



# Ethanol Technologies Pty Ltd

<https://www.ethtec.com.au>

## Proof of Concept Life Cycle Analysis

Undertaken by Lifecycles

April 2018

Ethtec Cellulosic Ethanol Pilot Plant

*This project received funding from the Australian Renewable Energy Agency (ARENA) as part of ARENA's Advancing Renewables Program. The views expressed herein are not necessarily the views of the Australian Government. The Australian Government does not accept responsibility for any information or advice contained within this document.*



# **Greenhouse gas and sustainability footprints of emerging biofuels for Queensland**

**Undertaken by Lifecycles**

**For Department of Environment and Science**

**30<sup>th</sup> April 2018**

## Citation

Grant T.F.(2018), Greenhouse gas and sustainability footprints of emerging biofuels for Queensland, Lifecycles, Australia.

## Copyright

© 2018 Lifecycles. To the extent permitted by law, all rights are reserved, and no part of this publication covered by copyright may be reproduced or copied in any form or by any means except with the written permission of Lifecycles.

## Important disclaimer

Lifecycles advises that the information contained in this publication comprises general statements based on scientific research. The reader is advised and needs to be aware that such information may be incomplete or unable to be used in any specific situation. No reliance or actions must therefore be made on that information without seeking prior expert professional, scientific and technical advice. To the extent permitted by law, Lifecycles (including its employees and consultants) excludes all liability to any person for any consequences, including but not limited to all losses, damages, costs, expenses and any other compensation, arising directly or indirectly from using this publication (in part or in whole) and any information or material contained in it.

## Acknowledgments

A wide range of biofuel proponents and developers assisted in supplying data and reviewing assumptions in this study. Staff at Department of Environment Science (DES) and two independent reviewers provided valuable inputs and Well Writ provided editing for the final report.

# Contents

<b>Shortened forms</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>Glossary</b>	<b>x</b>
<b>1 Executive summary</b>	<b>xii</b>
1.1 Method.....	xii
1.2 Results.....	xii
1.3 Conclusions.....	xiv
<b>2 Introduction</b>	<b>15</b>
2.1 Life cycle assessment.....	16
<b>3 Goal</b>	<b>17</b>
3.1 Reason for the study.....	17
3.2 Audience.....	17
<b>4 Scope</b>	<b>17</b>
4.1 Functional unit.....	17
4.2 Fuel scenarios included.....	20
4.3 System boundary.....	23
4.3.1 Included processes.....	23
4.3.2 Excluded processes.....	23
4.3.3 Cutoff criteria.....	24
4.4 Flows included in the LCA.....	24
<b>5 Inventory analysis</b>	<b>25</b>
5.1 Foreground data.....	26
5.2 Background data.....	29
5.3 Multi-functionality.....	30
5.4 Carbon modelling.....	34
5.5 Land use and land use change (LUC).....	35
5.6 Life cycle inventory model.....	36
<b>6 Impact assessment</b>	<b>36</b>
6.1 Impact assessment indicators and characterisation models.....	36
6.2 Results.....	37
6.2.1 Fossil fuel baseline.....	37
6.2.2 Results for biofuel substitution using system expansion method.....	38
6.2.3 Normalisation to national impact loads.....	41
<b>7 Interpretation</b>	<b>42</b>
7.1 Contribution analyses.....	42
7.1.1 Climate change.....	43
7.1.2 Fossil fuel use.....	44
7.1.3 Eutrophication.....	45



7.1.4	Particulate matter .....	46
7.1.5	Land use .....	48
7.1.6	Water scarcity .....	49
7.2	Sensitivity analyses .....	50
7.2.1	The effects of alternative allocation approaches for co-products .....	50
7.2.2	The effects of tyre source and alternative assumptions on fate .....	52
7.2.3	Landfill instead of composting waste as alternative fate for food waste garden waste and timber waste feedstocks.....	53
7.2.4	Exclusion of landfill store of carbon for tyres, solid waste, and CCA wood waste.....	55
7.2.5	Soil carbon changes from biomass removal .....	56
7.2.6	The inclusion of iLUC .....	57
7.2.7	Alternative markets for carbon from pyrolysis and destructive distillation .....	58
7.3	Data quality assessment and uncertainty analysis .....	59
<b>8</b>	<b>Discussion and conclusions</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Appendix A.</b>	<b>Feedstock and fuel details</b>	<b>64</b>
A.1	Biomass feedstocks .....	64
A.1.1	Overview of the waste feedstocks .....	64
A.1.2	Cane trash and tops.....	64
A.1.3	Forestry residues .....	65
A.1.4	Agricultural residues.....	66
A.1.5	Prickly acacia .....	67
A.1.1	Green waste and food waste .....	68
A.1.2	Wood waste and treated wood waste .....	69
A.1.3	Waste tyres .....	69
A.2	Agave for ethanol production .....	70
A.2.1	Description of process and allocation approaches .....	70
A.2.2	Data sources .....	71
A.2.3	Climate change results.....	74
A.3	Ethanol from sugarcane biorefinery .....	76
A.3.1	Description of the process.....	76
A.3.2	Process data .....	76
A.3.3	Climate change results.....	78
A.4	Ethanol from biomass using concentrated acid hydrolysis .....	79
A.4.1	Description of process.....	79
A.4.2	Process data .....	80
A.4.3	Climate change results.....	82
A.5	Ethanol from cotton trash using dilute acid hydrolysis .....	84
A.5.1	Overview of the process.....	84
A.5.2	Process data .....	85
A.5.3	Climate change results.....	87
A.6	Cane trash to ethanol via Glycell™ process, acid hydrolysis and fermentation .....	88
A.6.1	Description of the process and allocations .....	88
A.6.2	Process data .....	89
A.6.3	Climate change results.....	90
A.7	Tobacco for biodiesel production .....	91
A.7.1	Overview of the process and allocation issues .....	91
A.7.2	Data sources .....	92



A.7.3	Climate change results.....	94
A.8	Carinata for biodiesel production.....	95
A.8.1	Overview of the process.....	95
A.8.3	Data sources .....	96
A.8.4	Climate change results.....	99
A.9	Renewable diesel from biomass sources and tyres.....	100
A.9.1	Description of the process.....	100
A.9.2	Process data .....	101
A.9.3	Climate change results.....	102
A.10	Used tyres to renewable diesel via destructive distillation .....	103
A.10.1	Description of the process .....	103
A.10.2	Inventory data .....	104
A.10.3	Climate change results .....	105
A.11	Biomass to renewable diesel via catalytic depolymerisation .....	106
A.11.1	Description of the process and co-product assumptions.....	106
A.11.2	Process data .....	107
A.11.3	Climate change results .....	108
A.12	Renewable diesel from municipal solid waste using gasification and Fischer–Tropsch.....	109
A.12.1	Description of the process .....	109
A.12.2	Process data .....	110
A.12.3	Climate change results .....	112
<b>References</b>		<b>113</b>



# Figures

Figure 1 Framework for LCA from ISO 14040.....	16
Figure 2 Reference flows for replacing one litre of conventional fuel using E10, B5 and 100% diesel. ....	19
Figure 3 System boundary for the LCA .....	23
Figure 4 Inputs and outputs of a unit process in LCA. ....	24
Figure 5 The linking of unit process in an LCA to produce the functional unit. ....	25
Figure 6 Comparative impact assessment results for replacing one litre fossil fuel with biofuel as a fraction of total Australian per capita impact (normalisation). ....	41
Figure 7 Climate change impact for replacement of one litre of fossil fuel with equivalent biofuel. ....	43
Figure 8 Fossil fuel use for replacement of one litre of fossil fuel with biofuel. ....	44
Figure 9 Eutrophication for replacement of one litre of fossil fuel with biofuel, by life cycle stage.....	45
Figure 10 Eutrophication for replacement of one litre of fossil fuel with biofuel, by major emission source. ....	46
Figure 11 Particulate matter results for one litre fossil fuel replaced by equivalent biofuel. ....	47
Figure 12 Particulate matter contribution by substance for one litre fossil fuel replaced by equivalent biofuel. ....	47
Figure 13 Land use results for replacement of one litre of fossil fuel with equivalent biofuel. ....	48
Figure 14 Water scarcity results for replacement of one litre of fossil fuel with equivalent biofuel. ....	49
Figure 15 Climate change impact using economic allocation for 1 litre of fossil fuel replaced by equivalent biofuel .....	51
Figure 16 Comparison climate change results (using system expansion) to economic allocation .....	51
Figure 17 Sensitivity of tyre source and alternative fate for destructive distillation of tyres. ....	52
Figure 18 Sensitivity of tyre source and alternative fate for catalytic depolymerisation of tyres. ....	53
Figure 19 Sensitivity of alternative fate for organic materials for replacing one litre of fossil fuels with biofuel. ....	54
Figure 20 Sensitivity of excluding carbon storage in landfills. ....	55
Figure 21 Sensitivity of including possible soil carbon change from removing biomass from cane, wheat and forest systems on fuels made from these residues. ....	56
Figure 22 Sensitivity of climate change impacts of iLUC on biofuels from dedicated cropping systems... ..	57
Figure 23 Sensitivity of alternative and markets for carbon exported from pyrolysis processes. ....	58
Figure 24 Forest cover of Queensland. ....	65
Figure 25 Production (t/year) for wheat, averaged over four years. Source: (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2015).....	66
Figure 26 Distribution of prickly acacia in Queensland. (Department of Agriculture and Fisheries 2016) .	67
Figure 27 System model for ethanol from agave. ....	70
Figure 28 Climate change impacts from replacing gasoline with equivalent ethanol biofuel from agave. .	74
Figure 29 Climate change impacts from replacing gasoline with equivalent ethanol biofuel from agave and molasses.....	75
Figure 30 Climate change impacts from replacing gasoline with equivalent ethanol biofuel from sugarcane. ....	78
Figure 31 Sugarcane bagasse, tops and trash, and forestry residues to ethanol via concentrated acid hydrolysis.....	80



Figure 32 Breakdown of impacts for replacement of one litre gasoline with equivalent ethanol from sugarcane trash via concentrated acid hydrolysis.....	83
Figure 33 Overview of process for production of ethanol from cotton gin trash.....	84
Figure 34 Climate change impacts from replacing gasoline with equivalent ethanol from cotton gin trash via dilute acid hydrolysis.....	87
Figure 35 System boundary for ethanol from biomass via Glycell™ process.....	88
Figure 36 Contribution analysis for replacing 1 litre of gasoline with ethanol from cane trash and tops using the Glycell™ process.....	90
Figure 37 Biodiesel production from tobacco (Solaris).....	91
Figure 38 Contribution analysis of 1 litre of conventional diesel being replaced by biodiesel produced from tobacco.....	94
Figure 39 System boundary for vegetable oil production from Carinata.....	95
Figure 40 Contribution analysis for replacing diesel replaced with biodiesel produced from Carinata.....	99
Figure 41 System boundary for renewable diesel from pyrolysis.....	100
Figure 42 Climate change impacts from replacing 1 litre of diesel with equivalent renewable diesel via pyrolysis of different feedstocks.....	102
Figure 43 System boundary for renewable diesel from destructive distillation of tyres.....	103
Figure 44 Climate change impacts from replacing 1 litre of diesel with equivalent renewable diesel via destructive distillation of tyres.....	105
Figure 45 Overview of process for production of renewable diesel using catalytic depolymerisation.....	106
Figure 46 Climate change impacts from replacing diesel with equivalent renewable diesel via catalytic depolymerisation.....	108
Figure 47 System boundary for renewable diesel from gasification and Fischer–Tropsch from municipal solid waste.....	109
Figure 48 Contribution analysis for replacing diesel with renewable diesel produced from MSW using gasification and Fischer–Tropsch.....	112





# Tables

Table 1 Percentage reduction in impact of biofuel replacing fossil fuel. ....	xiii
Table 2 Reference flows for different fuel blends. ....	18
Table 3 List of current fuels to be assessed. ....	20
Table 4 Summary of foreground inventory data and assumptions for biofuel feedstocks. ....	26
Table 5 Summary of inventory data and assumption for fuel production processes. ....	27
Table 6 Summary of inventory data for major background processes in the LCA. ....	29
Table 7 Description of options for solving allocation in multifunction systems. ....	31
Table 8 Co-production in the LCA foreground and the replacement products used. ....	33
Table 9 Waste products utilised in LCA and alternative disposal pathways. ....	34
Table 10 Land use impacts from feedstock. ....	35
Table 11 Impact assessment categories and characterisation models used in this LCA. ....	36
Table 12 Results for production and use of one litre of fossil fuel. ....	37
Table 13 Impact assessment results for replacement of one fossil fuel with equivalent biofuel. ....	39
Table 14 Percentage reduction in impact of biofuel replacing fossil fuel. ....	40
Table 15 Estimate and annual impacts results for Australia in 2008. ....	41
Table 16: Change in percentage improvement climate change results when replacing fossil fuel with equivalent biofuel. ....	55
Table 17 Assumptions used for sensitivity analysis of including potential soil carbon change from removing biomass from cane, wheat and forest systems. ....	56
Table 18 Data quality statement and robustness assessment. ....	59
Table 19 Data for collection and delivery of 1 tonne of forestry residues to biofuel facility. ....	65
Table 20 Process data for collection and delivery of 1 tonne of agricultural residues to biofuel facility. ...	67
Table 21 Process data for delivering 1 tonne of prickly acacia to biofuel facility. ....	68
Table 22 Process data for delivering 1 tonne of food and garden waste to biofuel facility. ....	68
Table 23 Process data for composting garden and food waste. ....	68
Table 24 Process data for application of compost. ....	68
Table 25 Tyre end-of-life share in Queensland. ....	69
Table 26 Natural rubber and steel content in various types of tyres. ....	69
Table 27 Substitution assumptions for agave dunder production. ....	71
Table 28 Energy and economic data used for agave juice and agave bagasse allocation. ....	71
Table 29 Unit process data for agave production. ....	71
Table 30 Unit process data for agave crushing. ....	73
Table 31 Unit process data for ethanol production from agave. ....	73
Table 32 Climate change impacts from replacing gasoline with equivalent ethanol biofuel from agave and a 50/50 mix of agave and molasses. ....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Table 33 Production, water and chemical input for sugarcane production in the Burdekin. ....	76
Table 34 Unit process data for milling sugar juice. ....	77
Table 35 Unit process data for distillation of sugar juice. ....	77
Table 36 Data for pre-treatment per dry tonne of sugarcane bagasse/trash. ....	80
Table 37 Main assumptions for hydrolysis process. ....	81



Table 38 Main assumptions for fermentation and ethanol separation. ....	81
Table 39 Lignin waste energy process. ....	82
Table 40 Data used for economic and energy allocation of ethanol and electricity. ....	85
Table 41 Data used for ethanol production from cotton gin trash and electricity. ....	85
Table 42 Unit process data for GlycellTM process. ....	89
Table 43 Unit process data for distillery. ....	89
Table 44 Assumptions for credit provided for tobacco meal derived from tobacco oil production. ....	92
Table 45 Unit process data for tobacco production. ....	92
Table 46 Tobacco oil extraction process. ....	93
Table 47 Biodiesel esterification process from tobacco. ....	93
Table 48 Assumptions for credit provided for Carinata meal derived from Carinata oil production. ....	96
Table 49 Unit process data for Carinata production. ....	96
Table 50 Carinata oil extraction process. ....	97
Table 51 Biodiesel esterification process from Carinata. ....	97
Table 52 Unit process data for pyrolysis. ....	101
Table 53 Unit process data for hydrotreating. ....	101
Table 54 Unit process data for purification and fractionation. ....	101
Table 55 Process data inputs for catalytic depolymerisation of tyres. ....	104
Table 56 Unit process data for evaporation. ....	104
Table 57 Unit process data for pre-processing. ....	107
Table 58 Unit process data for catalytic depolymerisation. ....	107
Table 59 Unit process data for hydrotreating diesel. ....	107
Table 60 Unit process data for Fischer–Tropsch process. ....	110
Table 61 Syngas production from gasification of MSW organic components. ....	111



## Shortened forms

ACRONYM	FULL NAME
ABARES	Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics and Sciences
ABS	Australian Bureau of Statistics
ACCC	Australian Competition and Consumer Commission
AIP	Australian Institute of Petroleum
APSIM	Agricultural Production System Simulator
ARENA	Australian Renewable Energy Agency
AU	Australian
AUD	Australian dollar
AusLCI	Australian National Life Cycle Inventory Database
BMP	Best management practice
BOD	Biological oxygen demand
CAD	Canadian dollar
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CCA	Copper chromium arsenic (treated timber)
CIE	Compression ignition engines
COD	Chemical oxygen demand
CSBP	Chemicals and Fertilisers Division of Wesfarmers
DAP	Diammonium Phosphate
DES	Department of Environment and Science, Queensland Government
DDGS	Dried distiller's grains and solubles
dLUC	Direct land use change
EHP	Department of Environment and Heritage Protection, Queensland Government
EPU	Equivalent passenger units
GAP	Good agricultural practice
GHG	Greenhouse gas
GJ	Gigajoule
iLUC	Indirect land use change
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
kWh	Kilowatt hour
LCA	Life cycle assessment
LCI	Life cycle inventory
LUC	Land use change
MJ	Megajoule
ML	Megalitre
MSG	Monosodium glutamate
MSW	Municipal solid waste
MT	Megatonne
NEM	National electricity market
NMVOC	Non-methane volatile organic compounds
NREL	National Renewable Energy Laboratory
PM	Particulate matter
PULP	Premium unleaded petrol
RON	Research oxygen number
RSB	Roundtable for Sustainable Biomaterials



RSPO	Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil
RULP	Regular unleaded petrol
SIE	Spark ignition engines
SOM	Soil organic matter
tkm	Tonne.kilometer
UCO	Used cooking oil
USD	US dollar



# Glossary

TERM	DEFINITION
Allocation	Partitioning the input or output flows of a process or a product system between the product system under study and one or more other product systems (ISO 14040).
Biogenic carbon	Carbon derived from biomass (ISO/TS 14067).
Break crop effect	The benefits which occur due to the addition of a different crop in cropping rotation, such as the addition of legume and/canola in wheat cropping system
Carbon dioxide equivalent (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., CO <sub>2</sub> e)	Unit for comparing the radiative forcing of a greenhouse gas to that of carbon dioxide (ISO/TS 14067).
Carbon footprint	Sum of greenhouse gas emissions and removals in a product system, expressed as CO <sub>2</sub> equivalents and based on a life cycle assessment using the single impact category of climate change (ISO/TS 14067).
Characterisation factor	Factors derived from a characterisation model that are applied to convert an assigned life cycle inventory analysis result to the common unit of the category indicator (ISO 14040).
Direct land use change (dLUC)	Change in human use or management of land within the product system being assessed (ISO/TS 14067).
Eutrophication	The process by which a body of water becomes enriched in dissolved nutrients (as phosphates) that stimulate the growth of aquatic plant life usually resulting in the depletion of dissolved oxygen (Merriam-Webster.com 2016).
Fossil carbon	Carbon that is contained in fossilised material (ISO/TS 14067).
Functional unit	Quantified performance of a product system for use as a reference unit (ISO 14040).
Climate change potential (GWP)	Characterisation factor describing the radiative forcing impact of one mass-based unit of a given greenhouse gas relative to that of carbon dioxide over a given period of time (ISO/TS 14067).
Glycell™	Commercially available process for conversion of plant components into biomaterials.
Greenhouse gas (GHG)	Natural or anthropogenic gaseous constituent of the atmosphere that absorbs and emits radiation at specific wavelengths within the spectrum of infrared radiation emitted by the earth's surface, the atmosphere, and clouds (ISO 13065).
Impact category	Class representing environmental issues of concern to which life cycle inventory analysis results may be assigned (ISO 14044).
Indirect land use change (iLUC)	Change in the use or management of land that is a consequence of direct land use change, but which occurs outside the product system being assessed (ISO/TS 14067).
Land use change (LUC)	A change in human use or management of land.
Life cycle assessment (LCA)	Compilation and evaluation of the inputs, outputs and the potential environmental impacts of a product system throughout its life cycle (ISO 14040).
Life cycle impact assessment (LCIA)	Phase of life cycle assessment aimed at understanding and evaluating the magnitude and significance of the potential environmental impacts for a product system throughout the life cycle of the product (ISO 14040).
Life cycle inventory (LCI)	Phase of life cycle assessment involving the compilation and quantification of inputs and outputs for a product throughout its life cycle (ISO 14040).
Multi-functionality and co-products	Refers to a process that creates multiple products or functions. Products often thought of as waste can also be thought of co-products if they provide some function or value.
System boundary	Set of criteria specifying which unit processes are part of a product system (ISO 14040).
System expansion	Recommended ISO 14040 method for avoiding allocation. This is done by 'expanding the product system to include the additional functions related to the



	co-products' (ISO 14044), note also that Annex H in 13065 gives guidance on application of system expansion.
Tonne.kilometer	Units used to describe freight task measured by the multiple of the net tonnes moved and the net distance travelled (i.e. not including return distance)



# 1 Executive summary

---

## 1.1 Method

This report delivers the results of a life cycle assessment identifying the greenhouse gas benefits and broader sustainability profiles for emerging biofuels from feedstocks and technologies that, have not yet been used for commercial production of biofuels in Queensland. The sustainability credentials of biofuels have become more important with the implementation of the Queensland biofuel mandate.

The mandate sets minimum sales volumes of biobased petrol and biobased diesel for liable fuel sellers. The Liquid Fuel Supply Regulation 2016 prescribes sustainability criteria that must be satisfied for the biofuel to be eligible to count towards a liable fuel sellers' obligations under the mandate. All biofuels, regardless of the type and feedstock source, must deliver greenhouse gas emissions savings of at least 20% (before blending) when compared to regular petrol or diesel. A life cycle assessment is one way of demonstrating the greenhouse gas requirement can be met. This requirement is one of the principal drivers for undertaking this report.

The report also provides insights into the potential strengths and weaknesses of different emerging feedstocks and technologies across a variety of environmental indicators. The results of the LCA could inform proponents on the types of activities or process change that could deliver further improvements the performance of proposed biofuels.

The study examined 20 fuels scenarios, including seven sources of ethanol, two sources of biodiesel and 11 sources of renewable diesel. The selection of fuels and feedstocks was based on potential production scenarios in Queensland.

In LCA, the basis for comparing alternatives is referred to as a functional unit. For this study, the functional unit is a replacement of one litre of fossil fuel with the equivalent biofuel in the Queensland market.

Greenhouse gas emissions are a focus of the Regulation and these are measured using the impact category climate change, which is calculated by weighting each of the contributing gases using global warming potentials. For example carbon dioxide is 1 and methane is 25 under the current reporting guidance for Australian GHG accounting. (Commonwealth of Australia 2017) This study also includes other relevant environmental indicators, including fossil energy, eutrophication, particulate matter, land use and water scarcity.

## 1.2 Results

Table 1 shows the percentage emission reduction for replacing fossil fuel with equivalent biofuel. A positive percentage represents biofuel having a lower impact than fossil fuel. The colour map shows green cells representing where biofuels have lower impacts than fossil fuels and red cells where biofuels have greater impacts than the comparable fossil fuel.

Table 1 shows that in 18 of the 20 scenarios, the net climate change result for replacing fossil fuel with equivalent biofuel is a reduction in impacts. In two scenarios, the impacts of biofuel replacing fossil fuel is an increase in climate change impacts, which is due to the impacts of removing high carbon material from landfill to make these biofuels (tyres and CCA wood waste). Both of these waste streams are problem wastes for landfill: tyres are structurally problematic for landfills and CCA wood waste has toxic materials that could potentially leach from the material. If the carbon storage in landfill is not included in the scenario, both scenarios are positive for the biofuel.

One of the drivers of the biofuel industry is to replace demand on fossil so it not surprising that all scenarios except 1, have lower fossil energy depletion. The anomaly is renewable diesel from MSW using gasification and Fischer–Tropsch. There is significant electricity use in this process as well as a loss of electricity generation at landfill from biogenic methane, which is the alternative assumed use of MSW.

For eutrophication the scenarios that involve cropping have much higher impacts than fossil fuel. This is due to agricultural emissions and the relatively low impacts of fossil fuel on this indicator.

Particulate matter impacts are from two main sources: combustion emissions from biomass and fossil fuel combustion, and ammonia emissions from agriculture.

The land use impacts are dominated by the cropping activities, Carinata and tobacco. Sugarcane and agave have less land use impact as they are perennial crops and have higher productivity per hectare. The other biofuel scenarios have little effect on land use.



Finally, for water scarcity, irrigated sugarcane has the most significant impact because it is a fully irrigated crop. For all other scenarios water use is small since it is for biofuel production processes.

Table 1 Percentage reduction in impact of biofuel replacing fossil fuel.

	Climate change	Fossil energy depletion	Eutrophication	Particulate matter	Land use	Water scarcity
	%	%	%	%	%	%
E.agave ferm.	90	100	-535	8	-159	-89
E.sugarcane integ. bioref. ferm.	42	76	-1474	-50	-222	-12656
E.agave & moll. ferm.	80	91	-489	0	-282	-88
E.cane trash Glycell	72	76	-253	5	-51	-354
E.cane trash conc. acid	84	89	45	57	92	12
E.forestry res. conc. acid	73	82	13	50	86	8
E.cotton GT dilute acid	102	108	7	-31	59	-211
BD.Carinata transest.	52	67	-782	-37	-1076	-124
BD.tobacco transest.	46	60	-512	-104	-522	-2981
RD.forestry resid. pyrolysis	76	138	0	82	161	69
RD.cane trash pyrolysis	82	143	18	88	165	72
RD.wheat straw pyrolysis	84	143	29	92	165	72
RD.prickly acacia pyrolysis	80	142	3	85	164	71
RD.tyres destruc. distill.	18	254	186	232	261	261
RD.CCA wood waste cata. depoly.	-18	38	11	47	96	50
RD.green waste cata. depoly.	35	34	-76	5	81	-2
RD.forestry res. cata. depoly	39	40	-64	33	88	37
RD.food waste cata. depoly	35	34	-76	5	81	-2
RD.tyres. cata. depoly.	-29	63	-8	109	103	114
RD.MSW gasification FTP	593	-28	-401	-18	135	-137

Note: The table colour gradations are from green (better for biofuel) through to red (better for fossil fuel). Note the colour scaling is independent for each impact category – i.e. orange for climate change is better for biofuel, while for land use orange is better for fossil fuel.





## 1.3 Conclusions

The aim of this report was to determine the greenhouse gas emission profiles of the emerging biofuels for Queensland, represented by the climate change indicator. Of the 20 scenarios assessed, 17 of them had greater than 20% climate change benefit compared to conventional fossil fuel. The three fuels that do not meet this threshold would meet it if storage of carbon in landfill was excluded, as it is in Australia's national greenhouse accounts.

Because most of the scenarios were based on non-commercial technologies, a robustness check was undertaken to test how the results would shift if the scenario parameters were pushed to a highly conservative (in favour of fossil fuel) position. All 17 scenarios that initially passed the 20% threshold still had more than 20% savings after applying the robustness check.

There are some generalisations that can be drawn from the 20 scenarios in relation to climate change impacts.


- Biofuels which address waste management challenges with highly degradable carbon, such as MSW, food & green waste can have dramatic benefits, especially if the biofuel helps to keep these materials from going to landfill.
- Biofuels based on highly stable carbon wastes such as tyres and wood waste need to compete with alternative treatment methods which can include landfill but also other fuel using processes such as cement kilns. In these scenarios the local supply situation will be critical to determine the alternative fate of these materials and therefore the overall environmental performance.
- Biofuels based on accessing woody wastes that are otherwise breaking down in the environment, such as forestry and agriculture residues and prickly acacia, have performed very well with the only possible concern being the effects of these removals on soil carbon.
- Biofuels based on high biomass yields that combine to produce liquid fuels and electricity perform well, however they do increase indirect land use pressure, and for some, overall water demand.
- Biofuels based on vegetable oils have the benefits of low processing impacts and valuable protein co-products. There is also benefits of using these crops between other cereal crops for beneficial break crop effects.

Other environmental indicators provide insights to the trade-offs required to address climate change impacts. Unsurprisingly, growing crops has impacts on land use indicators, and irrigated crops impact water scarcity. Sugarcane production has potential impacts on eutrophication, which are already well understood in the sugar industry and are reduced through best practice management programs such as Smartcane Best Management Practice Program (BMP). Particulate matter impacts are mostly higher from fossil fuel production; however, where biomass combustion is included in the biofuel system there is potential for significant impacts, which will ultimately be a function of the quality of the emission control technology.

Care needs to be taken in interpreting the results, with consideration of the following parameters:

- the level of energy and carbon product exports from biomass systems
- ability to extract biomass without detrimental impacts to underlying soil carbon
- in the case of waste inputs, accessing the most likely alternative fate of the waste products that should be used as the baseline for comparison.

The transport of feedstocks has a low impact on the overall biofuel production footprint. It is likely that the economic cost of transport will be the limiting factor to aggregating material before the environmental impacts become a dominant factor.



## 2 Introduction

---

On 1 January 2017, Queensland's biofuel mandate commenced. The *Liquid Fuel Supply Act 1984* requires the fuel industry to meet targets for the sale of sustainable biobased fuels.

The biobased petrol mandate requires that three percent of the total volume of regular unleaded petrol sales and ethanol blended fuel sales by liable retailers must be sustainable biobased petrol (i.e. ethanol). For example, if three out of every 10 litres of regular petrol sold by a petrol station were E10, which contains 10% ethanol, that petrol station would have met the mandate. Eighteen months after commencement, from 1 July 2018, the ethanol mandate will increase to 4%. The biobased diesel mandate requires 0.5% of all diesel fuel sold to be sustainable biobased diesel.

To be counted towards a fuel seller's obligations under the biofuels mandate, biobased petrol and biobased diesel must meet the sustainability criteria prescribed by the Liquid Fuel Supply Regulation 2016.

The Liquid Fuel Supply Regulation 2016 provides the benchmarks for environmental performance that must be met for a biofuel to be considered sustainable and therefore eligible to be counted towards Queensland's biobased petrol and biobased diesel mandates.

The sustainability criteria are intended to mitigate environmental impacts from the expected increase in demand for biofuels as a result of Queensland's biofuel mandate. The sustainability criteria include:

- a greenhouse gas (GHG) improvement of 20% compared to regular petrol or diesel; and
- certification under a relevant environmental sustainability standard, which varies depending on the feedstock used to produce the biofuel.

In 2016, the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection (now Department of Environment and Science) commissioned Life Cycle Strategies to undertake a life cycle assessment (LCA) of existing and potential biofuels (Grant, Bontinck et al. 2016), in part to inform policy and determine which would meet the GHG requirements. The 2016 study covered ethanol produced from molasses, grain sorghum, wheat and starch waste, biodiesel produced from tallow, used cooking oil and canola feedstocks.

This report presents the results of a separate study that analyses a range of emerging feedstocks for biofuels that to date have not been used for commercial biofuel production in Queensland. This analysis considers crops /feedstocks such as agave, sweet sorghum, tobacco and Carinata, and waste products such as used tyres, sugarcane biomass, cotton gin trash and wood waste. It also includes forest timber grown for biomass, prickly acacia and macro algae production.

The study has been undertaken following the ISO 14040 and ISO 14044 guidelines and in line with the draft requirements for biofuels and bioenergy assessments established by the Australian Renewable Energy Agency (ARENA). The study has also undertaken a biofuels greenhouse gas calculation based on the Roundtable for Sustainable Biomaterials Standard? (Roundtable on Sustainable Biofuels 2008).





## 3 Goal

---

### 3.1 Reason for the study

The study is being undertaken to quantify the environmental impacts and benefits of potential biofuels that may play a role in fulfilling the biofuels mandate in Queensland.

The environmental impacts studied are limited to those that have the greatest effect on fossil and biofuel production and utilisation, and those of most relevance to government policy. These include greenhouse gas emissions represented using climate change, indicator fossil fuel depletion, impacts of phosphorus and nitrogen on eutrophication (excessive nutrient run-off), particulate matter, land use and water use.

The study calculates environmental impacts in two ways, to answer two different questions. The first is 'What is the impact of introducing the biofuel feedstock?', accounting for substitution effects of using or creating co-products and wastes. The second is, 'What is the GHG emission attributable to the fuel once it is in production?', according to the methods outlined in the Roundtable for Sustainable Biomaterials method.

### 3.2 Audience

The primary audience for the study is the Queensland Government and the Queensland biofuels industry. The report may also be a valuable resource for the transport sector. As the fuels analysed in the study cover a range of Australian producers, the audience may also include other government agencies and stakeholders in Australia.

## 4 Scope

---

### 4.1 Functional unit

The international standard on LCA describes the functional unit as defining what is being studied, and states that all analysis should be relative to the functional unit. The definition of the functional unit needs to clearly articulate functionality or service that is under investigation. In this LCA, the function was the supply of high-density liquid fuels suitable for use in the current vehicle fleet in Queensland. The role of liquid fuels is changing. In the Clean Energy Future and Government Policy Scenarios report prepared by CSIRO (Reedman and Graham 2011), biofuels were expected to be an increasing and significant part of the transport energy future, especially during the transition to electric alternatives. Liquid fuels are required for compression ignition engines (CIE), which typically use diesel fuels, and spark ignition engines (SIE), which use gasoline fuels.

The functional unit defines the common basis for comparison of alternative options being assessed. The central theme of this LCA is the replacement of conventional fuels with biofuel, the functional unit of this study is one litre of conventional fuel replacement in Queensland.

Because fuel use needs to be accounted for as actual vehicle emissions, using the most common blends of biofuel, the distance required to offset one litre of biofuel will vary by fuel type and blend.

The reference flow in an LCA is the amount of each system required to deliver the functional unit. The reference flows for replacing one litre of conventional fuels with biofuel are shown in Table 1. Using a 10% blend by volume (E10) in a petrol engine, in a standard vehicle, the car needs to travel 184 km to replace one litre of regular unleaded petrol (RULP) with ethanol. Using a 5% blend by volume (B5) in a diesel engine, in a standard vehicle, the car needs to travel 365 km to replace one litre of diesel with biodiesel (See Figure 2).

For the fuels that are produced from bio-crudes and used in diesel vehicles, the displacement of one litre of conventional fuel will be achieved through the use of one litre of fuel produced from renewable feedstock.

For transparency, the results of conventional fuels and biofuels will be calculated per km of travel and per GJ of fuel use.



Table 2 Reference flows for different fuel blends.

SCENARIO	REFERENCE FLOW
RULP replaced by E10 use	Operation of passenger vehicle with petrol (spark ignition) engine travelling 184 km in Queensland
Diesel replaced by B5 use	Operation of passenger vehicle with diesel (compression ignition) engine travelling 365 km in Queensland
Diesel from crude oil refining replaced by diesel from renewable feedstock	Operation of passenger vehicle with diesel (compression ignition) engine travelling 16.4 km in Queensland






Figure 2 Reference flows for replacing one litre of conventional fuel using E10, B5 and 100% diesel.

The results are shown as the impact of replacing one litre of fossil fuel with equivalent biofuel. This was done to provide the maximum insight to the differences between fuels. In Appendix D, results are shown per km of travel, and per GJ of fuel use.



## 4.2 Fuel scenarios included

The fuel production scenarios were selected based on potential technology (listed in Table 2). They include seven ethanol scenarios (i.e. ethanol produced from different feedstocks), two biodiesel scenarios and 11 renewable diesel scenarios.

Table 3 List of current fuels to be assessed.

SCENARIO TYPE	SCENARIO NAME	FUEL	DESCRIPTION
Ethanol	E.agave via ferm.	Ethanol from agave	This pathway is for production of ethanol from agave. The agave is grown predominately on land not suitable for cane farming.
Ethanol	E-integrated sugar cane bioref.	Ethanol from purpose-grown sugarcane	This process involves using existing sugarcane production in a dedicated biorefinery with 100% of sugar juice used for fermentation to ethanol and the bagasse used for production of electricity.
Ethanol	E-molasses & agave via ferm.	Ethanol from molasses and agave, used as alternative feedstock six months at a time	This pathway combines feedstocks from agave and sugar production to remove the seasonality of sugarcane harvesting and utilisation. The agave is grown predominately on land not suitable for cane farming. The cane is from current sugarcane production in North Queensland.
Ethanol	E.cane trash glycell	Ethanol production from cane trash using Glycell process	This scenario involves cane trash and crude glycerine being used as a feedstock to the Glycell process, which separates the three biomass fractions – cellulose, hemicellulose and lignin – for beneficial use. Here the hemicellulose is assumed to be the input for fermentation to ethanol.
Ethanol	E.cane trash conc acid.	Ethanol production from cane trash using concentrated acid hydrolysis	This scenario involves cane trash being processed through concentrated acid hydrolysis to produce sugars for fermentation to ethanol, and lignin and other biomass for energy production.
Ethanol	E.forestry res. conc. acid.	Ethanol production from bagasse using concentrated acid hydrolysis	This scenario involves processing bagasse through concentrated acid hydrolysis to produce sugars for fermentation to ethanol, and lignin and other biomass for energy production.
Ethanol	E.cotton GT, dilute acid.	Ethanol from dilute acid hydrolysis and fermentation of cotton gin trash	Cotton gin trash (CGT), a waste product of cotton ginning, is treated with dilute acid and enzymes to convert cellulose components to fermentable sugars, which are then converted to ethanol.



SCENARIO TYPE	SCENARIO NAME	FUEL	DESCRIPTION
Biodiesel	BD.Carinata transest.	Biodiesel produced from Carinata grown in Australia	Based on Carinata grown in Queensland to produce oilseed, which is pressed to extract the oil and processed using a conventional transesterification process.
Biodiesel	BD.tobacco transest.	Biodiesel produced from tobacco grown in Australia	Based on a nicotine-free variety of tobacco grown in Queensland that produces oil-rich seeds, which are pressed to extract the oil and processed using a conventional transesterification process.
Renewable Diesel	RD.forestry res. pyrolysis	Wood waste is collected and processed via pyrolysis to produce bio-crude, which is refined to a renewable diesel	Based on the process proposed at Northern Oil Refinery where different feedstocks are pyrolysed to produce a bio-oil, which is then put through a distillation unit to fractionate the crude, hydrotreated and finally purified into a mix of feedstocks.
Renewable Diesel	RD.cane trash pyrolysis	Cane trash is pyrolysed to produce a bio-oil, which is refined to a renewable diesel	
Renewable Diesel	RD.wheat straw pyrolysis	Agricultural residues, such as straw, are pyrolysed to produce a bio-oil, which is refined to a renewable diesel	
Renewable Diesel	RD.prickly acacia pyrolysis	Agricultural residues, such as straw, are pyrolysed to produce a bio-oil, which is refined to a renewable diesel	
Renewable Diesel	RD.tyres destruc. distill	Tyres are used to make a bio-oil from destructive distillation, which is then refined to renewable diesel	





SCENARIO TYPE	SCENARIO NAME	FUEL	DESCRIPTION
Renewable Diesel	RD.CCA wood waste cata depoly	Renewable diesel from wood waste, including CCA (copper chrome arsenic) timber, using catalytic depolymerisation	Catalytic depolymerisation breaks down organic materials including plastics and lignocellulosic material. The technology is flexible in terms of feedstock and is able to operate at small scales.
Renewable Diesel	RD.green waste cata depoly	Renewable diesel from green waste using catalytic depolymerisation	
Renewable Diesel	RD.forestry res. cata depoly	Renewable diesel from forest residues using catalytic depolymerisation	
Renewable Diesel	RD.food waste cata depoly	Renewable diesel from diverted food waste using catalytic depolymerisation	
Renewable Diesel	RD.tyres. cata depoly	Renewable diesel from tyres using catalytic depolymerisation	
Renewable Diesel	RD.MSW. Gasific. FT	Renewable diesel from municipal solid waste using gasification and Fischer–Tropsch synthesis	The gasification process is utilised on a residual organic fraction separated from municipal solid waste. It produces a synthesis gas stream, which is then converted using the Fischer–Tropsch process, into renewable diesel.



### 4.3 System boundary

The system boundary describes the life cycles, stages and processes included in the LCA. In this study, the function was the supply of liquid fuels to the transport sector. Typically, system boundaries should include everything that is substantially affected by demand for the fuels. This includes extraction and production processes and any additional activities required to make each option functionally equivalent. It also includes the effects of co-products along the supply chain.

#### 4.3.1 Included processes

The LCA included fuel production activities, including extraction, storage and transport, as well as refining of fuels (Figure 3). For inputs derived from crops or other biomass, all farming and harvesting operations were included. Also included were inputs to fuel refining, dehydration, blending and transport. Infrastructure elements such as plant and construction were also included, based on general models rather than primary data collection.

#### 4.3.2 Excluded processes

The system boundary excluded processes that are common to all options assessed and are therefore not affected by the choice of option. Excluded processes were fuel dispensing, vehicle production and vehicle maintenance (including oils and servicing), based on the assumption that all options use the same vehicles and infrastructure. Detailed system boundary diagrams are provided for each fuel scenario in Appendix A.




Figure 3 System boundary for the LCA



### 4.3.3 Cutoff criteria

The system boundary allowed for the exclusion from the inventory of any flows expected to be less than 1% of any impact category. A cutoff criterion of 1% of mass or energy flows was allowed for with the aim that not more than 5% of flows were excluded from the study. For small flows, estimates were used in preference to exclusion, where possible.

## 4.4 Flows included in the LCA

Figure 4 shows the characterisation of flows included in the LCA. These included flows to and from the environment as well as flows to and from other technical processes (the technosphere).




Figure 4 Inputs and outputs of a unit process in LCA.

The only water use included in the study was water extracted from groundwater, rivers, lakes and natural or man-made water storages. Rainfall onto agricultural land was not included (consistent with the impact method used in Pfister, Koehler et al. (2009)). Water use was identified within one of 36 catchments used in the Australian best practice recommended impact assessment guideline (Renouf, Grant et al. 2016).



# 5 Inventory analysis

Inventory analysis is the stage of the LCA in which the system being studied is broken up into unit processes. The unit processes can be categorised into foreground unit processes and background unit processes:

- **Foreground processes** are those for which specific data are collected for the study. They may include primary data collected from facilities; however, in this study it also includes secondary data from published papers and modified background processes from LCA databases.
- **Background processes** are those for which data are typically sourced from pre-existing databases. The background data are either less important to the study outcomes or are already well-characterised in the existing data sets and therefore do not warrant specific modelling. In some instances, background unit processes may be modified to better suit the conditions of the study.

Figure 5 shows how unit processes were linked to create a system that produces the functional unit of the study. The following sections outline the sources of the background and foreground inventory data.




Figure 5 The linking of unit process in an LCA to produce the functional unit.




## 5.1 Foreground data

The description of the foreground data has been broken up into the feedstocks and the biofuel production processes. While there are some interactions between the nature of the feedstock and the fuel production process, it is more efficient to describe the assumptions around them separately.

A summary of the data sources and assumptions for the feedstocks are described in Table 4. Many feedstocks included in this assessment are waste products or co-products from other systems and it is important to understand the assumptions around the alternative uses for treatment processes for those materials.

Table 4 Summary of foreground inventory data and assumptions for biofuel feedstocks.

FEEDSTOCK	SCENARIOS USED	COMMENT
Agave	E.agave ferm. E.agave & moll	Agave is a dedicated biofuel crop, assumed to be grown without irrigation in dry areas of Queensland not suitable for sugarcane production.  While test plots have been grown in Australia, data for this study was taken from agave grown in Mexico (Nunez, Rodriguez et al. 2011), which has similar soil conditions to Australia.
Sugarcane	E.sugarcane. ferm.	While it is common in Australia for molasses produced from sugar milling to be used for ethanol production, this scenario entails the use of sugarcane directly for producing ethanol without the production of raw sugar. This will increase the yield of ethanol per unit of cane and disconnect the ethanol supply from competition by other molasses users.  There is also the option to optimise a cane for high biomass yields and high fibre yields, increasing energy return from the bagasse. While there are potentially different inputs to this variant of sugarcane, no data is directly available as yet, so an average of current cane grown in Queensland was used (Renouf 2011). This is assumed to be reasonable as the variation with the different cane production systems is not expected to differ dramatically.
Cane trash and tops	E.cane trash Glycell E.cane trash conc. acid RD. cane trash pyrolysis	Cane trash and tops is made up of leaves and the tops of sugarcane that is left behind in the field to break down back into the soil. This material comprises up to 1/3 of the total mass of sugarcane plants (The Biomass Producer 2017).  While in some growing regions cane trash serves agronomic purposes by stabilising soil, in other regions the amount of trash is problematic for crop management. For this study, cane trash was assumed to increase from 25% to 75%, which allows for enough to be retained to support soil stability. The composition of the material was taken from an analysis of Brazilian cane trash (Franco, Pimenta et al. 2013). The change in nitrous oxide emissions from lowering the amount of residue is included.
Forestry residue	E.forestry res. conc acid RD.forestry resid. W cata. depoly.	Forestry residue is assumed to be woody biomass that is left behind from timber harvesting operations.  Like cane trash, the underlying assumption is that forestry residue can be removed at a sustainable rate that will not affect soil carbon in the forest where it is removed. Forestry residue is typically made up of branches and tops of trees. The material is assumed to degrade naturally on the forest floor, with its CO <sub>2</sub> being released into the atmosphere.
Green waste	RD.green waste cata depoly	Green waste is collected from municipal and commercial sources as a pure stream of organic material with a low level of contamination. The current use of this material is mostly open composting, so this is the alternative fate used in this scenario.
CCA wood waste	RD.wood waste cata depoly	CCA wood waste is a problem waste due to the presence of copper and arsenic in the wood, which makes combustion highly problematic and landfill also a poor option. Landfill is, however, considered the default alternative use of the material from biofuel.
Cotton gin trash	E.cotton gin trash dilute acid hydro	Cotton gin trash is a co-product of the cotton ginning process which separate cotton lint, from cottonseed. The material presents a significant waste disposal problem that cannot be used as stock feed, with the most common disposal methods being landfill or field spreading (Knox, Rochester et al. 2006).



FEEDSTOCK	SCENARIOS USED	COMMENT
		In this study field spreading will be taken as the default management approach, and this assumes that carbon contained in the trash will break down in the field and be emitted to the atmosphere.
Waste tyres	RD.tyres destruc. Distill. RD.tyres cata. depoly	Waste tyres represent a problematic waste disposal issue across Australia. Despite numerous options available for energy recovery and material recovery, most tyres at end of life are not beneficially utilised. There are three specific groups of waste tyres, which have different compositions of steel, natural rubber and synthetic rubber. These are passenger tyres, truck and bus tyres, and mining tyres.  In this study, the average mix of tyres is used as a default, with a sensitivity analysis undertaken on the use of specific tyre streams. The alternative fate of tyres in the study is assumed to be landfill.
Carinata	BD.Carinata	Carinata is a similar crop to canola but it can grow in drier and hotter conditions. A dedicated crop grown specifically for the oil content of the seed, it is used as a biofuel with the added benefit of juicing animal feed from the meal left over after oiler traction.  Agronomic data for producing Carinata has been supplied by Agrisoma.
Tobacco	BD.tobacco	Solaris tobacco is a nicotine-free version tobacco grown for high oil content. It also produces a valuable animal feed.  Data for its production was provided by Sunchem.
Food waste	RD.food waste cata depoly	Food waste represents a highly degradable feedstock, which is currently collected in a small number of local councils in Australia, but also separated and collected from some commercial operations. The source-separated material is currently either being composted or sent to anaerobic digestion, with the former being the default alternative use for this study.
Municipal solid waste	RD.MSW gasification FTP	Municipal solid waste represents a rich organic stream with both biological material and plastics, which can be used to provide a carbon feedstock. It is assumed in this study that the material is currently being sent to landfill and this is used as the alternative fate for this material.
Prickly acacia	RD.prickly acacia pyrolysis	Prickly acacia is a noxious weed that grows extensively in Queensland's drier areas and is a major problem for grazing properties, taking over large areas and making them unproductive. The management methods are a mix of spraying and mechanical removal.

Table 5 summarises the biofuel production processes, inventory data sources and assumptions. Data was sourced directly from companies where available, with missing data derived from published company data. Where company data was not available, the study used public data, LCA datasets and external studies.

**Table 5 Summary of inventory data and assumption for fuel production processes.**

FUEL SCENARIO	SCENARIO NAME	COMMENT
Dilute acid hydrolysis	E.cotton GT dilute acid hyrdo	This process is a common approach used for converting lignocellulosic material into ethanol. The data for this process has been taken from ecoinvent (Weidema, Bauer et al. 2016) based on a report by (Jungbluth, Dinkel et al. 2007)
Concentrated acid hydrolysis	E.cane trash conc. acid E.forestry res. conc acid	This process has been developed by EthTech Ltd over the last 10 years and involves a series of innovations for rapid conversion of lignocellulosic material to fermentable sugars and lignin. The fermentable sugars are converted to ethanol, and lignin with other unreacted material, and residue from fermentation, are used to provide the energy for the plant.
Fermentation and distillation	E.agave ferm E.cane biorefinery ferm E.agave & moll. ferm E.cane trash glycell E.cotton GT dilute acid hyrdo	Fermentation and distillation data are taken from data reported by Sarina Mill in (Grant, Bontinck et al. 2016). In all reported scenarios, the source of heat and electricity is entirely from biomass combustion, from bagasse or other waste biomass from the raw material processing.



FUEL SCENARIO	SCENARIO NAME	COMMENT
Fermentation ethanol separation	E.cane trash conc. acid hydro E.bagasse conc acid hydro E.wood waste conc acid	EthTech provided data for an alternative ethanol separation approach, which avoids distillation as well as silage waste. The energy source for the process is assumed to be based on combustion of lignin and other waste biomass from the process.
Biodiesel production	BD.Carinata BD.tobacco	Data for biodiesel production from vegetable oils has been taken from ecoinvent (Weidema, Bauer et al. 2013), with modifications based on Australian inputs.
Pyrolysis	RD.forestry residue pyrolysis RD.cane trash pyrolysis RD.wheat straw pyrolysis RD.prickly acacia pyrolysis	This pyrolysis process is based on the plant being constructed for Northern Oil Refinery in Gladstone. It includes a pyrolysis process as well as evaporation, hydrotreating and purification processes. Data for this scenario has been provided by Southern Oil Refinery.
Glycell process	E.cane trash, Glycell	Glycell data has been provided by Leaf Resources based on process modelling. The technology has a wide range of options. For this study both the cellulose and hemicellulose will be used for ethanol fermentation, even though economics may make this unlikely.
Destructive distillation	RD.tyres destruc. distill	The destructive distillation process is particularly well suited to tyres, producing a dry carbon product, steel for recycling and a bio-oil, which is processed through the evaporation, hydrotreating and purification processes of the Northern Oil Refinery. Data for this scenario was provided by Green Distillation Technologies as well as the Northern Oil Refinery.
Catalytic depolymerisation	RD.CCA wood waste cata depoly RD.forestry res. cata depoly RD.green waste cata depoly RD.food waste cata depoly RD.tyres. cata depoly	The catalytic depolymerisation process effectively dissolves organic matter from mineral substrates enabling the organic material to be recovered for fuel production. There is potential for a wide range of substrates, which have been included in the study based on data from CDP Waste2Energy.
Gasification and Fischer–Tropsch	RD.MSW gasification FTP	The gasification process is utilised on a residual organic fraction separated from municipal solid waste. It produces a synthesis gas stream that can then be converted, using the Fischer–Tropsch process, into renewable diesel. Data for this scenario has been taken from synthesis gas processes in ecoinvent and the Fischer–Tropsch process described in Iribarren, Susmozas et al. (2013).
Fuel production	RULP	Import data from Australian Institute of Petroleum (AIP) (AIP 2013) with underlying refining data from modified ecoinvent database (ecoinvent Centre 2010, ALCAS 2016).
Diesel supply to Queensland	Diesel	Import data from AIP (AIP 2013) with underlying refining data taken from modified ecoinvent database (ecoinvent Centre 2010, ALCAS 2016).
All processes	Tailpipe emission	Emission data from passenger vehicles from the Greet model (Elgowainy, Dieffenthaler et al. 2013).

A more detailed description of the unit process data for the foreground processes is provided in Appendix A.



## 5.2 Background data

While hundreds of background processes contributed to the LCA, the most important processes were those that affected the results or those that were modified from the original source to better represent an input to this LCA. These background processes, data sources and modifications are summarised in Table 5. The majority of background processes are energy, chemicals and transport processes so they are not affected by local factors such as climate and soil conditions in Queensland.

Table 6 Summary of inventory data for major background processes in the LCA.

PROCESS/EMISSION	DATA SOURCE
Natural gas supply	Data is based on national statistics released by ABARE (ABARE 2011), energy industry data (Energy Supply Association Australia 2012), and the National Greenhouse Account Factors (DIICCSRTE 2013).
Electricity supply	Australian electricity supply disaggregated by state using data from Department of the Environment (2014) Electricity Supply Association of Australia (2012) and ALCAS (2017)
Process chemicals	Background chemicals which are not part of AusLCI were modelled from ecoinvent 2.2 modified with AusLCI inventory data (ALCAS 2017)
Fertiliser, pesticides, tractor emissions	ecoinvent 2.2 data (ecoinvent Centre 2010) with minor upstream flows from AusLCI where available (ALCAS 2017)
Carbon black and charcoal	ecoinvent 2.2 data (ecoinvent Centre 2010) with minor upstream flows from AusLCI where available (ALCAS 2017)
Truck transport processes	Freight transport inventories are from AusLCI database (ALCAS 2017) and were derived from freight efficiency statistic developed by Adam Pekol Consulting. (Adam Pekol Consulting Pty Ltd 2011)
Agricultural offsets sorghum, Lucerne, wheat etc	Agricultural data not specifically modelled in the foreground was taken from AusLCI database (ALCAS 2017) based on project by CSIRO and lifecycles. (Grant, Eady et al. 2015)





## 5.3 Multi-functionality

Multi-functionality occurs when a single process or group of processes produces more than one usable output, or 'co-product'. ISO defines a co-product<sup>1</sup> as 'any of two or more products coming from the same unit process or product system'. A product is any good or service, so by definition it has some value for the user. This is distinct from a 'waste', which ISO defines as 'substances or objects which the holder intends or is required to dispose of', and therefore has no value to the user.

As LCA identifies the impacts associated with a discrete product or system, it is necessary to separate the impact of co-products arising from multifunction processes.

Many co-products are used and produced when making biofuels. In fact, the drive to produce fuels from non-food sources encourages fuel producers to use waste and co-products from other sectors in their production.

The ISO 14044 LCA standard provides a four-step hierarchy for solving the issue of multi-functionality:

- 1a **Avoid allocation by subdividing systems** – wherever possible, allocation should be avoided by dividing the unit process into sub-processes.
- 1b **Avoid allocation by system expansion** – expanding the product system to include the additional functions related to the co-products.
- 2 **Allocation by underlying physical relationships** – the inputs and outputs of the system should be partitioned between its different products or functions in a way that reflects the underlying physical relationships between them.
- 3 **Allocation between co-products** – the inputs should be allocated between the products and functions in a way that reflects other relationships between them. For example, data may be allocated between co-products in proportion to the economic value of the products.

(adapted from text in (International Organization for Standardization 2006)).

Table 7 describes the four options that are available for solving allocation in multifunction systems in order of preference outlined in the ISO 14044 standard (International Organization for Standardization 2006), with a modification in line with the recommendations from UNEP/SETAC global guidance for LCA databases (UNEP/SETAC Life Cycle Initiative 2011). Option 2 has been moved ahead of system expansion as it is only applied to combined production where the production volume of different co-products can be varied.

Option 1a is only applicable when the system is not a true multifunction process, and option 2 is only applicable when the ratio of co-products can be varied, such as between diesel and petrol production in a refinery. This leaves system expansion and allocation as the two main approaches to solving multifunction systems. This study uses both approaches for all fuels, with system expansion used in the forward-looking viewpoint, to determine the impact of introducing a new fuel pathway, and economic allocation to calculate the footprint of the fuel once it is in production.

---

<sup>1</sup> While there are subtle definitions that can be found between by-products and co-products in LCA there is no distinction in this study between the co-product and a by-product.



Table 7 Description of options for solving allocation in multifunction systems.

Option	Solution description	Graphical representation
1a	<p>Dividing the unit process to be allocated into two or more sub-processes and collecting the input and output data related to these sub-processes.</p> <p>For example, for a farming establishment producing crops and sheep, subdividing and collecting data on inputs such as diesel, fertilisers etc. for energy crop production and pastoral operations separately would avoid the need for allocation.</p>	<p>The diagram illustrates the subdivision of a 'Wheat/sheep farm' into two separate production units. The top part shows a single box for 'Wheat/sheep farm' with inputs: Wheat planting, Fertiliser, Pesticides, Wheat harvesting, Fencing, and Planting grasses. Two arrows point from this box to 'Sheep' and 'Wheat' output boxes. A downward arrow labeled 'Solve through subdivision' points to the bottom part. The bottom part shows two separate boxes: 'Sheep production' (with inputs: Fencing, Planting grasses) pointing to 'Sheep', and 'Wheat production' (with inputs: Wheat planting, Fertiliser, Pesticides, Wheat harvesting) pointing to 'Wheat'.</p>
2	<p>Physical relationships: For combined production, where the co-product amount is not fixed but can be changed, the impacts are allocated based on how the physical relationships between inputs and emissions change as the ratio of co-products changes. This will take the form of a mathematical relationship on how feed changes as a function of lamb production.</p>	<p>The diagram illustrates the allocation of impacts for a 'Wool/lamb mixed breed farm' based on physical relationships. The top part shows a single box for 'Wool/lamb mixed breed farm' with inputs: Feed, Drenching, and Methane emissions. Two arrows point from this box to 'Lamb' and 'Wool' output boxes. A downward arrow labeled 'Solve through physical relationships' points to the bottom part. The bottom part shows the same 'Wool/lamb mixed breed farm' box with two arrows pointing to 'Lamb' and 'Wool' boxes. The arrow to 'Lamb' is labeled with the equations: <math>\text{Feed} = 3.2\text{lamb} + 0.25</math> and <math>\text{Methane} = 3.6\text{lamb} + 0.04</math>. The arrow to 'Wool' is labeled with the equations: <math>\text{Feed} = 0.7\text{wool} + 0.8</math>, <math>\text{Methane} = 0.6\text{wool} + 0.14</math>, and <math>\text{Drenching} = 100\% \text{ to wool}</math>.</p>



Option	Solution description	Graphical representation
<b>1b</b>	<p>System expansion refers to the process of including the co-product into the system boundary and then removing it by providing a credit equal to the functional value of the co-product.</p> <p>For example, sugar refining has the outputs of raw sugar and molasses.</p> <p>In system expansion the determining product (the product that determines the level of production) raw sugar has all the impacts of the upstream processes (cane growing, crushing and refining) but is given a credit (negative amount) for the animal feed function (the alternative use of molasses).</p> <p>For molasses, (non-determining co-product) there is a debit (positive amount) of animal feed replacement to balance what was credited to raw sugar.</p> <p>In this way, when the two products are added the debit and credit for animal feed cancel out.</p>	
<b>3</b>	<p>Where physical relationships alone cannot be established as the basis of allocation, the inputs and emissions should be allocated between the co-products, based on other relationships between them such as the economic value of the co-products.</p> <p>This is shown here using the same example as system expansion of raw sugar and molasses. The percentage allocation is a function of the value per tonne and the amount of each product produced.</p>	

Note that all values used in the diagrams are for demonstration purposes and not actual values.

Table 8 shows the co-products in the foreground of this study and how they have been addressed. For each co-product the determining product is identified. This is the product that is the main economic driver for the production system. Co-products are then identified with the substitute that is used in the LCA and any alternative substitutes that are tested in the sensitivity section.

For biofuels that are utilising waste products there is no co-product, and the waste has no value; however, in accordance with ISO13065 the alternative fate of the waste needs to be taken into account. Table 9 shows feedstocks that are currently considered waste products and their potential alternative fate, which must be included into the LCA.



Table 8 Co-production in the LCA foreground and the replacement products used.

PROCESS	DETERMINING PRODUCT	CO-PRODUCT	SYSTEM EXPANSION SUBSTITUTED COMMODITY
Refining	Gasoline, diesel	LPG, naphtha, etc.	Allocation by underlying physical relationships* substitute not used.
Agave refining	Sugar	Bagasse	Queensland coal-fired electricity as a substitute.
Fischer–Tropsch diesel production	Renewable diesel	Electricity	Queensland coal-fired electricity as a substitute.
Fischer–Tropsch diesel production	Renewable diesel	Hydrogen	Hydrogen from chlor-alkali process as substitute.
Fischer–Tropsch diesel production	Renewable diesel	Renewable gasoline	Production and use of conventional gasoline offsetting the use of renewable gasoline.
Ethanol from sweet sorghum	Ethanol	Dunder product from distillation	System expansion substitutable with fertiliser product.
Cropping	Grains	Agricultural residues	Depending on cropping, may be substituted with cereal hay. Some may be left on field as alternative fate.
Tobacco seed crushing	Tobacco oil	Tobacco seed cake	Used as animal feed for pigs. Offset with high protein feed.
Carinata seed crushing	Carinata oil	Carinata seed cake	Used as animal feed for pigs. Offset with high protein feed.
Glycell process	Sugars	Lignin	Can be used for chemical processes. No substitute had been identified so alternative use is considered energy production. Offset is Queensland black coal electricity.



Table 9 Waste products utilised in LCA and alternative disposal pathways.

PROCESS	DETERMINING PRODUCT	WASTE PRODUCT	ALTERNATIVE FATE OR WASTE PRODUCT
<b>Sugar refining</b>	Sugar	Trash and tops	Trash and tops left are assumed to be left on the field to degrade, if they are not removed for use in biofuel system.
<b>Timber production</b>	Logs	Residues from timber production	Residues left in coup to degrade if they are not removed for use in a biofuel system.
<b>Road tyres</b>	Use on vehicle	Waste tyres	Landfill is the default destination used for road tyres based on (Mountjoy, Hasthanayake et al. 2015).
<b>Mining tyres</b>	Use on vehicle	Waste tyres	The default fate for mining tyres is assumed to be abandonment at the mine site.
<b>Cotton ginning</b>	Lint	Cotton trash	Distribution on field where material degrades. Alternative potential fate is landfill.
<b>Prickly acacia removal process</b>	Prickly acacia removal	Prickly acacia plants	Assumed to be cut and poisoned and left to degrade where it is removed.
<b>Food waste disposal</b>	Food waste management	Food waste	Composting is the default assumption, with landfill the potential alternative.
<b>Green waste disposal</b>	Green waste management	Green waste	Composting is the default assumption, with landfill the potential alternative.
<b>Wood waste disposal</b>	Wood waste management	Wood waste	Composting is the default assumption, with landfill the potential alternative.
<b>CCA wood waste disposal</b>	CCA wood waste management	CCA wood waste	Landfill is the default assumption.
<b>Municipal waste disposal</b>	Municipal waste management	Municipal solid waste	Landfill is the default assumption, with aerobic stabilisation the potential alternative.

## 5.4 Carbon modelling

Special attention is given to the sources and fate of carbon in the LCA. When inventorying carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions in LCA, a distinction is made between molecules of biogenic and fossil origins. Biogenic carbon originates from biomass, while fossil carbon originates from geological fossil fuel reserves (oil, coal and gas).

In LCA, the term biogenic carbon is used to refer to solid carbon contained in products and waste streams, as well as carbon in GHGs (i.e. CO<sub>2</sub> and methane), which are emitted from biogenic material. Atmospheric carbon is carbon held in the atmosphere, which can be absorbed by biomass through photosynthesis. This process is referred to as 'biogenic uptake' of CO<sub>2</sub>.

For the consequential LCA modelling the original source of the carbon has no effect on the results, because it is the fate of the carbon that drives the emission result, and not where it came from in the tyre production process. Fossil and biogenic carbon emissions are compared to each other, for example, storing fossil and biogenic carbon in a landfill. The type of carbon is of no consequence.

For calculation under the Roundtable for Sustainable Biomaterials (RSB), the GHG calculation approach states that biogenic carbon emissions will be treated as greenhouse neutral while fossil-based carbon will be counted as contributing to GHG. For this method the source of input feedstocks for the fraction which is biogenic and that which is fossil based are discerned.



## 5.5 Land use and land use change (LUC)

Impacts of land occupation and land transformation are complex to model in an LCA and are exacerbated in this study as most production systems proposed are not currently operating on a commercial scale. Table 10 outlines potential land use and land transformation consequences of each of the feedstocks. There are three situations described. The first situation is where perennial crops, new sugarcane and agave, are planted on pasture. Using IPCC land use methodology via the LUC tool developed by Blonk consultants (Blonk Consultants 2017), this led to no emissions from direct land use change (dLUC). This is because the sugar and agave are perennial systems with high biomass inputs so are unlikely to lead to a soil carbon change.

The second situation is where tobacco and Carinata are planted on existing cropland. Carinata in particular would be a break crop in cereal growing systems, and due to its better heat tolerance it can be used in hotter drier regions where canola, which is also used as break crop, cannot be used. It is not clear at this point where the tobacco might grow as it is a different variety to the traditional tobacco that was grown at the base of the Victorian Alps in north-eastern Victoria.

The third situation is where additional biomass is removed from an existing production system in the form of residues, which included cane trash and tops, cereal residues and forestry residues. These do not represent LUC but more a change in land management practice. There is a positive correlation in the soil carbon models between biomass inputs to land and increasing soil carbon (or possibly a reduction in soil carbon loss). However, this is not a simple correlation, other contributing factors will affect this. A sensitivity analysis is undertaken in Section 7.2.5 on the effect of potential soil carbon shifts.

Separate but connected to the dLUC effects are the indirect land use change (iLUC) impacts. iLUC are the potential impacts on areas outside the area under study. For example, if Carinata is grown in place of export canola or export wheat grain, there is potential for expansion of cropping land to fill this gap somewhere else in the world. A sensitivity analysis is undertaken in Section 7.2.6 on the effects of iLUC.

Table 10 Land use impacts from feedstock.

FEEDSTOCK	LAND USE OF BIOENERGY SYSTEM	LAND USE WITHOUT BIOENERGY SYSTEM	DISPLACEMENT EFFECTS
Agave	Occupation as perennial crop	Occupation as pasture	The displacement of beef production to other regions, countries or to feedlots
Sugarcane	Occupation as perennial crop	Occupation as pasture	The displacement of beef production to other regions, countries or to feedlots
Cane trash and tops	Occupation as perennial crop	Occupation as perennial crop	Potential change in soil carbon due to removal of biomass
Forestry residue	Occupation as production forest	Occupation as production forest	Potential change in soil carbon due to removal of biomass
Green waste	No direct land use	Land use for landfill disposal	Small effect on land use
Wood waste	No direct land use	Land use for landfill disposal	Small effect on land use
Cotton gin trash	Annual crop land	Annual crop land	Potential change in soil carbon due to removal of biomass
Waste tyres	No direct land use	Land use for landfill disposal	Small effect on land use
Carinata	Cropping land	Cropping land	Increased rotations of Carinata in wheat system will lead to expansion in wheat crop elsewhere in the world
Tobacco	Cropping land	Cropping land	Tobacco would displace cereal crop elsewhere in the world
Food waste	No direct land use	Land use for landfill disposal	Small effect on land use
Municipal solid waste	No direct land use	Land use for landfill disposal	Small effect on land use
Prickly acacia	Pasture land recovered	Possible pasture land increasingly lost	Increased availability and productivity of pasture land



## 5.6 Life cycle inventory model

The foreground and background data described in the prior two sections were modelled in SimaPro LCA software version 8.5. The inventory was calculated with 200 foreground processes which are either developed entirely for the study or modified from background data, and 8,000 background processes from the AusLCI and ecoinvent libraries. There was a total of 2,273 flows included in the inventory, of which 1,617 were not used in any of the indicators examined in the study. This is typical practice, with many flows in the LCA tracked for overall balance reasons and for indicators not relevant to this study.

# 6 Impact assessment

## 6.1 Impact assessment indicators and characterisation models

The impact assessment stage relates the inventory flows to the indicators chosen for the LCA. This was done by classifying which flows relate to which impact indicator and then selecting a characterisation model that quantifies the relationship of each inventory type to the indicator in question. For example, flows of carbon dioxide and methane are both known to contribute to the climate change indicator. The characterisation model chosen for the study was the 2013 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 100-year model. This uses carbon dioxide as the reference substance with a characterisation factor of 1 and methane with a characterisation factor of 25 carbon dioxide equivalents. The same approach was taken across all indicators. The calculation of the indicator results was the summation of all inventory flows multiplied by their relevant characterisation factors. This step is referred to as characterisation. The results are in equivalent units, such as kg CO<sub>2</sub> eq., for each indicator. Table 10 describes each of the indicators chosen for LCA and the source of the characterisation factors.

Table 11 Impact assessment categories and characterisation models used in this LCA.

INDICATOR	DESCRIPTION	CHARACTERISATION MODEL
Climate change	Measured in kg CO <sub>2</sub> eq. This is governed by the increased concentrations of gases in the atmosphere that trap heat and lead to higher global temperatures. Gases are principally carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide.	IPCC model based on 100-year timeframe (IPCC 2013).
Fossil energy	Measured in MJ lower heating value. It includes all energy resources extracted and used in any way. It does not include renewable energy, energy from waste or nuclear energy.	All fossil energy carriers based on lower heating values.
Eutrophication	Measured in g PO <sub>4</sub> <sup>-3</sup> eq. Algal growth from nutrient enrichment in freshwater and marine environments. Emission of nitrogen and phosphorus contribute with the model being based on the relative nutrient.	CML method based on redfield ratio (Institute of Environmental Sciences (CML) 2016).
Particulate matter	Measured in g PM <sub>2.5</sub> . This impact category looks at the health impacts from particulate matter for PM <sub>10</sub> and PM <sub>2.5</sub> . This is one of the most dominant immediate risks to human health as identified in the global burden of disease.	World impact plus method (Humbert, Marshall et al. 2011).
Land use	Measured in kg C deficit. The method is based on the increase or decrease in soil organic matter (SOM) as a function of LUC and land use occupation. It is based on the difference in the SOM from a natural reference state.	ILCD method (European Commission JRC IES 2011) based on Mila-i-Canals (i Canals, Romanya et al. 2007).



Consumptive water use	Measured in litres of water. Water extracted directly from the environment, thereby competing with environmental and other human requirements for water.	The impacts of water use based on water scarcity footprint by Pfsister (Pfsister, Koehler et al. 2009).
-----------------------	---	---

In addition to the characterisation process, the study used normalisation in the impact assessment stage. Normalised results were calculated by dividing results using characterisation models by an independent reference value, which for this study was the total annual emissions in Australia for each impact category. This provided an indication of the relative impact the product system had on each of the impact categories. Other impact assessment processes, such as grouping and weighting of indicators, were not undertaken in this study as the ISO standard (International Organization for Standardization 2006) forbids weighting when undertaking comparative assertions.

## 6.2 Results

This section presents the results of replacing one litre of fossil fuel with the functionally equivalent amount of biofuel. For the ethanol-based scenarios this is done by replacing 12.6 litres of RULP with 14 litres of E10. For the biodiesel scenarios this is done by replacing 22.2 litres of diesel with 22.3 litres of B5 and for renewable diesel the substitute is a direct 1 for 1 replacement of diesel with renewable diesel.

### 6.2.1 Fossil fuel baseline

Table 12 shows the impacts of production and use of RULP and diesel in Queensland. The climate change impacts for diesel were higher per litre than RULP, as it is a denser fuel and will drive an equivalent sized vehicle further. Diesel also has a slightly higher carbon content than RULP. The fossil energy depletion indicator represents all fossil fuels used in the production of RULP and diesel as well as the feedstock in the fuel itself.

Impacts on eutrophication are linked to NO<sub>x</sub> emissions and particulate matter impacts are linked to PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions – with both of these being produced during crude oil production, fuel transport and refinery operations. Land use for RULP and diesel is low, as the amount of fuel yielded from wells is very high compared to the overall land occupation. Fossil fuel production and use has a relatively low impact on water scarcity.

Table 12 Results for production and use of one litre of fossil fuel.

INDICATOR	CLIMATE CHANGE	FOSSIL ENERGY DEPLETION	EUTROPHICATION	PARTICULATE MATTER	LAND USE	WATER SCARCITY
Unit	kg CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	MJ NCV	g PO <sub>4</sub> <sup>-3</sup> eq.	g PM <sub>2.5</sub>	kg C deficit	litre eq.
RULP	2.97	42	0.676	0.614	7.7	6.72
Diesel	3.35	45.9	0.737	0.568	8.6	7.07





## 6.2.2 Results for biofuel substitution using system expansion method

Table 13 shows the impacts and benefits of replacing one litre of fossil fuel with equivalent biofuel using the system expansion method. The equation below describes how these values are calculated. Negative values represent a benefit as the impact of biofuel is lower than that of fossil fuel. When the number is positive the impact of biofuel is higher than current fossil fuel.

+ number → fossil fuel is preferable

*Fossil fuel prod. & use – biofuel prod. & use = net impact of replacement*

– number → biofuel is preferable

Table 14 shows the percentage emission reduction for replacing fossil fuel with biofuel according to the equation below.

$$\frac{\text{Fossil fuel prod. \& use} - \text{biofuel prod. \& use}}{\text{fossil fuel prod. \& use}} * 100$$

+ percentage → biofuel is preferable

– percentage → fossil fuel is preferable

The results are interpreted in detail in Section 7.1 but in summary the biofuels all perform better on climate change than the fossil fuel counterparts. Aside from the scenarios involving waste types, all scenarios have a savings of 40% with eight scenarios having savings above 80%. Waste tyres, and to a lesser extent waste, would present an anomaly whereby the alternative fate in landfill represents a carbon store, which reduces the overall benefit of utilisation as a biofuel. This is anomalous as these materials represent problems for landfills; tyres present a structural issue and CCA treated waste wood is a potential source of toxic emissions.

All biofuels have lower fossil fuel depletion than fossil fuels, which is to be expected as a central theme of biofuels is to replace the use of fossil-based fuels using biogenic material.

The remaining indicators vary substantially depending on the scenario. Cropping systems have impacts on eutrophication and land use, and when irrigation is used, on water scarcity. Particulate matter emissions depend more on the combustion processes and in reality will be highly dependent the quality of technology developed and associated emissions controls.



Table 13 Impact assessment results for replacement of one fossil fuel with equivalent biofuel

INDICATOR	CLIMATE CHANGE	FOSSIL ENERGY DEPLETION	EUTROPHICATION	PARTICULATE MATTER	LAND USE	WATER SCARCITY
Unit	kg CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	MJ NCV	g PO <sub>4</sub> <sup>-3</sup> eq.	g PM <sub>2.5</sub>	kg C deficit	litre eq.
E.agave ferm.	-2.67	-41.9	3.61	-0.049	12.3	5.99
E.sugarcane integ. bioref. ferm.	-1.25	-31.8	9.96	0.308	17.1	850
E.agave & moll. ferm.	-2.39	-38.2	3.31	0.00169	21.7	5.94
E.cane trash Glycell	-2.13	-31.8	1.71	-0.0319	3.95	23.8
E.cane trash conc. acid	-2.48	-37.3	-0.307	-0.35	-7.11	-0.799
E.forestry res. conc. acid	-2.17	-34.3	-0.0904	-0.306	-6.62	-0.55
E.cotton GT dilute acid	-3.04	-45.3	-0.0465	0.188	-4.57	14.2
BD.Carinata transest.	-1.75	-30.8	5.77	0.213	92.6	8.74
BD.tobacco transest.	-1.54	-27.4	3.77	0.59	44.9	211
RD.forestry resid. pyrolysis	-2.55	-63.5	0.0015	-0.466	-13.8	-4.85
RD.cane trash pyrolysis	-2.75	-65.7	-0.134	-0.502	-14.2	-5.12
RD.wheat straw pyrolysis	-2.82	-65.7	-0.21	-0.521	-14.2	-5.12
RD.prickly acacia pyrolysis	-2.67	-65.3	-0.0228	-0.482	-14.1	-5.05
RD.tyres destruc. distill.	-0.59	-117	-1.37	-1.32	-22.4	-18.5
RD.CCA wood waste cata. depoly.	0.591	-17.5	-0.0824	-0.27	-8.28	-3.56
RD.green waste cata. depoly.	-1.17	-15.6	0.557	-0.0265	-6.94	0.131
RD.forestry res. cata. depoly	-1.32	-18.4	0.472	-0.186	-7.55	-2.62
RD.food waste cata. depoly	-1.17	-15.6	0.557	-0.0265	-6.94	0.131
RD.tyres. cata. depoly.	0.963	-29.1	0.0581	-0.622	-8.84	-8.05
RD.MSW gasification FTP	-19.9	13.1	2.95	0.1	-11.6	9.67



Table 14 Percentage reduction in impact of biofuel replacing fossil fuel

	Climate change	Fossil energy depletion	Eutrophication	Particulate matter	Land use	Water scarcity
	%	%	%	%	%	%
E.agave ferm.	90	100	-535	8	-159	-89
E.sugarcane integ. bioref. ferm.	42	76	-1474	-50	-222	-12656
E.agave & moll. ferm.	80	91	-489	0	-282	-88
E.cane trash Glycell	72	76	-253	5	-51	-354
E.cane trash conc. acid	84	89	45	57	92	12
E.forestry res. conc. acid	73	82	13	50	86	8
E.cotton GT dilute acid	102	108	7	-31	59	-211
BD.Carinata transest.	52	67	-782	-37	-1076	-124
BD.tobacco transest.	46	60	-512	-104	-522	-2981
RD.forestry resid. pyrolysis	76	138	0	82	161	69
RD.cane trash pyrolysis	82	143	18	88	165	72
RD.wheat straw pyrolysis	84	143	29	92	165	72
RD.prickly acacia pyrolysis	80	142	3	85	164	71
RD.tyres destruc. distill.	18	254	186	232	261	261
RD.CCA W. Waste cata. depoly.	-18	38	11	47	96	50
RD.green waste cata. depoly.	35	34	-76	5	81	-2
RD.forestry res. cata. depoly	39	40	-64	33	88	37
RD.food waste cata. depoly	35	34	-76	5	81	-2
RD.tyres. cata. depoly.	-29	63	-8	109	103	114
RD.MSW gasification FTP	593	-28	-401	-18	135	-137

Note: The table colour gradations from green (better for biofuel) through to red (better for fossil fuel). Note the colour scaling is independent for each impact category – i.e. orange for climate change is better for biofuel, while for land use orange is better for fossil fuel.



## 6.2.3 Normalisation to national impact loads

To try and understand the relative importance of the different impact categories LCA results can be normalised against total annual impacts of a region, in this case Australia as estimated for 2008 in Table 14. Figure 6 shows the results from Table 13 divided by the total annual impacts in Table 15. The resulting numbers are very small because the use of one litre of fuel is small compared to the entire economy, but what is important is the relative contribution under each impact category. The results reflect the relatively high contribution of transport on climate change compared with other indicator endpoints (Eutrophication has a small effect in a small number of scenarios. It is important to note that low scores in normalisation do not mean the impacts are not relevant, but simply that the relative contribution is lower than impact categories with a high normalisation score.

Table 15 Estimate and annual impacts results for Australia in 2008.

IMPACT CATEGORY	UNIT	ANNUAL IMPACT	ANNUAL IMPACT PER CAPITA	DATA SOURCES
Climate change	kg CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	573,329,980,000	550471	(Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency 2010)
Fossil energy depletion	MJ NCV	11,697,515,000,000	12201	(Geoff Armitage 2007)
Eutrophication	g PO <sub>4</sub> <sup>-3</sup> eq.	259,272,380,000	10397	(Department of Environment and Heritage and Water 2011)
Particulate matter	g PM <sub>2.5</sub>	220,931,960,000	208207	(Department of Environment and Heritage and Water 2011)
Land use	kg C deficit	4,424,406,700,000	2847468	(ABARE-BRS 2010)
Water scarcity	litre eq.	60,508,705,000,000	550471	(Australian Bureau of Statistics 2015)




Figure 6 Comparative impact assessment results for replacing one litre fossil fuel with biofuel as a fraction of total Australian per capita impact (normalisation).




# 7 Interpretation

---

The interpretation step examined the results through a series of checks and analyses to ensure any conclusions drawn from the LCA were robust and well-supported by the data.

## 7.1 Contribution analyses



The results for the contribution analysis have been grouped into six categories:

- Feedstock production (grey) – production of agricultural and waste feedstocks including impacts from competition for co-product use and inputs to the biofuel process
- Biofuel production (green) – conversion of feedstocks into biofuel
- Co-products (purple) – the contribution of co-products from biofuel production
- Avoided fossil fuel production (blue) – production of fossil fuels displaced by the biofuel.
- Avoided fossil fuel emission (red) – this is the difference between the fossil fuel emissions compared with the biogenic carbon dioxide from biofuels
- Net results – (yellow hashed) this shows the results of the positive and negative contributions.

A more detailed breakdown and discussion of the impact of each fuel has been included in Appendix A.



## 7.1.1 Climate change

Figure 7 shows climate change impacts and benefits from replacing one litre of fossil fuel with biofuel.




Figure 7 Climate change impact for replacement of one litre of fossil fuel with equivalent biofuel.

The two scenarios involving agave (E.agave ferm. and E.agave & moll. ferm.) have similar results with the main impacts (above the line) being in feedstock production and the main savings (below the line) in avoiding fossil fuel emissions, avoided fossil fuel production and co-products. The coproduct credit is mainly from electricity exports.

The scenario using dedicated sugarcane to produce ethanol (E.sugarcane integ. bioref. ferm.) is similar to the agave scenarios, except that there is no electricity exports and the impacts from feedstock are slightly larger.

Ethanol from the Glycell process using cane trash and tops (*E.cane trash Glycell*) has very low feedstock impacts as it's sourced from a waste material. The scenario also has low processing energy because of the use of lignin as an energy source within the process.

Concentrated acid hydrolysis of cane trash (E.cane trash conc. Acid) has very low feedstock impacts from cane trash but higher impacts from wood waste (E.forestry res. conc. acid), which has some benefits in its alternative fate which is in compost feedstock.

Cotton trash processing using dilute acid hydrolysis has impacts from the supply of enzymes used after the pre-treatment with dilute acid.

Biodiesel from Carinata and tobacco are similar in their GHG contributions with substantial impacts in feedstock production offset by the production of valuable co-products, and relatively low impacts in the biodiesel production process.

Four different pyrolysis feedstocks (show very similar results for different feedstocks, which are all lignocellulosic-based and assumed to be processed in a similar way. Forestry residue has a longer assumption than other feedstock which means the feedstock impact is higher.

The use of tyres in destructive distillation has high impacts for feedstock from the impact of the alternative fate of tyres in landfill representing a carbon store. This is because tyres do not degrade in landfill, so the carbon contained in these is kept out of the atmosphere, despite the other issues tyres in landfill represent.



Finally use of municipal solid waste for production of renewable diesel (RD.MSW gasification FTP) is off the scale of the graph as the benefits of avoiding landfill of mixed organic waste fraction is so high, due to avoided landfill methane emissions. Full detail of the breakdown for this scenario can be see in Appendix A 12.

## 7.1.2 Fossil fuel use

Figure 8 shows the impacts on fossil fuel depletion of replacing one litre of fossil fuel with biofuel. For all scenarios the displacement of one litre of fossil fuel represents the largest benefit for fossil fuel use.

For the first eight ethanol scenarios the biofuel production system adds almost no fossil fuel depletion because the process energy is sourced from biomass within the biofuel system. For Carinata and tobacco there is significant fossil fuel use both in the cropping system, from tractors and fertiliser manufacture, and in the biofuel system, which is predominately from the methanol used in transesterification.

The pyrolysis process and catalytic depolymerisation involves significant fossil energy inputs in both gas and electricity, and hence the high impact in the red bar of the graph. Gasification with Fischer–Tropsch has higher impacts from feedstock and biofuel production than the fossil fuel life cycle. This is due in part to diversion of MSW from landfill where it generated methane – some of which (46%) is captured and used to generate electricity.

The largest fossil fuel offset for destructive distillation is from petroleum coke and steel recycling credits, which are co-products of destructive distillation. The availability of bioenergy for biofuel production processes has reduced the impacts of fossil fuel depletion for most fuels. For catalytic depolymerisation, fossil fuel use is due mostly to electricity and natural gas used in the production process.




Figure 8 Fossil fuel use for replacement of one litre of fossil fuel with biofuel.



### 7.1.3 Eutrophication

Figure 9 shows the impacts on eutrophication from replacing one litre of fossil fuel with equivalent biofuel by life cycle stage and Figure 10 shows same data but by emission type.

The highest net impacts from eutrophication come from dedicated crop systems including agave, cane sugar, Carinata and tobacco production. These impacts are predominantly from ammonia to air, except for sugar production where nitrogen and phosphorus to water are the dominant emissions. Ammonia is released where fertilisers are applied to crops while nitrogen and phosphorus emissions to water are from leaching and runoff from cropping land.

The impacts from biofuel production in the pyrolysis and gasification scenarios are due to nitrogen oxide emissions from combustion processes. The chemical oxygen demand to water is mostly from crude oil production.




Figure 9 Eutrophication for replacement of one litre of fossil fuel with biofuel, by life cycle stage.








Figure 10 Eutrophication for replacement of one litre of fossil fuel with biofuel, by major emission source.

### 7.1.4 Particulate matter

Figure 11 shows the impacts on particulate matter from replacing one litre of fossil fuel with biofuel. Figure 12 shows the contributions by substance to the particulate matter impacts. Combustion of biomass in both bagasse (in sugar and agave) and lignin (in acid hydrolysis) contribute to particulate matter emissions. The second major contributor is ammonia from feedstock production.

Ammonia is an emission from fertiliser application and acts as a secondary particulate. Fossil fuel production does produce significant particulate matter (shown in blue below), which provides a credit to each biofuel scenario. Note that for all tailpipe emissions there has been no change of particulate matter from vehicles.






Figure 11 Particulate matter results for one litre fossil fuel replaced by equivalent biofuel.




Figure 12 Particulate matter contribution by substance for one litre fossil fuel replaced by equivalent biofuel.



## 7.1.5 Land use

The land use results represent the impacts of occupying land and the effect of this on overall bio-productivity of the Earth's productive landscape. In these results any land transformation is not included for the biofuel systems since that is treated in the sensitivity analysis in Section 7.2.6. Figure 13 shows impacts on land use from replacing one litre of fossil fuel with biofuel. Carinata has the highest land use impact, being a dedicated crop with lower yield relative to other crops analysed, such as tobacco and sugar, which are irrigated. Land use within the other biofuel system based on waste products is very low.

The results here demonstrate that occupying land for agriculture has an impact on the bio-productivity of the planet and that utilising waste products and co-product where possible will lower this impact.




Figure 13 Land use results for replacement of one litre of fossil fuel with equivalent biofuel.



## 7.1.6 Water scarcity

Figure 14 shows the impacts on water from replacing one litre of fossil fuel with biofuel. The irrigation of sugarcane and tobacco dominated the water footprint as they were the only irrigated crops included in the analysis. Water use across the rest of the life cycle is not important compared to agriculture inputs.




Figure 14 Water scarcity results for replacement of one litre of fossil fuel with equivalent biofuel.



## 7.2 Sensitivity analyses

Sensitivity analyses were used to increase the robustness of conclusions from the LCA and provide further insights into the observed environmental impacts. The following were included in the sensitivity analyses:

- ▶ The effects of alternative allocation approaches for co-products
- ▶ The effects of tyre source and alternative assumptions on fate
- ▶ Landfill as an alternative fate instead of aerobic stabilisation of waste as alternative fate for food waste and municipal solid waste (MSW) feedstocks
- ▶ Exclusion of landfill store of carbon for tyres, solid waste, and timber wastes.
- ▶ Soil carbon changes from biomass removal with sugar and cereal residues and forestry residues
- ▶ The inclusion of indirect land use change (iLUC)
- ▶ Alternative markets for carbon products from pyrolysis.

### 7.2.1 The effects of alternative allocation approaches for co-products

The default allocation approach to dealing with co-products and wastes was system expansion, in line with ISO 14044 standards and the draft ARENA guidelines for undertaking LCA for bioenergy and biofuel projects. However, both of these documents also require the effect of possible alternative approaches to be tested in the LCA to determine if they change the results. This sensitivity analysis examined the effect of economic allocation on the LCA results. Economic values were collected from the best available sources in the public domain. Ideally a price average of price trend data from the last five years was used, but in some cases, it was limited to a single quoted price. Wherever possible, the same price data were used in a single allocation. In some instances, industry price ratios were used rather than absolute values.

Figure 15 shows the results for the scenarios using economic allocation. In all scenarios the climate change impacts are lower for biofuel than the fossil fuels they replace.

Figure 16 shows the direct comparison of economic allocation with the study results based on system expansion. The variation in the results are greatest when comparing scenarios with waste products such as tyres, wood waste. For most other scenarios the variation is not so significant between the two calculation approaches.






Figure 15 Climate change impact using economic allocation for 1 litre of fossil fuel replaced by equivalent biofuel




Figure 16 Comparison climate change results (using system expansion) to economic allocation



## 7.2.2 The effects of tyre source and alternative assumptions on fate

The results for the beneficial uses of tyres for biofuel production produce counter-intuitive results. While tyres represent a problematic disposal problem in landfill or dumping at mine sites, this disposal does keep carbon in the tyres out of the atmosphere. If tyres are utilised in biofuel the carbon stored in the tyres, or some fraction of it, is released to the atmosphere.

This sensitivity analysis looks at the different assumptions of what will happen to tyres if they are not utilised in biofuel. These options include:

- Landfill – all tyres are assumed to be stored in landfill where they do not degrade (study default)
- Cement kiln – tyres are combusted in a cement kiln where they replace coal.
- No fate – no prior destination is assumed and no credit for carbon storage is provided to waste tyres
- Economic allocation – under economic allocation the prior fate of tyres is ignored, fossil carbon emissions from the tyres are counted as GHG emissions while biogenic carbon emissions are ignored.

The sensitivity analysis also looks at the effects of different types of tyres, such as truck and bus tyres, passenger tyres or mining tyres taking into account the different composition of tyres shown in Appendix A.1.3.

Figure 17 and Figure 18 show how the climate change results vary depending of the assumptions of both the alternative fate for tyres and the source of tyres for destructive distillation and catalytic depolymerisation respectively.

Landfill and cement kilns present similar results with both beneficially avoiding the emission of fossil carbon to the atmosphere either through its storage in landfill or its replacement of coal emissions in a cement kiln. If the prior fate is ignored, the benefits are greater from the use tyres in the biofuel scenario. The economic allocation approach based on the RSB calculation approach ignores prior fate of the waste, as the tyres typically have no value, but also only credits emission offset from biogenically (via plants) derived carbon. So, in this instance, the emissions from synthetic rubber produced into biofuel are counted as climate change contributors. This is highest for the passenger tyres, which have the greatest amount of synthetic rubber.




Figure 17 Sensitivity of tyre source and alternative fate for destructive distillation of tyres.



For renewable diesel produced through catalytic depolymerisation, the alternative fate of landfill storage or cement kilns represent a more favourable pathway for tyres in terms of climate change impacts. This is because the carbon offset is achieved in these scenarios with a minimum amount of additional processing. Even ignoring the prior fate in the no fate scenario, the benefits of passenger tyres offsets are not sufficient to offset the biofuel processing emissions. This is because of the high proportion of fossil-based carbon in the passenger tyres. For mining tyres, which are all-natural rubber, the biofuel option is preferable under the no alternative fate scenario and similarly under the economic allocation scenario.




Figure 18 Sensitivity of tyre source and alternative fate for catalytic depolymerisation of tyres.

### 7.2.3 Landfill instead of composting waste as alternative fate for food waste garden waste and timber waste feedstocks.

For source separated organics waste streams the default assumption is that the alternative fate of these is composting. This is currently common for food, green waste and timber waste however there is potential for the biofuel industry to divert material from landfill. This scenario examines the impact if the alternative fate for food waste, green waste and wood waste is landfill rather than composting. It includes two landfill options – the average Australian landfill which is assumed to capture 46% of methane ((Commonwealth of Australia 2017) and the second where there is no gas capture - which may represent smaller regional landfills.

Note that CCA wood waste and MSW to gasification are not included in this sensitivity as they are already assumed to be diverted from landfill.

Wood waste used in catalytic depolymerisation changes little with alternative waste treatment due to the low level of degradable organic carbon released in landfill or aerobic stabilisation (Figure 19). For food waste and MSW the conventional life difference between aerobic stabilisation and landfill with or without gas capture is very large. This is principally due to methane emissions from landfill which, if avoided, lead to very large benefits, in this case allocated to the production of biofuel.








Figure 19 Sensitivity of alternative fate for organic materials for replacing one litre of fossil fuels with biofuel.



## 7.2.4 Exclusion of landfill store of carbon for tyres, solid waste, and CCA wood waste.

The decision to count the carbon in waste disposal to landfill as a carbon sequestration can be challenged on several grounds. Firstly, the national greenhouse gas account for Australia (Commonwealth of Australia 2017) do not count these materials entering landfill as a store in our national accounts. The international standard on carbon footprinting of products (International Organization for Standardization 2013) does not explicitly mention landfill carbon, but does require carbon storage in products to be reported separate to the carbon footprint. Carbon content and degradability of waste is estimated in the national accounts to develop emission factors for methane from landfills, but the actual store of biogenic carbon in landfill is not included. Secondly, there no specific management of waste at? landfill aimed at storing carbon and there is a high level of uncertainty about the permanence of the carbon store. Finally, there are the other impacts of landfill, including leachate and resource loss which make it difficult to prioritise this technology as a treatment option in the future.

This sensitivity analysis excludes carbon storage in landfill and other disposal options such as abandonment of mining tyres. Figure 20 shows how the climate change results change from the study results when the landfill carbon storage is excluded. Table 16 shows that the three scenarios which previously do not meet the 20% climate change saving threshold will more than meet this threshold if landfill carbon storage is not included.




Figure 20 Sensitivity of excluding carbon storage in landfills.

Table 16: Change in percentage improvement climate change results when replacing fossil fuel with equivalent biofuel

Robustness Check	Study result %	Result when excluding landfill carbon storage.
	%	%
RD.tyres destruc. distill.	18	76
RD.CCA wood waste cata. depoly.	-18	124
RD.tyres. cata. depoly.	-29	11
RD.MSW gasification FTP	593	1008




## 7.2.5 Soil carbon changes from biomass removal

There are fuel pathways that have the potential to change soil carbon due to biomass removal, which would affect the results for climate change. These are those involving cane trash, wheat straw and forestry residues. Table 17 outlines the assumptions used for this sensitivity analysis. Soil carbon changes are complex, site specific and require specific calculations with high levels of uncertainty. A detailed calculation of these carbon changes is beyond the scope of this report, so some typical estimates of potential soil carbon changes have been used.

**Table 17 Assumptions used for sensitivity analysis of including potential soil carbon change from removing biomass from cane, wheat and forest systems.**

Feedstock	Change in C	Source/comment
Cane trash	500 kg/ha/year	Estimate from changes in burnt cane to green cane harvesting described in (Robertson and Thorburn 2007). Proposal is to remove 75% of residues.
Wheat straw	130 kg/ha/year	Unpublished data from CSIRO using the Agricultural Production Systems sIMulator (APSIM) in AER 22 to look at soil carbon accumulation. Assumption is that shifting from average to 15% removal of residue to 75% removal will change soil carbon accumulation from 218 kg/ha/year. With 60% less biomass being retained soil carbon changes to 130 kg/ha/year.
Forestry residues	5,000 kg/ha/35 years.	Author estimate based on directional suggestion from (Achat, Fortin et al. 2015).

Figure 21 shows the results for possible carbon changes from soil carbon change. For sugarcane trash the changes in results are small. This is due to the high yields of biomass per ha, so any potential change in soil carbon is spread across a significant volume of biofuel. By contrast, with the impacts for potential changes for wheat straw, the impacts are significant because the yield of straw is much lower, and the carbon loss is concentrated in a smaller volume of fuel.



**Figure 21 Sensitivity of including possible soil carbon change from removing biomass from cane, wheat and forest systems on fuels made from these residues.**



## 7.2.6 The inclusion of iLUC

To test the potential influence of indirect land use change iLUC, iLUC factors provided by CARB (California Air Resources Board 2015) were used. In this study only five scenarios are based on crops and therefore have potential impact on iLUC.

In this approach, waste/co-products including residues, bagasse, tyres, gin trash and other wastes have no iLUC value. Carinata value was 14.5 g CO<sub>2</sub> per MJ of fuel, which was also used for tobacco, while for sugarcane the value was 11.8 g CO<sub>2</sub> per MJ of fuel (California Air Resources Board 2015). No factors have been found for agave, so the agave scenarios used the same value as sugarcane.

Figure 22 shows the potential change to climate change impact when iLUC values are included for biodiesel from Carinata and tobacco, and ethanol from sugarcane and agave. The impacts are not insignificant; however, they do not negate the overall climate change benefits of these fuels.




Figure 22 Sensitivity of climate change impacts of iLUC on biofuels from dedicated cropping systems.



## 7.2.7 Alternative markets for carbon from pyrolysis and destructive distillation

For the scenarios that have a dry carbon product export, there is some uncertainty around the destination markets for that product.

Four scenarios were tested:

- petroleum coke – a product used in the steel industry (this is a default scenario used in the study)
- charcoal – a product with a range of uses including filtration and combustion
- carbon black – this can be used as a filler in plastics and tyres
- no market – this scenario provides no credit for exported carbon, which forms a baseline for the minimum performance of the option.

Data for all three products have been taken from ecoinvent LCA database.

Figure 23 shows that the assumptions around the carbon market have a significant effect on the overall performance of the pyrolysis biofuel scenarios and that the petroleum coke scenario is the most conservative in the sense that it gives the least benefit to the biofuel scenarios of the three products tested. Even in the extreme case where there is no market for the carbon exported, the scenarios are still favourable from a climate change perspective for all scenarios with the exception of renewable tyres processed through destructive distillation.




Figure 23 Sensitivity of alternative and markets for carbon exported from pyrolysis processes.



### 7.3 Data quality assessment and uncertainty analysis

A systematic uncertainty analysis is not possible in this scope of this study; however, to test the robustness of results, a set of conservative assumptions tests have been applied to each scenario based on the data quality commentary. The selection of criteria is based on authors' judgements of the areas of greatest importance and uncertainty in each scenario.

Table 18 lists the data quality consideration for both the feedstock and the biofuel production process for each scenario. The 4<sup>th</sup> column provides the parameters that were varied in the scenario to test the robustness of the results to potential variation. The last two columns provide the results of the study as well as the results using the robustness check.

For the 17 scenarios that have greater than 20% climate change savings, all of these pass the robustness test, and none of them fall below 29%. There is a significant reduction in benefits from removing energy and carbon product exports.

**Table 18 Data quality statement and robustness assessment.**

SCENARIO NAME	DATA QUALITY FEEDSTOCK	DATA QUALITY FUEL SYSTEM	ROBUSTNESS CHECK ASSUMPTIONS	STUDY RESULT	ROBUSTNESS CHECK
				CLIMATE CHANGE SAVINGS FROM BIOFUEL REPLACEMENT OF FOSSIL	
E.agave ferm.	Agave is not grown at a commercial scale but growth trial data is local to Australia.	Commercial applications of ethanol as biofuel from agave are not common, even in Mexico; however, commercial application is common for tequila production. Energy co-production is taken from sugarcane system, so level of energy export has some uncertainty.	No energy credit 20% lower agave yield 10% lower ethanol yield	76%	45%
E.sugarcane integ. bioref. ferm.	Established cropping system with low uncertainty	Established fermentation and distillation technology. While Australia has traditionally used molasses as feedstock, Brazil has used sugar juice for many years.	No bio-dunder credit	42%	39%



SCENARIO NAME	DATA QUALITY FEEDSTOCK	DATA QUALITY FUEL SYSTEM	ROBUSTNESS CHECK ASSUMPTIONS	STUDY RESULT	ROBUSTNESS CHECK
				CLIMATE CHANGE SAVINGS FROM BIOFUEL REPLACEMENT OF FOSSIL	
E.agave & moll. ferm.	Molasses component of scenario is well-tested and based on real data – for agave component see prior scenario.	Molasses component of scenario is well tested and based on real data – for agave component see prior scenario.	No energy credit 20% lower agave yield 0% lower ethanol yield	90%	64%
E.cane trash Glycell	Availability of cane trash and tops is not under contention. Harvesting and aggregation approach may have some uncertainty.	Commercial applications of the technology are not readily available. In the study a number of potential co-products have already been excluded from this scenario.	Acid recycle efficiency change from 99% to 90% Ethanol yield dropped by 10% Double glycerine used 300 km for transport of cane trash instead of 100 km No benefit from nitrous oxide reduction from cane trash application	42%	39%
E.cane trash conc. acid	Availability of cane trash and tops is not under contention. Harvesting and aggregation approach may have some uncertainty. It is also suggested that unutilised bagasse may also be sourced for this technology.	While concentrated acid hydrolysis is not a new technology, the version proposed in this study has not proceeded past pilot plant stage.	Acid use doubled Ethanol yield dropped by 10% 300 km for transport of cane trash instead of 150 km No benefit from nitrous oxide reduction from cane trash application	80%	65%
E.wood waste conc. acid	Supply of sufficiently clean wood waste may be limited.		Acid use doubled Ethanol yield dropped by 10% 200 km for transport of wood waste instead of 100 km	72%	67%
E.cotton GT dilute acid	Cotton gin trash is a waste product that is available and centralised.	Established technology, although not applied in Australia. All data are from European database.	20% lower ethanol yield No electricity export	102%	66%
BD.Carinata transest.	Similar to canola, which is commonly grown in Australia, so very low uncertainty.	Transesterification is a proven technology. Markets for glycerine are sometimes difficult.	10% lower yield No co-product credits for glycerine or potassium carbonate	52%	48%



SCENARIO NAME	DATA QUALITY FEEDSTOCK	DATA QUALITY FUEL SYSTEM	ROBUSTNESS CHECK ASSUMPTIONS	STUDY RESULT	ROBUSTNESS CHECK
				CLIMATE CHANGE SAVINGS FROM BIOFUEL REPLACEMENT OF FOSSIL	
BD.tobacco transest.	This variety has not been grown on scale in Australia so some uncertainty around yield. Italian study is thought to under-report yield.	Transesterification is a proven technology. Markets for glycerine are sometimes difficult.	10% lower yield No co-product credits for glycerine or potassium carbonate	46%	41%
RD.forestry resid. pyrolysis	Actual source of residue has not been specified yet, there are also unknown implications for soil carbon.	Well established pilot plant is in place although final mix of technology options is still being explored. The exact markets for carbon co-product has some uncertainty.	500 km transport for forestry residue instead of 150 km 10% lower yield in bio-oil from pyrolysis No carbon export	76%	69%
RD.cane trash pyrolysis	Good quality data on availability and supply. Unknown implications for soil carbon.		Soil carbon loss from removal 10% lower yield in bio-oil from pyrolysis No carbon export	82%	79%
RD.wheat straw pyrolysis	Good quality data on availability and supply. Unknown implications for soil carbon.		Soil carbon loss from removal. 10% lower yield in bio-oil from pyrolysis No carbon export	84%	30%
RD.prickly acacia pyrolysis	Harvesting data based on sugarcane harvesting.		500 km transport instead of 150 km 10% lower yield in bio-oil from pyrolysis No carbon export	80%	73%
RD.tyres destruc. distill.	Exact source and type of tyres used is uncertain, as is the fate of tyres if they are not used in biofuel.		No commercial plant available so data is from small-scale plants and process models.	500 km transport instead of 100 km 10% lower yield in destructive distillation No carbon export	18%





SCENARIO NAME	DATA QUALITY FEEDSTOCK	DATA QUALITY FUEL SYSTEM	ROBUSTNESS CHECK ASSUMPTIONS	STUDY RESULT	ROBUSTNESS CHECK
				CLIMATE CHANGE SAVINGS FROM BIOFUEL REPLACEMENT OF FOSSIL	
<b>RD.CCA W. waste cata. depoly.</b>	Source type of wood waste is uncertain, as is the fate of timber waste if not used in a biofuel system.		200 km transport instead of 100 km 20% lower yield of diesel	-18%	-18%
<b>RD.green waste cata. depoly.</b>	Green waste supply is well understood, although the catchment required to source material is uncertain.		200 km transport instead of 100 km 20% lower yield of diesel	35%	33%
<b>RD.forestry res. cata. depoly</b>	Actual source of residue has not been specified yet, there are also unknown implications for soil carbon.	Well studied at small scale but pilot and commercial-scale plants are not available.	500 km transport instead of 150 km 20% lower yield of diesel	39%	36%
<b>RD.food waste cata. depoly</b>	Food waste collections still being established so the catchment required to source material is uncertain.		200 km transport instead of 100 km 20% lower yield of diesel	35%	33%
<b>RD.tyres. cata. depoly.</b>	Exact source and type of tyres used is uncertain, as is the fate of tyres if they are not used in biofuel.		500 km transport instead of 100 km 20% lower yield of diesel	-29%	-21%
<b>RD.MSW gasification FTP</b>	Supply of MSW is well understood, although composition of material used in biofuel production is uncertain.	Well established technology, which has been used outside of Australian for many years.	10% lower yield No electricity export	593%	118%



## 8 Discussion and conclusions

---

The aim of this report is to determine the climate change benefits of potential biofuels for Queensland. Of the 20 scenarios assessed, 17 of them had greater than 20% benefit compared to conventional fossil fuel. The three fuels that do not meet this threshold would meet it if storage of carbon in landfill was excluded, as it is in Australia's national greenhouse accounts.

Because most of the scenarios were based on non-commercial technologies, a robustness check was undertaken to test how the results would shift if the scenario parameters were pushed to a highly conservative (in favour of fossil fuel) position. All 17 scenarios that initially passed the 20% threshold still had more than 20% savings after applying the robustness check.

There are some generalisations that can be drawn from the 20 scenarios in relation to climate change impacts.

- Biofuels which address waste management challenges with highly degradable carbon, such as MSW, food & green waste can have dramatic benefits, especially if the biofuel helps to keep these materials from going to landfill.
- Biofuels based on highly stable carbon wastes such as tyres and wood waste need to compete with alternative treatment methods which can include landfill but also other fuel using processes such as cement kilns. In these scenarios the local supply situation will be critical to determine the alternative fate of these materials and therefore the overall environmental performance.
- Biofuels based on accessing woody wastes are otherwise breaking down in the environment, such as forestry and agriculture residues and prickly acacia, have performed very well with the only possible concern being the effects of these removals on soil carbon.
- Biofuels based on high biomass yields that combine to produce liquid fuels and electricity perform well and however they do increase indirect land use pressure and for some overall water demand.
- Biofuels based on vegetable oils have the benefits of low processing impacts and valuable protein co-products. There is also benefits of using these crops between other cereal crops for beneficial break crop effects.

Other environmental indicators provide insights to the trade-offs required to address climate change impacts. Unsurprisingly, growing crops leads to impacts of land use indicators, and irrigated crops have impacts on water scarcity. The sugarcane growing system has significant potential impacts on eutrophication, which is already well understood in the sugar industry and is reduced through best practice programs such as Smartcane BMP Program. Particulate matter impacts are mostly higher from fossil fuel production; however, where biomass combustion is included in the biofuel system there is potential for significant impacts, which will ultimately be a function of the quality of the emissions control technology.

Care needs to be taken in interpreting the results, with consideration of the following parameters:

- the level of energy and carbon product exports from biomass systems
- ability to extract biomass without detrimental impacts to underlying soil carbon
- in the case of waste inputs, accessing the most likely alternative fate of the waste products that should be used as the baseline for comparison.

The transport of feedstocks has a low impact on the overall biofuel production footprint; it is likely that economic cost of transport will be the limiting factor to aggregating material before the environmental impacts become a dominant factor.



# Appendix A. Feedstock and fuel details

## A.1 Biomass feedstocks

### A.1.1 Overview of the waste feedstocks

This appendix provides additional detail on waste products used as feedstocks including collation and alternative fates for that material if it is not used for biofuels.

The waste feedstocks assessed were:

- cane trash and tops (shortened to cane trash)
- agricultural residues – taken here to be cereal straw residues
- forestry residues
- prickly acacia
- green waste
- timber waste
- CCA treated timber waste
- food waste
- municipal solid waste (organic material fraction)
- waste tyres.

### A.1.2 Cane trash and tops

Cane trash and tops are the residues after cane harvesting, which represent 25% of the biomass of a sugarcane crop (Botha 2009). The energy content of cane trash and tops is approximately 15 MJ/kg on a dry mass basis; however, after harvesting it has a water content of approximately 78% (Botha 2009). Botha also states that the relative energy content of trash and tops is 19.2% of total cane crop energy.

The economic value was assumed to be zero in the field because the material is currently not collected for sale. The transport distance for cane trash and tops was assumed to be 150 km by road given the proximity of sugarcane throughout Queensland within proximity of potential biofuel facilities.

The impact of removing cane trash and tops from the field is twofold. Firstly, residual material left on cropland leads to nitrous oxide emissions. The relationship between the amount of residue remaining and nitrous oxide emissions was assumed to be linear and is described in the National Inventory Report (Commonwealth of Australia 2017).

The second effect is the potential change in soil carbon levels due to lower inputs of residue. While there is evidence that soil carbon changes with inputs of residues and fertilisers, there is no simple relationship. Robertson and Thorburn (2007) suggest a potential for an 8 to 15% increase in soil carbon when changing from a burnt cane to a green cane system with trash blankets over many years. However, a reduction from 100% to 25% of residue is a different situation. The default assumption was that trash management can be managed to maintain soil carbon at the same levels as at 100%. Assuming a soil carbon content of approximately 30 t/ha, a 10% increase over 20 years would equate to 0.5% per annum or 150 kg carbon per annum. This is used as a sensitivity assessment in section 7.2.5.




### A.1.3 Forestry residues

Forestry residues are a waste biomass of trims from harvested trees in forestry operations. In Australia, 41% of the country's forested areas are in Queensland, which has 52.5 million hectares of native forests and 233,000 hectares of plantations (Figure 24). Harvested forests are dominated by softwood plantations, with exotic and native hoop pines the main varieties (Queensland 2018).

On average, of every 100 tonnes of trees that are harvested, 65 tonnes is left behind in the forest to degrade (Andrew Macintosh 2018).

Forestry residues play a role in soil carbon accumulation (Achat, Fortin et al. 2015); however, detailed modelling of this is beyond the scope of this LCA. In the sensitivity section of this report, a scenario has been run whereby a difference of 5000 kg of carbon per ha is assumed due to biomass removal over a 35 year period, which is the assumed length of a softwood rotation.



Source: Terrestrial Ecosystem Research Network

Figure 24 Forest cover of Queensland.

The process data for collection and delivery of forestry residues to a biofuel facility are shown in Table 19.

Table 19 Data for collection and delivery of 1 tonne of forestry residues to biofuel facility.

Item	Unit	Flow	Transportation distances (km)
Transport, truck, 28 t	tkm	150	150 km transport (author's assumption)
Wood chipping, mobile, diesel	hr	0.1	Author's estimate on time. Process consumes 70 L diesel per hour



## A.1.4 Agricultural residues

Cereal residues were assumed to be from wheat, barley and similar grains. Wheat has been used in this study as a typical source of residues. Wheat production in Queensland is shown in Figure 25. The highest amounts of residue are from the southern parts of the state, but there is significant production up into central Queensland. It was assumed that a biofuel facility would be located within a few hundred kilometres of the grain growing areas, so the transport distance has been estimated to be an average of 150 km.




Figure 25 Production (t/year) for wheat, averaged over four years. Source: (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2015).

Wheat residue was treated in similar way to cane trash, with zero economic value and an impact on nitrous oxide emissions as described in the National Inventory Report (Commonwealth of Australia 2017). The energy content of straw and wheat grain was assumed to be 18 MJ/kg (Feedipedia 2016), making the energy allocation the same as a mass allocation between residue and grain.

For potential changes in soil carbon, the change has been estimated using currently unpublished data from CSIRO which used APSIM (an agricultural simulation tool). Data for the Queensland cereal growing region was used to look at soil carbon accumulation. The current soil carbon accumulation in this region is 218 kg/ha/year. For a sensitivity analysis, the assumption was that cereal residue harvesting will be gained through shifting from average to 15% removal of residue to 75% removal. This results in 60% less retained biomass, which was then assumed to reduce soil carbon accumulation by 60%, equating to 130 kg/ha/year.



Table 20 shows the process for the supply of wheat straw to a biofuel facility. The transport distance for residues was assumed to be 150 km by road, and a shift from cropping with 15% stubble removal to 75% stubble removal. This allows for 25% to be retained for soil stability.

Table 20 Process data for collection and delivery of 1 tonne of agricultural residues to biofuel facility.

Item	Unit	Flow	Transportation distances (km)
Transport, truck, 28 t	tkm	150	150 km transport (author's assumption)
Wheat, dryland, 75% stubble removed	t	1113	Practice in higher biomass harvest scenario
Wheat, dryland, 15% stubble removed	t	-1113	Current typical practice (Umbers, Watson et al. 2016)

### A.1.5 Prickly acacia

Prickly acacia is thorny shrub or small tree that is native to India, but in Australia it is a widespread invasive plant that can encourage erosion, threaten biodiversity and reduce pasture productivity. Prickly acacia is a restricted invasive plant under the *Biosecurity Act (2014)*.

A map of distribution of prickly acacia is shown in Figure 26. For a biorefinery located in Gladstone there is a significant supply of the crop within 150 km. The majority of the prickly acacia, however, sits 500 km west of Gladstone. The baseline assumption for the use of prickly acacia was based on a transport distance of 150 km by articulated truck, with a sensitivity analysis undertaken using 500 km of road transport and rail transport.

Energy use in harvesting prickly acacia was based on 2sugarcane harvesting as suggested by Schmidt, Giles et al. (2012). No alternative fate was attributed to prickly acacia, and benefits of its removal are not included in this study. The data for delivering prickly acacia to a biofuel facility is shown in Figure 26.




Figure 26 Distribution of prickly acacia in Queensland. (Department of Agriculture and Fisheries 2016)



Table 21 Process data for delivering 1 tonne of prickly acacia to biofuel facility.

Process	Unit	Flow	Comment
Tractor operation, diesel use	L	1.7	Based on sugarcane harvesting energy use (Renouf, Wegner et al. 2011)
Transport, truck 40 t	tkm	150	

### A.1.1 Green waste and food waste

Green waste and food waste may be supplied through either households, which have source separated organics collections, or from commercial collections from businesses. For the purpose of this study it was assumed that these collections are in place for waste management reasons, with commercial composting assumed to be the alternative fate of this material.

Green waste in 2015 was 619,017 t, making up 11.7% of the total waste recovered. Combined food waste from domestic, commercial and industrial facilities was 59,383 t, adding another 1.1% of total waste recovered (Waste Data and Reporting 2016).

Process data for supply of food or garden wastes are shown in Table 22. The data for commercial composting are shown in Table 23 and the benefits of using this compost is shown in Table 24.

A sensitivity analysis was undertaken in section 7.2.3 where the alternative fate of the material was landfill. The rationale is that a strong market for this material due to biofuel demand could increase separation from waste streams. The main differences between food and green waste are the moisture content and the degradation behaviour when it is sent to landfill. Landfill degradation and emissions data were based on the information in the National Inventory Report (Commonwealth of Australia 2017).

Table 22 Process data for delivering 1 tonne of food and garden waste to biofuel facility.

Item	Unit	Amount	Transportation distances (km)
Transport, truck, 40 t	tkm	100	100 km transport (author's assumption)
Wood chipping, mobile, diesel	hr	0.1	Author's estimate on time. Process consumes 70 L diesel per hour
Composting garden and food waste	t	-1	Alternative fate of material

Table 23 Process data for composting garden and food waste.

Process	Unit	Amount	Comment
Compost output	t	0.5	50% compost yield from input material
Inputs			
Diesel machinery use	L	3.307	
Electricity	kWh	8.80	
Water	m <sup>3</sup>	11.00	

Source: Pers. comm., Jefferies Compost Soil and Mulch

Table 24 Process data for application of compost.

Outputs	Unit	Amount	Replaces
Nitrogen (N)	%	1.2%	Urea
Phosphorus (P)	%	0.2%	Triple super phosphate
Potassium (K)	%	1.0%	Potassium chloride

Source: Pers. comm., Jefferies Compost Soil and Mulch



## A.1.2 Wood waste and treated wood waste

Besides general wood waste such as sawdust and timber offcuts, another category of wood waste includes timber treated with chemicals such as copper chrome arsenate (CCA), high temperature creosote (HTC), pigmented emulsified creosote (PEC) and light organic solvent preservative (LOSP). This category of timber comes from engineered timber products from the construction and demolition waste stream, packaging and transport, and utilities sources.

The amount of timber waste recovered in 2015 was 180,504 tonnes, which accounted for 3.4% of total waste generated (Waste Data and Reporting 2016).

The only scenario in this report using wood waste was based on the use of CCA wood, so landfill is the assumed alternative fate because CCA timber cannot be composted. Landfill degradation and emissions data were based on the information in the National Inventory Report (Commonwealth of Australia 2017). The transport distance was assumed to be 100 km for supply of wood waste to the biofuels facility; pre-processing of the material was incorporated into the catalytic depolymerisation process data.

## A.1.3 Waste tyres

Used tyres represent a significant waste management problem. This is partly due to the volume of tyres produced and some unique challenges in the storage and disposal of waste tyres. This includes problems compacting landfills that contain tyres, fire risks, mosquitos breeding in stored tyres and leaching of hazardous compounds from tyre dumps.

Determining the alternative fate of tyres was difficult because many tyres are not able to be accounted for; some are exported and some abandoned (especially in the case of mining tyres).

The share of end of life arisings for tyres in Queensland has been adopted from (Mountjoy, Hasthanayake et al. 2015) with the quantities in terms of equivalent passenger units (EPU) shown in Table 25. Table 26 shows the composition of different types of tyres. The important components are the steel, which can be recycled, and the natural and synthetic carbon components, which end up in the biofuel.

**Table 25 Tyre end-of-life share in Queensland.**

Item	No. of EPU	Share (%)	Distance to biofuel producer (km)
Passenger vehicles	3261783	29	100
Trucks	3581578	31	100
Other vehicles	4559469	40	500

Source: (Emma Mountjoy, Dharshi Hasthanayake et al. 2015)

**Table 26 Natural rubber and steel content in various types of tyres.**

Item	Natural rubber %	Synthetic rubber (%)	Other carbon-based constituents (%)	Steel (%)	Other non-carbon constituents (%)
Passenger vehicles	6.58	40.42	27	16.5	9.5
Trucks	12.15	32.85	22	25	8
Other vehicles (mining etc.)	47	0	29	12	12

Sources:– (Anne and Evans 2006)





## A.4 Ethanol from biomass using concentrated acid hydrolysis

### A.4.1 Description of process

This pathway uses lignocellulosic biomass materials, such as sugarcane tops and trash, as well as forestry residues to produce ethanol. The scenario was based on a new technology process being developed by Ethanol Technologies Limited (Ethtec) and implemented by North Queensland BioEnergy Corporation Limited (NQBE). Figure 31 shows the supply of the different potential feedstocks for the concentrated hydrolysis process.


Sugarcane bagasse may also be used from un-utilised bagasse at sugar mills, with the underlying assumption that the material used had no current use or significant economic or environmental value.

Forestry residues similarly were assumed to be sourced from forestry operations using material that is currently not utilised.

The Ethtec process uses several steps to produce ethanol from lignocellulosic biomass. Once collected, the lignocellulosic feedstock is impregnated with concentrated sulfuric acid using a tailored twin screw extruder. The extruded product is then adjusted to optimum acid concentration so that it undergoes a rapid hydrolysis reaction, which converts the cellulose and hemicellulose components of the feedstock to fermentable sugars. This material is then filtered with the lignin component of the feedstock being recovered for energy production and the acid being separated from the sugars for reuse. The sugars are then fermented to ethanol, which is recovered using an induced phase separation process. The ethanol recovery process simultaneously produces a solid waste stream, which is combusted along with the lignin for energy recovery.

As there are some gaps in available data, these have been filled with publicly available data, and where necessary proxy data from similar processes.

An additional sensitivity analysis has been undertaken where sugarcane bagasse was the feedstock assumed to compete with bagasse for use in electricity generation.



## A.4.2 Process data

Table 35 shows the pre-treatment data. Energy use for pre-treatment was provided by Ethtec. The Ethtec process is expected to be energy self-sufficient in steam and electricity by combustion of the lignin and solid waste components from the process. Acid consumption was based on 1.2% of total acid loading.

Table 35 Data for pre-treatment per dry tonne of sugarcane bagasse/trash.

Process	Value	Unit	Source comment
<b>Inputs</b>			
Twin screw extruder	50	kWh	Pre-treatment, 0.4–0.06 kWh per kg dry matter. Internal data from Ethtec.
<b>Sulfuric acid</b>	12	kg	Assumed to be make up acid – 1.2% assuming acid load of 1:1 with dry solids content.
<b>Outputs</b>			
<b>Treated biomass</b>	1	t	1 tonne of biomass and 1 tonne sulfuric acid
<b>Dry matter basis</b>			

Energy data for hydrolysis has been ignored based on the assumption that the Ethtec process would be self-sufficient in electricity and steam. The hydrolysis process used concentrated (40% C) sulfuric acid (Hamelinck, Hooijdonk et al. 2005) (Waldron 2010), and the acid was assumed to be recovered after the hydrolysis process with a net consumption of 1.2%. The process flows assumed for the hydrolysis process are shown in Table 36. The process flows for ethanol production are shown in Table 37 and the assumptions from ecoinvent data for combustion of lignin material for energy production are shown in Table 38. All energy was assumed to be supplied from locally generated steam and electricity from lignin and solid waste combustion; however, no energy export was assumed. While there are unique processes being developed for simultaneous ethanol recovery and waste treatment that are not based on distillation, no data are available on this process, so as a replacement, distillation was assumed, based on energy from lignin and solid waste material combustion.




Table 36 Main assumptions for hydrolysis process.

Flow	Unit	Value	Comment
<b>Outputs</b>			
Sugars from hydrolysis process	kg	0.78	
Lignin and other residual biomass to energy	kg	0.22	Based on assumption of 22% lignin (Franco, Pimenta et al. 2013)
<b>Materials and energy</b>			
Sugars from hydrolysis reactor	kg	1	From ecoinvent, based on enzymatic process
Energy from lignin and solid waste combustion			

Table 37 Main assumptions for fermentation and ethanol separation.

Flow	Unit	Value	Comment
<b>Outputs</b>			
Ethanol, azeotropic	kg	1	
Residual material sent to bioenergy combustion with lignin.	kg		Amount not specified but assumes that all biomass is used for energy generation and will match requirements of the process.
<b>Inputs</b>			
Sugars from hydrolysis reactor	kg	2.17	Assumes 90% fermentation efficiency, i.e. ~0.46 kg ethanol/kg sugars, Pers. comm., Dr. Russel Reeves, Ethtec
Potassium carbonate	kg	0.25	Gross amount assumed. Recycling of K <sub>2</sub> CO <sub>3</sub> needs to be accounted for.
Quicklime	kg	0.032	Assumed to be needed for neutralisation – from ecoinvent process
Water	kg	2	Pers. comm., Dr. Russel Reeves, Ethtec
Energy from lignin and waste biomass combustion	MJ		Amount not specified but assume that all biomass is used for energy generation and will match requirements of the process.



Table 38 Lignin waste energy process.

Flow	Unit	Value	Comment	
<b>Products</b>				
Lignin (biomass) combusted for energy <sup>2</sup>	MJ	1	Per unit of fuel input	
<b>Materials and energy</b>				
Urea, as N	kg	3.49E-05	Adapted from the dataset 'wood chips, in cogen 6400 kWh, wood, emission control', according to actual water, carbon and energy content of the fuel (unconverted solids, mainly lignin)	
Sodium chloride, powder	kg	5.35E-06		
Lubricating oil	kg	4.28E-06		
Water, decarbonised, at user	kg	1.03E-03		
<b>Emissions to air</b>				
Phenol, pentachloro-	kg	1.15E-11		
Toluene	kg	4.24E-07		
Formaldehyde	kg	1.83E-07		
PAH, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons	kg	1.56E-08		
Hydrocarbons, aliphatic, alkanes, unspecified	kg	1.28E-06		
Nitrogen oxides	kg	5.74E-05		
NMVOC,	kg	8.61E-07		
Particulates, <2.5 µm	kg	7.08E-06		
Dinitrogen monoxide	kg	2.87E-05		
Acetaldehyde	kg	7.99E-08		
Methane, biogenic	kg	6.13E-07		
Benzo(a)pyrene	kg	7.08E-10		
Ammonia	kg	2.22E-05		
Benzene, ethyl-	kg	4.24E-08		
Sulfur dioxide	kg	3.25E-06		
Benzene, hexachloro-	kg	1.01E-14		
Carbon monoxide, biogenic	kg	9.86E-06		
Hydrocarbons, aliphatic, unsaturated	kg	4.38E-06		

### A.4.3 Climate change results

Figure 32 shows the climate change results for 1 litre of fossil fuel being replaced with the equivalent ethanol. The major benefit from the climate change impacts perspective is the absorption of carbon from the atmosphere. There are small benefits from avoiding nitrous oxide by removing excess trash from the sugarcane field. Assuming an additional soil carbon loss of 0.5 t per ha from removing 75% of cane trash has almost no effect on the climate change impacts. The effect of feedstock from sugarcane trash and tops is almost zero as there are small emissions savings from removing trash from the field, and small emission impacts from transporting material to the biofuel facility. For forestry residues there is a larger impact due to transport and chipping of forestry residue.

The third column shows the results of using bagasse as the feedstock in the situation where it is taken away from use in cogeneration plants. This results in a positive emission result, suggesting that the climate change benefits of direct use of bagasse to offset natural gas would be preferable to its use in biofuels.

<sup>2</sup> Analysis by SGS Australia P/L of the lignin cake from the Ethtec Process shows gross calorific values of 14.8 MJ/kg at 34.0% moisture and 20.1 MJ/kg at 10.3% moisture. Pers. comm., Dr. Russel Reeves, Ethtec.






Figure 32 Breakdown of impacts for replacement of one litre gasoline with equivalent ethanol from sugarcane trash via concentrated acid hydrolysis.



# References

- (2014). Biosecurity Act 2014.
- ABARE-BRS (2010). Land Use of Australia Version 4, 2005-06.
- ABARE (2011). Energy in Australia 2011. Canberra ACT, ABARE, Australian Bureau of Agricultural Research Economics.
- Achat, D. L., M. Fortin, G. Landmann, B. Ringeval and L. Augusto (2015). "Forest soil carbon is threatened by intensive biomass harvesting." *Scientific Reports* 5: 15991.
- Adam Pekol Consulting Pty Ltd (2011). Australian Transport Facts 2011, Data tables.
- AIP (2013). Report on Australia's oil refinery industry, Australian Institute of Petroleum.
- ALCAS (2016). Australian Life Cycle Inventory Database (AusLCI) Version1.23 20160408. A. L. C. A. Society. Melbourne.
- ALCAS (2017). Australian Life Cycle Inventory Database (AusLCI) Version1.27. A. L. C. A. Society. Melbourne.
- Andrew Macintosh, R. D. (2018). "The waste in Tasmania's forests: most timber left to rot." Retrieved 21/03/2018, 2018, from <https://www.crikey.com.au/2012/12/14/the-waste-in-tasmanias-forests-most-timber-left-to-rot/>.
- Anne and R. Evans (2006). "The Composition of a Tyre: Typical Components." *The Waste & Resources Action Programme*.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2015). "4610.0 - Water Account, Australia, 2013-14." Retrieved 21 March 2016, from <http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Lookup/4610.0Main+Features12013-14?OpenDocument>.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2015). "7121.0 - Agricultural Commodities, Australia, 2013-14." Retrieved 23 June 2015, from <http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/allprimarymainfeatures/97B95C93A7FD9B75CA2573FE00162CAF?opendocument>.
- Australian Energy Regulator. (2017). "Weekly-volume-weighted-average-spot-prices." Retrieved October 15, 2017, from <https://www.aer.gov.au/wholesale-markets/wholesale-statistics/weekly-volume-weighted-average-spot-prices>.
- Blonk Consultants (2017). Direct Land Use Change Assessment Tool, Version 2017.2. Gouda.
- Botha, F. (2009). *Energy yield and cost in a sugarcane biomass system*. Proceedings of the Australian Society of Sugar Cane Technologists.
- California Air Resources Board (2015). CA-GREET 1.8b versus 2.0 CI Comparison Table. California.
- Commonwealth of Australia (2017). National Greenhouse Accounts Factors. Canberra, Department of the Environment, Commonwealth of Australia.
- Commonwealth of Australia (2017). National Inventory Report 2015 Volume 1. Canberra.
- Commonwealth of Australia (2017). National Inventory Report 2015 Volume 2. Canberra.
- Department of Agriculture and Fisheries (2016). Prickly acacia, *Vachellia nilotica* subsp. *indica* (Benth) Kyal and Boatwr, The State of Queensland,.
- Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency (2010). Australian National Greenhouse Accounts, National Inventory Report 2008 Volume 1. Canberra, Commonwealth of Australia.
- Department of Environment and Heritage and Water (2011). National Pollutant Inventory (NPI) data for year 2009/10. Canberra.



Department of the Environment (2014). National Greenhouse Accounts Factors. Canberra, Department of the Environment, Commonwealth of Australia.

DIICCSRTE (2013). National Greenhouse Accounts Factors. Canberra, Department of Industry Innovation Climate Change Science Research and Tertiary Education, Commonwealth of Australia.

ecoinvent Centre (2010). ecoinvent data version 2.2, reports No. 1-25, as implemented in SimaPro 7.2. Dübendorf, Swiss Centre for Life Cycle Inventories.

Electricity Supply Association of Australia (2012). Electricity Gas Australia 2012. Melbourne,, Electricity Supply Association of Australia.

Elgowainy, A., D. Dieffenthaler, V. Sokolov, R. Sabbisetti, C. Cooney and A. Anjum (2013). SOFTWARE AND MANUAL FOR GREET.net 2013 (ANL-SF-12-005) - Software: GREET 2, Version 2.7.

Emma Mountjoy, Dharshi Hasthanayake, Tom Freeman and M. K. (2015). STOCKS & FATE OF END OF LIFE TYRES – 2013-14 STUDY, Hyder.

Energy Supply Association Australia (2012). Energy Gas Australia 2012. Canberra, Energy Supply Association Australia.

EnergyQuest Pty Ltd (2010). Benchmarking the Price of Fuel Ethanol in Australia: Report to Australian Competition and Consumer Commission.

European Commission JRC IES (2011). ILCD handbook - International Reference Life Cycle Data System (ILCD) - ILCD Handbook Recommendations for Life Cycle Impact Assessment in the European context. Ispra (VA) Italy, European Commission Joint Research Centre Institute for Environment and Sustainability,.

Feedipedia (2016). On-line encyclopedia of animal feeds.

Franco, H. C. J., M. T. B. Pimenta, J. L. N. Carvalho, P. S. G. Magalhães, C. E. V. Rossell, O. A. Braunbeck, A. C. Vitti, O. T. Kölln and J. Rossi Neto (2013). "Assessment of sugarcane trash for agronomic and energy purposes in Brazil." Scientia Agricola 70: 305-312.

Gao, F. (2016). Data on sugar milling and ethanol production from molasses. T. Grant, Wilmar.

Geoff Armitage, B. (2007). Resources and Energy Statistics 2013.

Grant, T., P.-A. Bontinck, B. Sharma and M. Renouf (2016). Greenhouse gas and sustainability footprints of current and future biofuels for Queensland. Melbourne, Australia, Lifecycles.

Grant, T., S. Eady, H. Cruyppenninck and A. Simmons (2015). AusLCI methodology for developing Life Cycle Inventory for Australian agriculture. Melbourne, Lifecycles.

Grisan, S., R. Polizzotto, P. Raiola, S. Cristiani, F. Ventura, F. di Lucia, M. Zuin, S. Tommasini, R. Morbidelli, F. Damiani, F. Pupilli and M. Bellucci (2016). "Alternative use of tobacco as a sustainable crop for seed oil, biofuel, and biomass." Agronomy for Sustainable Development 36(4): 55.


Hamelinck, C. N., G. v. Hooijdonk and A. P. C. Faaij (2005). "Ethanol from lignocellulosic biomass: techno-economic performance in short-, middle- and long-term." Biomass and Bioenergy 28(4): 384-410.

Humbert, S., J. D. Marshall, S. Shaked, J. V. Spadaro, Y. Nishioka, P. Preiss, T. E. McKone, A. Horvath and O. Jolliet (2011). "Intake Fraction for Particulate Matter: Recommendations for Life Cycle Impact Assessment." Environmental Science & Technology 45(11): 4808-4816.

Hyder Consulting (2006). Waste and Recycling in Australia, Short Paper, Department of Environment and Heritage.

i Canals, L. M., J. Romanya and S. J. Cowell (2007). "Method for assessing impacts on life support functions (LSF) related to the use of 'fertile land' in life cycle assessment (LCA)." Journal of Cleaner Production 15(15): 1426-1440.

Institute of Environmental Sciences (CML) (2016). CML-IA Characterisation Factors Version 4.7. U. o. Leiden. Leiden, NL.



International Organization for Standardization (2006). International Standard, ISO 14044, Environmental Management Standard- Life Cycle Assessment, Requirements and Guidelines. Switzerland.

International Organization for Standardization (2006). International Standard, ISO/DIS14040, Environmental Management Standard- Life Cycle Assessment, Principles and Framework. Switzerland.

International Organization for Standardization (2013). Technical Specification, ISO/TS 14067:2013, Greenhouse gases — Carbon footprint of products — Requirements and guidelines for quantification and communication. Switzerland, ISO.

IPCC (2013). Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. C. Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.: 1535.

Iribarren, D., A. Susmozas and J. Dufour (2013). "Life-cycle assessment of Fischer–Tropsch products from biosyngas." Renewable Energy 59(Supplement C): 229-236.

Jungbluth, N., M. Chudacoff, A. Dauriat, F. Dinkel, G. Doka, M. Faist Emmenegger, E. Gnansounou, N. Kljun, M. Spielmann, C. Stettler and J. Sutter (2007). ecoinvent data version 2.0, Life Cycle Inventories of Bioenergy, v2.0 - ecoinvent report No. 8. Zurich, Ecoinvent Centre.

Jungbluth, N., F. Dinkel, G. Doka, M. Chudacoff, A. Dauriat, M. Spielmann, J. Sutter, N. Kljun and K. Schleiss (2007). Life Cycle Inventories of Bioenergy. Version 2.0, Ecoinvent report number 17. Dübendorf, Swiss Centre for Life Cycle Inventories,.

Kent, G. (2007). The value of bagasse to an Australian raw sugar factory. Proceedings of the Australian Society of Sugar Cane Technologists.

Knox, O., I. Rochester, G. Vadakattu and L. Lawrence (2006). Composting in Australian cotton production, CSIRO Entomology and Cotton Catchment Communities CRC, Australian Cotton Research Institute.

Linan-Montes, A., S. De La Parra-Arciniega, M. Garza-González, R. García-Reyes, E. Soto-Regalado and F. Cerino-Córdova (2014). "Characterization and thermal analysis of agave bagasse and malt spent grain." Journal of Thermal Analysis and Calorimetry 115(1): 751-758.

McIntosh, S., T. Vancov, J. Palmer and S. Morris (2014). "Ethanol production from cotton gin trash using optimised dilute acid pretreatment and whole slurry fermentation processes." Bioresource Technology 173(Supplement C): 42-51.

Merriam-Webster.com. (2016). "Eutrophication." Retrieved Web. 16 July 2016.

Mountjoy, E., D. Hasthanayake and T. Freeman (2015). Stocks & Fate of End of Life Tyres - 2013-14 Study—Final Report. Melbourne, Hyder Consulting Pty Ltd.

Nunez, H. M., L. F. Rodriguez and M. Khanna (2011). "Agave for tequila and biofuels: an economic assessment and potential opportunities." Gcb Bioenergy 3(1): 43-57.

Pfister, S., A. Koehler and S. Hellweg (2009). "Assessing the environmental impacts of freshwater consumption in LCA." Environmental Science & Technology 43(11): 4098-4104.

Queensland, T. (2018). Retrieved 21/03/2018, 2018, from <http://www.timberqueensland.com.au/Growing/Facts.aspx>.

Reedman, L. J. and P. W. Graham (2011). Road transport sector modelling: Supplementary report on Clean Energy Future and Government Policy Scenarios. Canberra.

Renouf, M. (2011). Environmental evaluation of product diversification in sugarcane systems using life-cycle assessment: An Australian case study. PhD Thesis, The University of Queensland.

Renouf, M., T. Grant, M. Sevenster, J. Logie, B. Ridoutt, F. A. Ximenes, J. Bengtsson, A. Cowie and J. Lane (2016). Best Practice Guide for Mid-Point Life Cycle Impact Assessment in Australia- Version 2. Melbourne, Australia, ALCAS Impact Assessment Committee.





- Renouf, M. A., M. K. Wegner and R. Pagan (2010). "Life cycle assessment of Australian sugarcane production with a focus on sugarcane growing." International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment 15: 927-937.
- Renouf, M. A., M. K. Wegner and R. Pagan (2011). "Life cycle assessment of Australian sugarcane products with a focus on cane processing." International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment 16: 125-137.
- Robertson, F. A. and P. J. Thorburn (2007). "Management of sugarcane harvest residues: consequences for soil carbon and nitrogen." Soil Research 45(1): 13-23.
- Rossi, L., E. Fusi, G. Baldi, C. Fogher, F. Cheli, A. Baldi and V. Dell'Orto (2013). "Tobacco seeds by-product as protein source for piglets." Open Journal of Veterinary Medicine 3(01): 73.
- Roundtable on Sustainable Biofuels (2008). Global Principles and Criteria for Sustainable Biofuels Production.
- Said-Pullicino, D., F. G. Erriquens and G. Gigliotti (2007). "Changes in the chemical characteristics of water-extractable organic matter during composting and their influence on compost stability and maturity." Bioresource technology 98(9): 1822-1831.
- Schmidt, E., R. Giles, R. Davis, C. Baillie, T. Jensen, G. Sandell and C. Norris (2012). Sustainable Biomass Supply Chain for the Mallee Woody Crop Industry. Canberra, Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation.
- Self Nutrition Data. (2017). "Agave Nector Nutrition Facts & Calories." 2017, from <http://nutritiondata.self.com/facts/cereal-grains-and-pasta/7738/1>.
- Tao, L., D. Schell, R. Davis, E. Tan, R. Elander and A. Bratis (2014). NREL 2012 achievement of ethanol cost targets: Biochemical ethanol fermentation via dilute-acid pretreatment and enzymatic hydrolysis of corn stover, National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), Golden, CO.
- The Biomass Producer. (2017). "Bagasse and cane trash." Retrieved 7 December 20107, 2017, from <http://biomassproducer.com.au/producing-biomass/biomass-types/crop-residue/bagasse/#harvesting>.
- Umbers, A., P. Watson and D. Watson (2016). GRDC Farm Practices Survey Report 2015. Canberra, Grains Research and Development Corporation.
- UNEP/SETAC Life Cycle Initiative (2011). Global Guidance Principles for life cycle assessment databases: A Basis for Greener Processes and Products. Paris, United Nations Environment Programme and Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry.
- Waldron, K. (2010). Bioalcohol production. [electronic resource] : biochemical conversion of lignocellulosic biomass, Boca Raton : CRC Press ; Oxford : Woodhead Pub., 2010.
- Waste Data and Reporting, D. o. E. a. H. P. (2016). State of Waste and Recycling in Queensland 2015. Queensland.
- Weidema, B. P., C. Bauer, R. Hischer, C. Mutel, T. Nemecek, J. Reinhard, C. O. Vadenbo and G. Wernet (2013). Overview and methodology. Data quality guideline for the ecoinvent database version 3. Ecoinvent Report 1(v3). St. Gallen, The ecoinvent Centre.
- Weidema, B. P., C. Bauer, R. Hischer, C. Mutel, T. Nemecek, J. Reinhard, C. O. Vadenbo and G. Wernet (2016). Overview and methodology. Data quality guideline for the ecoinvent database version 3. Ecoinvent Report 1(v3.3). St. Gallen, The ecoinvent Centre.
- Yang, L., M. Lu, S. Carl, J. A. Mayer, J. C. Cushman, E. Tian and H. Lin (2015). "Biomass characterization of Agave and Opuntia as potential biofuel feedstocks." Biomass and Bioenergy 76(Supplement C): 43-53.







CONTACT US

t +61 (0)3 9417 1190

e [info@lifecycles.com.au](mailto:info@lifecycles.com.au)

w [www.lifecycles.com.au](http://www.lifecycles.com.au)