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ABSTRACT
This paper presents the development of a comprehensive gasification module designed to be integrated in a MFA-LCA framework. From existing gasification models present in the literature, the most appropriate modelling strategy is selected and implemented into the module. This module needs to be able to capture the influence of input parameters, such as gasification reactor type, oxidizing agent, feedstock composition and operating conditions on the process outputs, including syngas yield, its composition and LHV, as well as tar and char contents. A typical gasification process is usually modelled in four steps: drying, pyrolysis, oxidation and reduction. Models representing each of these steps are presented in this paper. Since the type of gasification reactor is taken into account in the module, models for downdraft moving bed and bubbling fluidized bed reactor are also reviewed. The gasification module will be integrated into a MFA framework (VMR-Sys), which enables calculation of relevant gasifier feedstock parameters, such as moisture content, composition, properties and particle size distribution. Outputs from the module will also include elemental compositions obtained from VMR-Sys calculations. Finally, all outputs from the module will be used to build LCA-inventory data.

1. INTRODUCTION

In most developed countries, recyclables have been collected separately for several decades. More recently, source-sorted collections of organics are being implemented, with the aim of recycling this fraction of Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) through anaerobic digestion and composting. Once recyclables and organics are diverted and reintroduced into the circular economy, other recovery loops need to be implemented to deal with the remaining waste stream, often referred to as refuse. At the moment, this stream is mostly disposed of in landfills, but still contains valuable resources (e.g. recyclables and organic wastes) and a potential for energy recovery. Thermochemical treatments, which are characterized by an important waste reduction in mass (70-80%) and in volume (80-90%), appear to be interesting options to recover either resources or energy from the refuse stream (Arena, 2012). More precisely, gasification appears to be particularly well suited to convert a great variety of waste components present in the refuse stream into a quality syngas, appropriate for multiple applications: combined heat and power (CHP), production of valuable chemicals and fuels (Arena, 2012).

Several tools are used in waste management planning to guide decisions. In the past few years, Material Flow Analysis (MFA) gained in popularity as a decision-making tool. MFA models are able to predict output stream characteristics of a given waste treatment process and may be combined with a Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) in order to estimate environmental impacts of a given waste management system. However, since transfer coefficients from empirical data are often used in LCA inventory databases to model material conversions in treatment plants, effects of input stream characteristics and operating conditions are not taken into accounts. In order to capture these effects, a gasification model based on constitutive equations (mass and energy balances, reaction kinetics, transport phenomena) need to be developed. Therefore, the aim of this work is to select the most appropriate modelling strategy in order to develop a comprehensive gasification module designed to be integrated in a MFA-LCA framework.

1.1 Abbreviations and symbols

ABM Agent-Based Model
CHP Combined heat and power
During the gasification process, the combustible fraction of MSW is mostly converted into carbon monoxide (CO), hydrogen (H₂) and methane (CH₄) (Arena, 2012). These three gases are the main constituents of syngas. The syngas may also contain vapor, carbon dioxide (CO₂), large amounts of nitrogen (N₂) in the case of air-blown gasifier, and a wide variety of non-desirable components (e.g. H₂S) (Sikarwar et al., 2016). While char contains mainly elemental carbon, ash is primarily composed of minerals and metals, with minimal elemental carbon (Klinghoffer et al., 2011). Depending on the MSW feedstock, the quality of the syngas may greatly vary (Sikarwar et al., 2017). The effects of MSW moisture content, chemical composition and particle size on the gasifier outlet streams are discussed in the following sections.

1.3 MSW moisture and ash content

MSW components are separated into wet and dry materials, based on their water contents. Dry combustible materials such as plastics, textiles, rubber, leather and wood are characterized by a water content of 0-30%. Wet combustible materials, such as green residues, food and other organic wastes usually contain 40-90% of water. Dry non-combustible materials such as metals, glasses and other inorganic compounds do not contain water and are considered inert (Themelis et al., 2002). The allowable feedstock moisture content depends on the type of reactor. In this study, only downdraft moving bed and bubbling fluidized bed reactors are considered. Downdraft reactor can handle feedstock characterized by less than 20% moisture content, while bubbling fluidized bed reactor feedstock must not exceed 55% moisture content (Arena, 2012). Therefore, in order to meet reactors criteria in terms of moisture content, wet combustible materials should be removed or partially dried before entering the gasification. Finally, the fraction of dry non-combustibles in the feedstock should also be removed prior to the process to reduce its fraction below 20% (Bailie et al., 1997; Themelis et al., 2002; US department of Energy, 2008).

1.4 MSW chemical composition

Since MSW may contain element traces such as sulfur (S) chlorine (Cl) and nitrogen (N), the produced syngas may contain contaminants such as hydrogen sulfide (H₂S), carbonyl sulfide (COS), hydrochloric acid (HCl), ammonia (NH₃) and hydrogen cyanide (HCN) (Sikarwar et al., 2016; US department of Energy, 2008). Furthermore, due to traces of alkali metals in MSW, syngas may also contain traces of sodium (Na) and potassium (K) (Sikarwar et al., 2016). H₂S causes equipment corrosion, while NH₃, HCl and trace...
metals contribute to deactivation of catalysts used in the syngas downstream conversion (Sikarwar et al., 2016). MSW feedstock may also contain fluorine (F), arsenic (As) and phosphorus (P), known as catalyst poisons for liquid fuels synthesis processes, as well as volatile metals such as cadmium (Cd) and mercury (Hg), known as potential catalyst poisons and are particularly difficult to remove (US department of Energy, 2008). Finally, the produced syngas from MSW gasification may also contain particulates and tars (Sikarwar et al., 2016). Presence of tars can lead to equipment blockages (Sikarwar et al., 2016). The two types of reactors reviewed in this work, fluidized bed and downdraft moving bed reactors, are selected because of their performance in reducing the amount of tar emitted. In fact, fluidized bed produces tar concentration in syngas of the order of 10 g/m³, while downdraft moving bed reactor produces tar concentration around 1 g/m³ of syngas (Milne et al., 1998; Basu, 2013).

1.5 MSW particle size

Feedstock particle size distribution has direct impacts on the syngas yield (Sikarwar et al., 2016). In fact, with smaller particles, fluid-particle heat transfer is improved and gasification rate is enhanced exponentially (Sikarwar et al., 2016). Higher heat transfer resistance caused by larger particles results in higher residual char yield, due to incomplete pyrolysis (Lv et al., 2004). Finer particles may be elutriated from fluidized beds before complete conversion, thus reducing gasification efficiency and increasing fly ash. In addition a reduction in particle size also increases H₂ yield and decreases tar production (Hernández et al., 2010; Luo et al., 2009; Sikarwar et al., 2016). Therefore, in order to improve the syngas quality, pretreatment including removing or shredding/compacting of large waste articles should be considered before the gasification process (US department of Energy, 2008). Downdraft moving bed reactors can treat particles as large as 50 mm, while fluidized bed reactors usually accept smaller particles of the order of 6 mm (Basu, 2013), although some bubbling fluidized bed reactors have overbed feeding of very large particles.

1.6 Context

The present work aims at developing a comprehensive gasification process module, to be integrated in a Mass Flow Analysis and Life Cycle Assessment (MFA-LCA) framework. The Chaire de Recherche sur la Valorisation des Matières Résiduelles (CRVMR, Research Chair on Advanced Waste Recovery) at Polytechnique Montreal, is currently developing a methodology to assess the sustainability of Waste Management Systems (WMS), based on the integration of three distinct tools:

- **VMR-Gen**: Agent-Based Model (ABM) to predict the behaviour of the waste generator, providing the MSW flows and compositions of the source-sorted waste streams;
- **VMR-Sys**: MFA based framework to calculate waste and products flows and stocks throughout the WMS. Comprehensive process modules, one for each waste treatment technology, are developed and integrated into this framework;
- **VMR-Imp**: Waste LCA modelling to evaluate the WMS impacts.

The VMR-Sys tool is composed of different process modules (e.g. composting, anaerobic digestion, etc.) all tied together by a MFA calculation framework. Detailed results from VMR-Sys are then used to build the LCA-inventory in VMR-Imp tool. Imbedded in the MFA framework VMR-Sys, the gasification process module will receive detailed information on the feedstock, such as its moisture content, composition and particle size distribution and will capture the influence of a variation of waste flows or compositions for different types of gasification reactors (downdraft moving bed or bubbling fluidized bed). Based on the type of reactor selected, the module will identify the required sets of feedstock properties and thus provide targets for the pretreatment sequence of operations, as shown in Figure 1. The gasification module will then predict the output results in terms of syngas yield, composition and lower heating value (LHV) as well as the composition of tar and char. These outputs will be used in VMR-Imp to build the LCA-inventory data. In order to build a gasification process module, models for each step of the process (drying, pyrolysis, reduction and oxidation) and for the reactor hydrodynamics must be selected. A survey of available modelling strategies is presented in section 2.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Typically, gasification processes are separated into four steps: drying, pyrolysis, oxidation and reduction. Figure 2 presents the simplified input and output streams for each step, with their respective chemical compositions. Descriptions of the different modelling approaches for each gasification step and each reactor type are presented in the next sub-sections.

2.1 Gasification process

2.1.1 Drying step

The first step of the gasification process consists of drying. Since the drying characteristic time is considerably shorter than other reaction times in the overall gasification process, this step is often assumed to be instantaneous (Di Blasi, 2000). Stoichiometric relations are the simplest ways to represent the phenomena. In this approach, it is assumed that a fixed fraction of water initially contained in the feedstock is evaporated. The produced vapor is directly added to the other gas components, without the use of kinetic models (Gupta & Bhaskaran, 2018). For example, in the study of Gerber et al. (2010) it is assumed that 10% of the water contained in the feedstock is evaporated.

In order to consider the effects of temperature on the drying yield, kinetically controlled models are used. A typical drying kinetic model is presented in Eq. 1, where \( r_g \), \( A_g \), \( E_p \), \( T_0 \) and \( C_{g0} \) represent the evaporation rate (kmol/m²·s), the pre-exponential drying factor (1/s), the activation energy of water evaporation (J/kmol), the drying temperature...
(K) and the water concentration (kmol/m³), respectively (Salem & Paul, 2018). Constant temperature or a certain temperature profile may be used to describe the drying step. For example, a temperature of 400K is used in the study of Salem & Paul (2018) while a temperature profile ranging from 368K to 473K is used by Dejtrakulwong & Patum sawad (2014).

Other drying models exist in the literature. For example, in studies by Di Blasi & Branca (2013) and Sharma (2011), a diffusion controlled process is used to describe the drying step. In such models, evaporation rate is limited by vapor diffusion throughout the particle pores (Shokri & Or, 2011). Finally, an isothermal evaporation process is used in a study by Gerber & Oevermann (2014). In this model, the evaporation process is described by a lumped method at a constant evaporation temperature (373K), where a certain amount of water is evaporated over a short time period (Gerber & Oevermann, 2014; Gupta & Bhaskaran, 2018). Since this process is usually very rapid, its kinetic is often neglected.

2.1.2 Pyrolysis step

Once water is partially evaporated, the feedstock is devolatilized into volatiles, tar and char (Sharma, 2011). In the literature, pyrolysis fraction (fp) and kinetic models are used to describe the mass loss. In the most simplified models, pyrolysis is assumed to occur instantaneously at the feeding location, along with the drying step (Gupta & Bhaskaran, 2018). In a study by Giltrap et al. (2003), the pyrolysis fraction fp is introduced in order to represent the degree of devolatilization of an instantaneous pyrolysis process. A fp of zero indicates no pyrolysis while a fp of one indicates that feedstock is completely devolatilized into volatiles, tar and char (Giltrap et al., 2003). A fp of 0.5 is assumed in a study by Giltrap et al. (2003).

Devolatilization process described by a kinetic model is shown in Eq. 2, where m0, m∞, X and ω represent the feedstock mass at t=0 (kg), the feedstock mass at t=∞ (kg), the extent of conversion and the order of reaction, respectively (Grammelis et al., 2009; Gupta & Bhaskaran, 2018). The reaction rate constant is expressed by the Arrhenius reaction rate.

\[
r_p = A_p \exp \left( -\frac{E_p}{RT} \right) \left( 1 - X \right)^\omega
\]  

(1)

Several pyrolysis kinetic models exist, such as the one-step global model, the one-stage multi-reaction model and the two-stage semi-global model (Gupta & Bhaskaran, 2018; Sheth & Babu, 2006). These pyrolysis models are presented in Table 1, where n represents the number of moles and Kp represents the kinetic rate constant (Di Blasi, 2000; Gupta & Bhaskaran, 2018; Sheth & Babu, 2006). In the one-stage global model, pyrolysis is considered as a single-step reaction, where volatiles, tar and char are produced simultaneously (Gupta & Bhaskaran, 2018). On the other hand, in the one-stage multi-reaction model, pyrolysis is represented with several simultaneous competing reactions. Finally, in the two-stage semi-global model, pyrolysis is considered as a two-stage reaction, where the final product (primary tar) of the first reaction produces a secondary tar (Sheth & Babu, 2006).

While pyrolysis fraction fp and kinetic models predict the mass loss of the solids, other models are used to estimate the volatiles composition (Sharma et al., 2006). In the literature, volatiles usually comprise CO, CO₂, H₂, H₂O, CH₄, etc.
2.1.3 Oxidation step

In the literature, different approaches are used to predict the oxidation yield. Since all oxidation reaction rates are faster by a few orders of magnitude than those of char reduction reactions, the oxidation step is often assumed to be instantaneous (Babu & Sheth, 2006; Giltrap et al., 2003; Sharma, 2011). For example, in the studies by Giltrap et al. (2003) and Babu & Sheth (2006) an instantaneous and complete oxidation process was assumed at the feeding location.

Other studies, such as those by Sharma (2011) and Salem & Paul (2018), use a heuristic approach to predict the oxidation yield. In this approach, the oxidation and pyrolysis products are allowed to react with the oxidizing agent available, in a sequence of descending order of reaction rates (Sharma, 2011). Reaction rates listed in Table 2 are only used as a guide to establish the sequence of oxidation reactions described below:

1. Oxidation of hydrogen (reaction O-4)
2. Oxidation of carbon monoxide (reaction O-2)
3. If oxygen remains, the oxidation of methane takes place (reaction O-3)
4. If oxygen still remains, char and tar are oxidized simultaneously according to their reaction rates (reactions O-1 and O-5)

Finally, in studies by Di Blasi & Branca (2013) and Tinnant et al. (2008), kinetic models are used to predict the quantity of gases produced during the oxidation step. Reaction rates presented in Table 2 are used to represent the kinetics of homogeneous reactions (O-2, O-3, O-4, O-5 and WG).

2.1.4 Reduction step

After the oxidation step, the products go through the reduction step in an oxidant-free environment. This step is primarily dominated by heterogeneous reactions, where the char is converted into gaseous products (Gupta & Bhaskaran, 2018). Reactions occurring during the reduction step are presented in Table 3.

These heterogeneous reduction reactions involve the diffusion of a variety of gases (O \(_2\), CO \(_2\), H \(_2\)O, H \(_2\)) from the bulk gas phase to the outer surface and then into the pores of the char particles (Gupta & Bhaskaran, 2018). As the char reacts, its particle size decreases while its porosity increases, leading to more active sites available for the gas to react and, as a result, to an increase of the extent of reaction (Sharma, 2011). In order to capture these effects, the unreacted shrinking core model, as well as the char reactivity factor model, are used in the literature. The unreacted shrinking core model is described by Eq. 7, where \(k_m\) is the kinetic constant (m/s) of the heterogeneous reactions presented in Table 3, the concentrations (kmol/m\(^3\)) of the species \(i\) (O \(_2\), CO \(_2\), H \(_2\)O, H \(_2\)), the particle volumetric surface area (1/m\(^3\)) and the mass transfer coefficient (m/s) for the species \(i\) is presented in Eq. 8, respectively.

\[
\eta = \frac{a_c \left( \frac{C_i}{\rho_m} \right)}{\rho_m \left( \frac{1}{\rho_m} \right)}
\] (7)

Equation of the particle volumetric surface area \(a_c\) is presented in Eq. 8, where \(\epsilon\) and \(d_p\) represent the bed void-
The mass transfer coefficient \( k_{mi} \) is defined by Eq. 9, where \( D_i \) and \( S_h \) represent the diffusivity coefficient of species \( i \) in the gaseous boundary layer (m²/s) and the Sherwood number obtained from correlation involving Reynolds and Schmidt numbers for species \( i \) (Fogler, 2016).

\[
(9)
\]

2.2 Reactor hydrodynamics

Depending on the number of dimensions being considered, hydrodynamics models can be classified into zero-dimensional, one-dimensional, two-dimensional or three-dimensional models (Basu, 2010). Characteristics of these models are shown in Table 5. In the following sections, selected models are presented for the downdraft moving bed reactor and for the fluidized bed reactor.

2.2.1 Downdraft moving bed reactors

Pressure and temperature profiles exist along the length of downdraft moving bed reactors. In this type of reactors, the bed pressure drop is proportional to the gas velocity (Levenspiel & Kunii, 2012). Assuming that the reactor operates under steady state conditions and that there is no radial gradients in concentrations, temperature and reaction rates, the downdraft moving bed may be approximated as a plug flow reactor (PFR) (Fogler, 2016). This assumption is mostly valid for large reactors and caution should be applied in the case of small downdraft gasifiers. A few studies, such as those by Di Blasi (2000), Giltrap et al. (2003) and Tinaut et al. (2008), use this type of approximation for downdraft reactors.

2.2.2 Fluidized bed reactors

Fluidized bed reactors are widely used in the industry due to excellent heat and mass transfers, followed by uniform temperature distribution and concentrations throughout the reactor volume (Bandara et al., 2017). It is often considered that the temperature remains constant within the fluidized bed, and that the gas pressure drop across the bed of particles remains constant (Rhodes, 2008). Since fluidized bed reactors are well mixed, they are often assumed to be analogous to continuous stirred tank reactors (CSTR), resulting in no spatial variation of concentra-

### Table 2: Chemical reaction rates in oxidation zone (Sharma, 2011; Tinaut et al., 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reactions</th>
<th>Reaction rates (mol/m³s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-1: ( C + 0.5O_2 \rightarrow CO )</td>
<td>( r_{O1} = 6.55 \times 10^4 \exp \left( \frac{-89900}{RT} \right) \left[ \frac{C_{O2}}{M_{O}} \right] )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-2: ( CO + 0.5O_2 \rightarrow CO_2 )</td>
<td>( r_{O2} = 3.6 \times 10^7 \exp \left( \frac{-166200}{RT} \right) \left[ \frac{C_{CO}}{M_{CO}} \right] \left[ \frac{C_{O2}}{M_{O}} \right] )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-3: ( CH_4 + 1.5O_2 \rightarrow 2H_2O + CO )</td>
<td>( r_{O3} = 9.2 \times 10^6 \exp \left( \frac{-89300}{RT} \right) \left[ \frac{C_{H4}}{M_{H4}} \right]^{1/2} \left[ \frac{C_{CO}}{M_{CO}} \right] )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-4: ( H_2 + 0.5O_2 \rightarrow H_2O )</td>
<td>( r_{O4} = 1.0 \times 10^{11} \exp \left( \frac{-42000}{RT} \right) \left[ \frac{C_{H2}}{M_{H2}} \right] )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-5: ( C_{H2} + O_2 + 2.99O_{2.99} \rightarrow 6CO + 3.1H_2 )</td>
<td>( r_{O5} = 59.8 \times 10^{10} \exp \left( \frac{-104130}{RT} \right) \left[ \frac{C_{H2}}{M_{H2}} \right] \left[ \frac{C_{O2}}{M_{O2}} \right]^{1/2} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Chemical reaction rates in reduction zone (Tinaut et al., 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reactions</th>
<th>Reaction rates (mol/m³s)</th>
<th>Reaction rate constants (m/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1: ( C + CO_2 \rightarrow 2CO )</td>
<td>( r_{R1} = a_1 \exp \left( \frac{-129700}{RT} \right) \left[ \frac{C_{C}}{M_{C}} \right] )</td>
<td>( k_{R1} = (3.42 \times 10^7) \exp \left( \frac{-129700}{RT} \right) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2: ( C + H_2O \rightarrow CO + H_2 )</td>
<td>( r_{R2} = a_2 \exp \left( \frac{-125520}{RT} \right) \left[ \frac{C_{C}}{M_{C}} \right] )</td>
<td>( k_{R2} = 1.67 \times 10^7 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3: ( C + 2H_2 \rightarrow CH_4 )</td>
<td>( r_{R3} = a_3 \exp \left( \frac{-121620}{RT} \right) \left[ \frac{C_{C}}{M_{C}} \right] )</td>
<td>( k_{R3} = 0.60 \times \frac{1}{D_p} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4: ( CH_4 + 2H_2 \rightarrow CO + 3H_2 )</td>
<td>( r_{R4} = a_4 \exp \left( \frac{-77390}{RT} \right) \left[ \frac{C_{H4}}{M_{H4}} \right] )</td>
<td>( k_{R4} = 0.0265 \times \frac{1}{D_p} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tions, temperature and reaction rates (Fogler, 2016). It must be noted that modelling fluidized bed reactors as CSTR may give relatively accurate results, higher precision results usually require complex models that capture more closely the hydrodynamics of such reactors (Fogler, 2016). These effects may be roughly captured by a single-phase PFR model, which considers the gas flowing through the bed in manner similar to a PFR, assuming an average bed voidage, an uniform solid distribution and that high particle mixing and high superficial gas velocities are reached (Mostoufi et al., 2001). Two-phase models are used for higher precision, where the bubbles and the emulsion phases are either represented with CSTR in series, PFR, or with a combination of CSTR and PFR (Jafari et al., 2004). The latter are the most common type of two-phase models used, where the bubble phase is modelled as a PFR and the emulsion phase as a CSTR (Jafari et al., 2004). Other more complex models also exist in the literature, such as three-phase models, capturing the interactions of the bubbles, emulsion and cloud phases (Levenspiel & Kunii, 2012).

3. GASIFICATION MODULE DEVELOPMENT

Keeping with the aim of developing a flexible, yet accurate gasification module capable of capturing the effect of reactor types, simplified models for the drying, pyrolysis, oxidation and reduction steps are selected. Since characteristic times for moisture evaporation, devolatilization and oxidation are considerably shorter than those for char reduction, these processes are often considered to be instantaneous (Di Blasi, 2000). Therefore, stoichiometric relations are used to represent these steps.

3.1 Drying model

An evaporation of 10% of the water initially contained in the MSW is assumed during the drying step. Water content of MSW is provided by VMR-Sys.

3.2 Pyrolysis model

Since the reaction is assumed to be instantaneous and complete, a pyrolysis fraction of 1 is assumed in order to predict the solids mass loss during the pyrolysis step. Therefore, all of the carbon (C), oxygen (O) and hydrogen (H) atoms initially contained in the MSW are transformed into CO, CO₂, CH₄, H₂O, H₂ and char during this step. It is also assumed that the nitrogen (N) and sulfur (S) atoms contained initially in the MSW are transformed into NH₃ and H₂S during this step (Sikarwar et al., 2016).

To take into account the effects of MSW composition, the devolatilization of MSW is described by the breakdown of cellulose, hemicellulose and lignin (Sharma, 2011). The contents of cellulose, hemicellulose and lignin of different MSW components are presented in Table 6. To consider the plastics fraction of the MSW, the feedstock is also separated into HDPE, LDPE, PP, PS, PVC and PET.

Having the MSW composition of plastics, cellulose, hemicellulose and lignin provided by VMR-Sys, the distribution of CO, CO₂, H₂, H₂O, CH₄ is predicted for a certain char yield. In order to predict the amount of char produced, pyrolysis char yields of different plastics and organic fractions of the MSW are used. These fractions are presented in Table 7.

3.3 Oxidation model

Since it is assumed to be instantaneous, a heuristic approach is chosen to describe the reaction sequence during the oxidation step. In this step, the effects of the oxidizing agent type and quantity are taken into account.

3.4 Reduction model

In order to capture the effects of the MSW particle size for both the downdraft reactor and the bubbling fluidized bed reactor in the reduction step, the unreacted shrinking core model is chosen. Particle size distribution is provided by VMR-Sys in order to calculate the overall reaction rate.

3.5 Hydrodynamics models

Keeping with the aim of developing a flexible, yet accurate gasification module capable of capturing the effect of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero-dimensional (stirred tank reactor)</td>
<td>Algebraic equations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-dimensional (plug flow)</td>
<td>Differential equations with respect to volume or catalyst mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-dimensional</td>
<td>Conservation of mass, momentum and energy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-dimensional</td>
<td>- Euler-Euler approach:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Solid and gas: continuous, Navier-Stokes equation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Transport properties of solids: kinetic theory of granular flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Eulerian-Lagrange approach:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Gas phase: continuous, Navier-Stokes equation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Solid phase: Newtonian equation of motion for each individual particle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Papers | 64.7 | 13.0 | 0.9 |
| Cardboards | 59.7 | 13.8 | 14.2 |
| Grasses | 59.0 | 38.0 | 3 |
| Yard wastes | 26.82 | 10.23 | 24.54 |
| Food wastes | 46.09 | 0.0 | 12.03 |
| Leaves | 9.48 | 3.24 | 33.88 |
| Diapers | 33.7 | 4.6 | - |
| Wood | 49.8 | 20.8 | 26.7 |

TABLE 6: Cellulose, hemicellulose and lignin contents (wt. % dry) of organic fraction of MSW (Agarwal et al., 2014; Couhert et al., 2009; Komilis & Ham, 2003; Wang et al., 2015).
reactor types, simplified reactor models are selected. The downdraft moving bed reactor is modelled as a PFR, while the fluidized bed reactor is approximated as a single-phase model using a CSTR.

### 3.5.1 Plug flow reactor model

Since the drying, pyrolysis and oxidation steps are assumed to be instantaneous at the feeding location, oxidation products represent the initial molar flows $F_i^0$ of the reactor (kmol/s). In a PFR, concentrations, temperature, pressure and velocity vary along the reactor length. In order to capture the variation of molar flows along the length, the design equation of the PFR is used. This equation is shown in Eq. 10, where $v_{ij}$ represents the stoichiometric coefficient of species $i$ in reactions $j$ and $A_c$ represents the cross-sectional area of the reactor (m$^2$) (Fogler, 2016).

$$\frac{dF_i}{dz} = A_c \sum v_{ij}F_{ij}$$ (10)

Since gas-phase reactions are present in the reduction zone, concentrations are expressed in terms of temperature and pressure, as shown in Eq. 11 (Fogler, 2016). Having the inlet molar flows ($F_i^0$), the entrance volumetric flow rate $v_0$ (m$^3$/s) can be obtained.

$$C_i = \frac{F_i^0}{v_0}$$ (11)

The initial temperature ($T_0$) and pressure ($P_0$) for the model are those of the gas coming out of the oxidation zone. Assuming no work and an adiabatic reactor, the temperature profile along the length is described by Eq. 12, where $C_{pi}$ and $\Delta H_{Rxj}$ represent the mean heat capacity of species $i$ (J/kmol.K) and the heat of reaction of reactions $j$ (J/kmol) (Fogler, 2016).

$$\frac{dT}{dx} = \frac{A_c \sum v_{ij} \Delta H_{Rxj}}{\sum \Sigma p_i C_{pi}}$$ (12)

The pressure drop across the reduction zone can be evaluated by the Ergun equation, presented in Eq. 13, where $\mu_g$, $\rho_g$ and $U_0$ represent the gas viscosity (kg/m.s), the gas density (kg/m$^3$) and the superficial gas velocity (m/s) (Fogler, 2016).

$$\frac{dP}{dx} = \frac{150 (1-\varepsilon^2) \mu_g U_0^2}{\varepsilon^2 d_p^2} + 1.75 (1+\varepsilon) \rho_g U_0^2$$ (13)

The interstitial gas velocity profile ($U_g$) is expressed in Eq. 14 and the superficial gas velocity profile is shown in Eq. 15 (Di Blasi & Branca, 2013; Rhodes, 2008).

$$\frac{dU_g}{dx} = \frac{1}{\mu_g} \sum v_{ij} M_{ij}$$ (14)

$$\frac{dU_s}{dx} = \varepsilon \frac{dU_g}{dx}$$ (15)

Since the char particles shrink during the reduction step, the particle diameter $d_p$ decreases with respect to the char mass loss, as shown in Eq. 16, which assumes spherical particles (Sharma, 2011). Assuming a constant bed voidage and particle density, a decrease in the particle diameter causes a decrease in the solid velocity (Di Blasi & Branca, 2013). The void fraction is expressed in Eq. 17, where $\rho_s$ and $\rho_p$ represent the bed density (kg/m$^3$) and the particle density (kg/m$^3$) (Rhodes, 2008). Finally, the solid velocity profile is presented in Eq. 18, where $r_i$ only takes into account the heterogeneous reactions (Di Blasi & Branca, 2013).

$$d_p = \frac{3 \sqrt{A_{char}}}{\sqrt{F_{i0}^0}} (16)$$

$$\varepsilon = 1 - \frac{\rho_p}{\rho_s} (17)$$

$$\frac{dU_s}{dx} = - \frac{M_{char}}{\rho_s} \sum \gamma_{i} T_{i, char}$$ (18)

### 3.5.2 Continuous stirred tank reactor model

The design equation of a CSTR is shown in Eq. 19 (Fogler, 2016). Gas-phase concentrations used in reaction rates are expressed in Eq. 11. The entrance volumetric flow rate $v_0$ (m$^3$/s) is assumed to be the volumetric flow rate of the gas produced during the oxidation step, since drying, pyrolysis and oxidation steps are assumed to be instantaneous.

$$v = \frac{F_{i0}^0 - F_i^0}{\gamma_i}$$ (19)

The initial temperature ($T_0$) and pressure ($P_0$) for the model are those of the MSW entering the CSTR. The uniform temperature of the fluidized bed ($T$) is calculated with Eq. 20, assuming no work and an adiabatic reactor (Fogler, 2016). Since the pressure drop can be approximated as the apparent bed weight, Eq. 21 is used, where L represents the bed height (m) (Rhodes, 2008).

$$T = T_0 + \frac{\gamma_i \Delta H_{Rxj}}{\sum \Sigma p_i C_{pi}}$$ (20)

$$\Delta P = L(1-\varepsilon)(\rho_s - \rho_g)g$$ (21)

Assuming a constant bed voidage and particle density, particle shrinkage causes a decrease in the solid velocity (Di Blasi & Branca, 2013). In order to calculate the particle diameter and the bed voidage, Eq. 16 and Eq. 17 are used (Rhodes, 2008; Sharma, 2011). In order to predict the residence time of the MSW in both gasifiers, Eq. 22 is used, where $\tau$ represents the residence time (s) (Fogler, 2016).

$$\tau = \frac{V}{\nu_{0}}$$ (22)

### 3.6 Elements partitioning

In order to complete the mass balance for the gasification process, all non-reactive elements must be partitioned between the outlet gas and solids streams. This is achieved by partitioning the non-reactive elements that are tracked by the VMR-Sys using coefficients obtained from different studies. A compilation of these partitioning hypotheses is presented in Table 8.

### Table 7: Pyrolysis char yield (wt%) of different plastics (HDPE, LDPE, PP, PS, PVC, PET) and organic constituents (cellulose, hemicellulose, lignin) (Sharma, 2011; Williams & Williams, 1999).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HDPE</th>
<th>LDPE</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>PVC</th>
<th>PET</th>
<th>Cellulose</th>
<th>Hemicellulose</th>
<th>Lignin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Char  yield</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. VALIDATION OF THE GASIFICATION MODULE PREDICTIONS

The predictions obtained with the gasification module are validated with the syngas compositions of CO, N₂, H₂, CH₄ and CO₂ presented in two experimental studies: 1. Jayah et al. (2003), with wood as feedstock; 2. Garcia-Bacaicoa et al. (2008), with a mixture of wood and HDPE as feedstock. Both studies were carried out in pilot scale fixed beds operating under a co-current mode. Characteristics of these flows and the operating conditions are presented in Table 9.

Predicted syngas composition from the module are presented in Figure 3 for the two experimental sets of conditions. It can be seen that the predictions agree generally well with results obtained in the two experimental studies. For the comparison with the experimental results from by Jayah et al., (2003), the elementary compositions in terms of C, H, O, N, S and volatile materials, fixed carbon, ash and wood moisture content presented in their work were used. It is possible to observe good agreement between the module predictions and the experimental results for CO₂, CH₄ and CO, while larger amounts of H₂ are predicted. This could be attributed to the fact that the elementary compositions describing wood and HDPE provided by VMR-Sys might be slightly different from the actual elementary compositions of the feedstocks used in this study.

In regard to the larger quantities of H₂ predicted by the module compared with the experimental results, this may be explained by the limitations associated with the Water-Gas Shift (WGS) reaction in the reduction zone to adequately predicts the balance of CO, CO₂, H₂O and H₂. Since the WGS reaction is characterized by slow reaction kinetics, very little H₂ and CO₂ are converted into CO and H₂O. These effects therefore slightly increase the H₂/CO ratio and reduce the H₂/CO/CO₂ ratio of the syngas produced. However, given the general consistency of the module predictions with the two experimental studies used for data validation, it is reasonable to conclude that the developed gasification module offers a very useful tool to be integrated in a MFA-LCA framework since it is able to capture the influence of feedstock composition and properties, together with the operating conditions of the gasifier.

5. CONCLUSIONS

In order to develop a comprehensive gasification process module to be integrated in a MFA-LCA framework, a review of available models was presented. The gasification process was divided into four steps: drying, pyrolysis, oxidation and reduction. Drying, pyrolysis and oxidation are assumed to be instantaneous. Four models representing the drying step were presented: stoichiometric relations, kinetic models, diffusion-controlled models and isothermal evaporation processes. Instantaneous evaporation of 10% of the initial water contained in the MSW was assumed during the drying step. For the pyrolysis step, two approaches to model the mass loss were presented, that is kinetics models and pyrolysis fraction (f_p). The latter was chosen. To predict the distribution of CO, CO₂, H₂, H₂O, CH₄, tar and char, a few methods were presented. To take into account the effects of MSW composition, the devolatilization of MSW described by the breakdown of cellulose, hemicellulose and lignin was chosen. All of the nitrogen (N) and sulfur (S) initially contained in the MSW was assumed to be completely transformed into NH₃ and H₂S during the pyrolysis step. Three approaches were presented to model the oxidation step: stoichiometric conversion, heuristic and kinetic models. The heuristic approach that takes into account a sequence of reactions,
was chosen for this step. Two approaches were presented for the reduction step: the unreacted shrinking core model and the char reactivity factor model. The former model was selected since this model may be applied for both PFR and CSTR reactors, while the latter is specific to PFR only. Finally, the downdraft moving bed reactor was approximated as a PFR, while the fluidized bed reactor was approximated as a CSTR. Water content, MSW composition and average particle size are provided by VMR-Sys as inputs to the gasification module. The module predicts syngas yield, composition and LHV as well as the tar and char contents as functions of the oxidizing agent, operating conditions, reactor types and feedstock composition. The next step will be to integrate this gasification module into VMR-Sys, hence providing a more robust mean of building LCA-inventory data for VMR-Imp.
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