-carbon-negative-power-generation_Oct2019-4.pdf [Accessed January 12, 2023]

GCCSI (2022). State of the Art: CCS technologies 2022. Available at:


<https://www.globalccsinstitute.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/State-of-the-Art-CCS-Technologies-2022.pdf> [Accessed December 16, 2022]

Gidden, M. J., Riahi, K., Smith, S. J., Fujimori, S., Luderer, G., Kriegler, E., ... & Takahashi, K. (2019). Global emissions pathways under different socioeconomic scenarios for use in CMIP6: a dataset of harmonized emissions trajectories through the end of the century. *Geoscientific model development*, 12(4), 1443-1475.

Grazhdani, D. (2016). Assessing the variables affecting on the rate of solid waste generation and recycling: An empirical analysis in Prespa Park. *Waste Management*, 48, 3-13.

Haszeldine, R. S., Flude, S., Johnson, G., & Scott, V. (2018). Negative emissions technologies and carbon capture and storage to achieve the Paris Agreement commitments. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 376(2119), 20160447.

Herraiz, L., Su, D., Muslemani, H., Struthers, I., Thomson, C., Chalmers, H. & Lucquiaud, M. (2022). A preliminary assessment of negative CO₂ emissions in the European waste sector. Conference



paper. 2nd International Conference on Negative CO₂ Emissions, June 14-17, 2022, Goteborg, Sweden.

Hirata, T., Tsujiuchi, T., Kamijo, T., Kishimoto, S., Inui, M., Kawasaki, S., et al. (2019). Near-Zero Emission Thermal Power Plant using Advanced KM CDR Process™. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 92, 102847.

Husebye, J., Brunsvold, A. L., Roussanaly, S., & Zhang, X. (2012). Techno economic evaluation of amine based CO₂ capture: impact of CO₂ concentration and steam supply. *Energy Procedia*, 23, 381-390.

IEAGHG (2020). IEAGHG Technical Report: CCS on Waste to Energy 2020-06. Available at: <https://www.club-co2.fr/files/2021/01/2020-06-CCS-on-Waste-to-Energy.pdf> [Accessed December 16, 2022]

International Association of Oil & Gas Producers (2021). CCUS projects in Europe. Available at: <https://iogpeurope.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Map-of-EU-CCS-Projects-draft-221024.pdf> [Accessed December 16, 2022]

International CCS Knowledge Centre (2018). The Shand CCS Feasibility Study Public Report. Available at: https://ccsknowledge.com/pub/documents/publications/Shand%20CCS%20Feasibility%20Study%20Public%20_Full%20Report_NOV2018.pdf [Accessed February 27, 2023]

IPCC (2021). Climate change 2021 – The Physical Science Basis. Available at: https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGI_SPM_final.pdf [Accessed January 6, 2023]

IPCC (2022). Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change. Working Group III contribution to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Available at: <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg3/> [Accessed Jan 13, 2023]

Keith, D. W. (2000). Geoengineering the climate: History and prospect. *Annual review of energy and the environment*, 25(1), 245-284.

Kothari, R., Tyagi, V. V., & Pathak, A. (2010). Waste-to-energy: A way from renewable energy sources to sustainable development. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 14(9), 3164-3170.

Krautwurst, S., Gerilowski, K., Jonsson, H. H., Thompson, D. R., Kolyer, R. W., Iraci, L. T., ... & Bovensmann, H. (2017). Methane emissions from a Californian landfill, determined from airborne remote sensing and in situ measurements. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 10(9), 3429-3452.

Kumar, A., & Samadder, S. R. (2017). A review on technological options of waste to energy for effective management of municipal solid waste. *Waste Management*, 69, 407-422.


Lomax, G., Lenton, T. M., Adeosun, A., & Workman, M. (2015). Investing in negative emissions. *Nature Climate Change*, 5(6), 498-500.

Muhammad, H. A., Roh, C., Cho, J., Rehman, Z., Sultan, H., Baik, Y. J., & Lee, B. (2020). A comprehensive thermodynamic performance assessment of CO₂ liquefaction and pressurization system using a heat pump for carbon capture and storage (CCS) process. *Energy Conversion and Management*, 206, 112489.

Palstra, S. W. L., & Meijer, H. A. J. (2010). Carbon-14 based determination of the biogenic fraction of industrial CO₂ emissions – Application and validation. *Bioresource Technology*, 101, 3702–3710.

Pamplany, A., Gordijn, B., & Brereton, P. (2020). The ethics of geoengineering: a literature review. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 26(6), 3069-3119.

Pires, J. C. M. (2019). Negative emissions technologies: a complementary solution for climate change mitigation. *Science of the Total Environment*, 672, 502-514.



Preston, C. J. (2013). Ethics and geoengineering: reviewing the moral issues raised by solar radiation management and carbon dioxide removal. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 4(1), 23-37.

Prognos (2019). CEWEP calculation tool for assessing impact on waste management based on the new EU waste legislation. Available at: https://www.cewep.eu/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Summary_Peer_Review_20190417.pdf [Accessed December 16, 2022]

Realise-CCUS (2020). Industrial clusters. Available at: <https://realiseccus.eu/ccus-and-refineries/industrial-clusters> [Accessed December 16, 2022]

Seo, Y., Huh, C., Lee, S., & Chang, D. (2016). Comparison of CO₂ liquefaction pressures for ship-based carbon capture and storage (CCS) chain. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 52, 1-12.

Stéphenne, K. (2014). Start-up of world's first commercial post-combustion coal fired CCS project: contribution of Shell Cansolv to SaskPower Boundary Dam ICCS project. *Energy Procedia*, 63, 6106-6110.

Su, D., Herraiz, L., Lucquiaud, M., Thomson, C., & Chalmers, H. (2023). Thermal integration of waste to energy plants with Post-combustion CO₂ capture. *Fuel*, 332, 126004.

Su, D. Herraiz, L., Lucquiaud, M. & Thomson, C. (2022). Report on the technical comparison of the investigated WtE CCUS technologies. Working paper - NEWEST-CCUS Project Deliverable 5.3.

UK Government (2021). Post-combustion carbon dioxide capture: Best available techniques (BAT). Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/post-combustion-carbon-dioxide-capture-best-available-techniques-bat> [Accessed December 16, 2022]

US Department of Energy (2020). W.A. Parish Post-Combustion CO₂ Capture and Sequestration Demonstration Project – Final Scientific/Technical Report. Available at: <https://www.osti.gov/servlets/purl/1608572> [Accessed February 27, 2023]

Vaughan, N. E., & Lenton, T. M. (2011). A review of climate geoengineering proposals. *Climatic change*, 109(3), 745-790.

World Bank (2018). What a Waste 2.0: A global snapshot of solid waste management to 2050. Available at: <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/30317> [Accessed December 16, 2022]

World Bank (2016). United Mexican States MX TF Carbon Capture, Utilization and Storage Development in Mexico: Pre-feasibility study for establishing a carbon capture pilot plants in Mexico. Report No: AUS8579-2. Available at: https://www.gob.mx/cms/uploads/attachment/file/107318/CCPP_Final_Report.pdf [Accessed February 27, 2023]

Xie, P., Lu, X., Yang, X., Ingham, D., Ma, L., & Pourkashanian, M. (2017). Characteristics of liquid flow in a rotating packed bed for CO₂ capture: A CFD analysis. *Chemical Engineering Science*, 172, 216-229.

Yu, C. H., Cheng, H. H., & Tan, C. S. (2012). CO₂ capture by alkanolamine solutions containing diethylenetriamine and piperazine in a rotating packed bed. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 9, 136-147.

ZEP (2019). The costs of CO₂ transport: Post-demonstration CCS in the EU. Available at: <https://www.globalccsinstitute.com/archive/hub/publications/119811/costs-co2-transport-post-demonstration-ccs-eu.pdf> [Accessed December 16, 2022]

Zhao, B., Su, Y., & Tao, W. (2014). Mass transfer performance of CO₂ capture in rotating packed bed: Dimensionless modeling and intelligent prediction. *Applied energy*, 136, 132-142.

