LIFE CYCLE ENERGY AND EVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS OF A MODEL BIOREFINERY IN THAILAND

Rachasak Chinnawornrungsee

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Science

The Petroleum and Petrochemical College, Chulalongkorn University
in Academic Partnership with

The University of Michigan, The University of Oklahoma,
Case Western Reserve University and Institut Français du Pétrole

2013

Thesis Title: Life Cycle Energy and Environmental Analysis of a Model

Biorefinery in Thailand

By: Rachasak Chinnawornrungsee

Program: Petroleum Technology

Thesis Advisors: Asst. Prof. Pomthong Malakul

Assoc. Prof. Thumrongrut Mungcharoen

Accepted by the Petroleum and Petrochemical College, Chulalongkorn University, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Science.

.....College Dean

(Asst. Prof. Pomthong Malakul)

Thesis Committee:

(Asst. Prof. Pomthong Malakul)

(Assoc. Prof. Thumrongrut Mungcharoen)

(Asst. Prof. Manit Nithitanakul)

(Dr. Vorakan Burapatana)

ABSTRACT

5473018063: Petroleum Technology Program

Rachasak Chinnawornrungsee: Life Cycle Energy and Environmental

Analysis of a Model Biorefinery in Thailand

Thesis Advisors: Asst. Prof. Pomthong Malakul and Assoc. Prof.

Thumrongrut Mungcharoen, 125 pp.

Keywords: Life cycle analysis (LCA), Biorefinery

This study aims to evaluate life cycle energy and environmental impacts associated with the production of biofuel (bioethanol) and biopolymer (polylactic acid, PLA) by using sugarcane and cassava as feedstocks for a possible model biorefinery in Thailand. Since there is currently no biorefinery in the country, secondary data sources from existing bioethanol and PLA plants were used for life cycle analysis (LCA). The system boundary was defined as cradle-to-gate and LCA methodology based on ISO 14040 series was used. Data were analyzed by using commercial LCA software, SimaPro 7.1, with Eco-Indicator 95 and CML 2 baseline 2000. The biorefinery processes was modeled and its performance was evaluated in several aspects such as fuel and biopolymer production, raw materials used, and total revenue generated for various scenarios. The results indicated that the biorefinery showed better performance in both global warming potential (GWP) and energy resources with increasing sugarcane usage. This was due to the use of bagasse and biogas as sources of fuel to generate electricity and steam by using cogeneration system in the biorefinery. In contrast, increasing PLA production led to higher GWP and energy resources impacts because of high electricity and steam usage in the bioplastic production process. Moreover, acidification potential (AP) and eutrophication potential (EP) impacts were also added in the results. Finally, eco-efficiency parameter was developed in order to combine both environmental (GWP, AP, EP, and energy resources) and economic (revenue) aspects by using average revenue gained and average impact associated. Among 5 scenarios studied, the results showed that S4 was the best scenario as it has higher eco-efficiency in several aspects.

บทคัดย่อ

ราชศักดิ์ ชินวรรังสี : การศึกษาการประเมินผลกระทบด้านพลังงานและสิ่งแวดล้อม ของแบบจำลองของระบบโรงกลั่นชีวภาพในประเทศไทยตลอดวัฏจักรชีวิต (Life Cycle Energy and Environmental Analysis of a Model Bioretinery in Thailand) อ. ที่ปรึกษา: ผศ. คร. ปมทอง มาลากุล ณ อยุธยา และ รศ. คร. ชำรงรัตน์ มุ่งเจริญ, 125 หน้า

งานวิจัยนี้ทำการประเมินผลกระทบด้านพลังงานและสิ่งแวคล้อมตลอดวัฏจักรชีวิตของ การผลิตเชื้อเพลิงชีวภาพ (ใบโอเอทานอล) และพลาสติกชีวภาพ (พอลิแลคติกเอซิค) โดยใช้อ้อย และมันสำปะหลังเป็นวัตถุคิบสำหรับแบบจำลองที่เป็นไปได้ของระบบโรงกลั่นชีวภาพใน ประเทศไทย เนื่องจากในขณะนี้ยังไม่มีระบบโรงกลั่นชีวภาพในประเทศ ดังนั้นข้อมูลทุติยภูมิจาก โรงงานผลิตใบโอเอทานอล และโรงงานผลิตพอลิแลคติกเอซิค จึงถูกนำมาใช้ในการประเมินผล กระทบตลอดวัฏจักรชีวิต ขอบเขตของการสึกษานี้ครอบคลุมตลอดวัฏจักรของการผลิตผลิตภัณฑ์ ์ ตั้งแต่การเพาะปลูกและการเก็บเกี่ยววัตถุดิบ การขนส่งวัตถุดิบ การแปรรูปวัตถุดิบ ตลอดจนการ ผลิตใบโอเอทานอลและการผลิตพอลิแลคติกเอซิด โดยใช้วิธีการประเมินตามมาตรฐานสากล ISO 14040 ข้อมูลต่างๆ ที่เก็บรวบรวมถูกนำมาวิเคราะห์โดยใช้โปรแกรม SimaPro 7.1 ด้วยวิธี Eco-Indicator 95 และ CML baseline 2000 เพื่อประเมินภาระสิ่งแวคล้อมด้านต่างๆ โดยเน้นที่ ผลกระทบด้านภาวะโลกร้อนและการใช้พลังงาน จากผลการศึกษาพบว่า ระบบโรงกลั่นชีวภาพส่ง ผลกระทบในแง่ภาวะโลกร้อนและการใช้พลังงานน้อยลง เมื่อเพิ่มปริมาณการใช้อ้อยเป็นวัตถดิบ ้เนื่องจากการนำกากอ้อยและก๊าซชีวภาพมาใช้เป็นเชื้อเพลิงในการผลิตไอน้ำและกระแสไฟฟ้าเพื่อ ใช้ภายในโรงงาน ในทางตรงกันข้าม การเพิ่มปริมาณการผลิตพอลิแลคติกเอซิด ทำให้ผลกระทบ ทางด้านภาวะโลกร้อนและการใช้พลังงานสูงขึ้น เนื่องจากการใช้ ใฟฟ้าและ ใอน้ำจำนวนมากใน การผลิตพอลิแลคติกเอซิด นอกจากนี้ ผลการศึกษายังแสดงผลกระทบในด้านภาวะการเกิดฝนกรด และภาวะการเกิดน้ำเน่าเสีย อีกด้วย สุดท้าย ตัวแปลของการประเมินประสิทธิภาพเชิงนิเวศ เศรษฐกิจ (Eco-efficiency) ถูกสร้างขึ้นเพื่อรวบรวมผลกระทบในด้านต่างๆ (ภาวะโลกร้อน, การ เกิดฝนกรด, การเกิดน้ำเน่าเสีย, และการใช้พลังงาน) เข้ากับด้านเศรษฐกิจ (รายได้) โดยใช้รายได้ เฉลี่ย และค่าเฉลี่ยผลกระทบค้านต่างๆ ของสถานการณ์ตัวอย่าง จากการศึกษาทั้งหมด 5 สถานการณ์ (SI-S5) พบว่า S4 เป็นสถานการณ์ที่ดีที่สุด เนื่องจากมีค่าการประเมินประสิทธิภาพ เชิงนิเวศเศรษฐกิจที่สูงในหลายๆ ด้าน

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work would not have been possible without the assistance of the following individuals:

First and foremost, I sincerely appreciate Asst. Prof. Pomthong Malakul, my advisor, and Assoc. Prof. Thumrongrut Mungcharoen, my co-advisor, for providing invaluable knowledge, creative comments, untouchable experience in classroom, and kind support throughout this research work.

I would like to thank Asst. Prof. Manit Nithitanakul and Dr. Vorakan Burapatana for being my thesis committee. Their suggestions and comments are very beneficial for me and this work.

I also thank Mr. Seksan Papong for your kind suggestion and kind support throughout this research work.

This thesis work is funded by the Petroleum and Petrochemical College, and by the Center of Excellence on Petrochemical and Materials Technology, Thailand. I would also like to express my appreciation to the National Metal and Materials technology Center (MTEC) for their technical.

I greatly appreciate all PPC staffs and my friends who gave me support and encouragement.

Finally, I am deeply indebted to my family for their love, understanding, encouragement, and support for me at all time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|---|--|
| tle Page | i |
| bstract (in English) | iii |
| bstract (in Thai) | iv |
| cknowledgements | v |
| able of Contents | vi |
| st of Tables | ix |
| st of Figures | xiv |
| TER | |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW | 4 |
| 2.1 Biorefinery | 4 |
| 2.1.1 Biorefinery Concept | 4 |
| 2.1.2 Biomass Feedstocks | 5 |
| 2.1.3 Technological Processes in Biorefinery | 9 |
| 2.1.4 Biorefinery Products | 14 |
| 2.2 Potential Feedstocks for Biorefinery in Thailand | 16 |
| 2.2.1 Sugarcane | 16 |
| 2.2.2 Cassava | 17 |
| 2.3 Current Status of Bioethanol Productions and Uses | |
| in Thailand | 19 |
| 2.3.1 Sugarcane based Ethanol Production | 22 |
| 2.3.2 Molasses based Ethanol Production | 24 |
| 2.3.3 Cassava based Ethanol Production | 27 |
| 2.4 Current Status of Polylactic acid (PLA) Productions | |
| and Uses in Thailand | 30 |
| 2.4.1 PLA Resin Production | 32 |
| | postract (in English) postract (in Thai) postract (|

| CHAPTER | P | AGE |
|---------|---|------------|
| | 2.5 Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) | 39 |
| | 2.5.1 Overview | 39 |
| | 2.5.2 Definition of LCA | 39 |
| | 2.5.3 Methodology | 40 |
| | 2.5.4 Applications of LCA | 46 |
| | 2.6 LCA and Related Studies on Biorefineries | 47 |
| Ш | METHODOLOGY | 65 |
| | 3 1 Materials and Equipment | 65 |
| | 3.1.1 Equipment | 65 |
| | 3.1.2 Software | 65 |
| | 3.2 Experimental Procedures | 65 |
| | 3.2.1 Preparation | 65 |
| | 3.2.2 Goal, Scope, Functional Unit, and System Boundary | 65 |
| | 3.2.3 Inventory analysis | 69 |
| | 3.2.4 Impact assessment | 71 |
| | 3.2.5 Interpretation | 71 |
| IV | RESULTS AND DISCUSSION | 72 |
| | 4.1 Biorefinery Model | 72 |
| | 4.2 Life Cycle Inventory | 74 |
| | 4.2.1 Sugarcane based Ethanol Production | 74 |
| | 4.2.2 Molasses based Ethanol Production | 76 |
| | 4.2.3 Cassava based Ethanol Production | 76 |
| | 4.2.4 PLA Resin Production | 76 |
| | 4.3 Life Cycle Impact Assessment | 77 |
| | 4.3.1 Global Warming Potential (GWP) | 77 |
| | 4.3.2 Acidification Potential (AP) | 7 9 |
| | 4.3.3 Eutrophication Potential (EP) | 79 |

| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---------|---|------|
| | 4.2.4 Energy Pagayrage | 90 |
| | 4.3.4 Energy Resources | 80 |
| | 4.4 Eco-Efficiency | 82 |
| | 4.5 Biorefinery Performance Analysis | 84 |
| | 4.5.1 Raw Materials Consumption | 85 |
| | 4.5.2 Fuel and Biopolymer Production | 85 |
| | 4.5.3 Profit Generation | 85 |
| | 4.6 Comparison with Conventional Process | 86 |
| | 4.6.1 Sugarcane based Ethanol | 86 |
| | 4.6.2 Molasses based Ethanol | 88 |
| | 4.6.3 Cassava based Ethanol | 88 |
| | 4.6.4 Sugarcane based PLA resin | 88 |
| | 4.6.5 Cassava based PLA resin | 88 |
| V | CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 89 |
| | 5 1 Conclusions | 89 |
| | 5.2 Recommendations | 90 |
| | 5.2.1 Suggestions for Improvement of Inventory Data | 90 |
| | 5.2.2 Suggestions for Improvement of Environmental | |
| | Performance | 90 |
| | 5.2.3 Suggestions for Improvement of Profit Generated | 91 |
| | REFERENCES | 92 |
| | APPENDICES | |
| | Appendix A Life Cycle Inventory (LCI) | 98 |
| | Appendix B Life Cycle Impact Assessment (LCIA) | 107 |
| | CURRICULUM VITAE | 125 |

LIST OF TABLES

| TABI | L E | PAGE |
|------------|--|------|
| 2.1 | Biorefinery products | 14 |
| 2.2 | Sugarcane productivity in Thailand | 17 |
| 2.3 | Various names of cassava in different region | 17 |
| 2.4 | · · | 18 |
| | Composition of cassava | |
| 2.5 | Gasohol consumption in Thailand | 20 |
| 2.6 | Current ethanol plants in Thailand | 21 |
| 2.7 | Ethanol plants which plan to produce in 2010-2011 | 22 |
| 2.8 | Companies which doing business with biopolymers in Thailand | 32 |
| 2.9 | Scenarios of molasses-based ethanol case study | 51 |
| 2.10 | Emission for cassava cultivation and treatment | 64 |
| 3.1 | Scenarios of biorefinery under study (S1-S5) | 68 |
| 3.2 | Average price of the feedstocks, production cost, and products | |
| | for profit calculation | 68 |
| 3.3 | Sources of the inventory data used in this study | 70 |
| 4.1 | Four major stages of the processes in the biorefinery model | 74 |
| 4.2 | Eco-efficiencies of scenarios in this study | 83 |
| Al | Results of the inventory analysis of sugarcane cultivation in Thailand | 98 |
| A2 | Results of the inventory analysis of sugarcane ethanol conversion | 99 |
| A3 | Results of the inventory analysis of ethanol dehydration | 99 |
| A4 | Results of the inventory analysis of sugar milling in Thailand | 100 |
| A5 | Results of the inventory analysis of molasses ethanol conversion | 100 |
| A 6 | Results of the inventory analysis of cassava cultivation | 101 |
| A7 | Results of the inventory analysis of cassava chips production | 101 |
| A8 | Results of the inventory analysis of cassava ethanol conversion | 102 |
| A 9 | Results of the inventory analysis of one ton of cassava starch | |
| | with biogas production line | 103 |

| TABI | L E | PAGE |
|------|---|-------------|
| A10 | Results of the inventory analysis of cassava sugar production | 104 |
| A11 | Results of the inventory analysis of PLA resin production | 104 |
| A12 | Results of the inventory analysis of electrical energy cogeneration | 105 |
| A13 | Results of The inventory data of feedstocks transportation for 1 | |
| | ton-kilometer (tkm) for 10-wheel truck at full load 16 tons | 106 |
| B1 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg sugarcane by using CML 2 | |
| | baseline 2000 V2.03 / World, 1990 | 107 |
| B2 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg sugarcane by using | |
| | Eco-indicator 95 V2.03 / Europe e | 107 |
| В3 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg sugarcane based ethanol (96%) |) |
| | by using CML 2 baseline 2000 V2.03 / World, 1990 | 108 |
| B4 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg sugarcane based ethanol (96%) |) |
| | by using Eco-indicator 95 V2.03 / Europe e | 108 |
| B5 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg sugarcane based ethanol (99.5%) | (o) |
| | by using CML 2 baseline 2000 V2.03 / World, 1990 | 109 |
| B6 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg sugarcane based ethanol (99.5%) | (0) |
| | by using Eco-indicator 95 V2.03 / Europe e | 109 |
| B7 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg molasses by using CML 2 | |
| | baseline 2000 V2.03 / World, 1990 | 110 |
| B8 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg molasses by using | |
| | Eco-indicator 95 V2.03 / Europe e | 110 |
| B9 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg molasses based ethanol (99.5%) |) |
| | by using CML 2 baseline 2000 V2.03 / World, 1990 | 111 |
| B10 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg molasses based ethanol (99.5%) |) |
| | by using Eco-indicator 95 V2.03 / Europe e | 111 |
| B11 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg cassava roots by using CML 2 | |
| | baseline 2000 V2.03 / World, 1990 | 112 |
| B12 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg cassava roots by using | |
| | Eco-indicator 95 V2.03 / Europe e | 112 |

| IABI | LL. | PAGE |
|------|---|------|
| B13 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg cassava chips by using CML 2 | |
| | baseline 2000 V2.03 / World, 1990 | 113 |
| B14 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg cassava chips by using | |
| | Eco-indicator 95 V2.03 / Europe e | 113 |
| B15 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg cassava based ethanol (99.5%) |) |
| | by using CML 2 baseline 2000 V2.03 / World, 1990 | 114 |
| B16 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg cassava based ethanol (99.5%) |) |
| | by using Eco-indicator 95 V2.03 / Europe e | 114 |
| B17 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg sugar from sugarcane by | |
| | using CML 2 baseline 2000 V2.03 / World, 1990 | 115 |
| B18 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg sugar from sugarcane by | |
| | using Eco-indicator 95 V2.03 / Europe e | 115 |
| B19 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg sugarcane based PLA resin | |
| | by using CML 2 baseline 2000 V2.03 / World, 1990 | 116 |
| B20 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg sugarcane based PLA resin | |
| | by using Eco-indicator 95 V2.03 / Europe e | 116 |
| B21 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg cassava starch with biogas | |
| | by using CML 2 baseline 2000 V2.03 / World, 1990 | 117 |
| B22 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg cassava starch with biogas | |
| | by using Eco-indicator 95 V2.03 / Europe e | 117 |
| B23 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg sugar from cassava starch | |
| | by using CML 2 baseline 2000 V2.03 / World, 1990 | 118 |
| B24 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg sugar from cassava starch | |
| | by using Eco-indicator 95 V2.03 / Europe e | 118 |
| B25 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg cassava based PLA resin by | |
| | using CML 2 baseline 2000 V2.03 / World, 1990 | 119 |
| B26 | Results of the impact assessment 1 kg cassava based PLA resin by | |
| | using Eco-indicator 95 V2.03 / Europe e | 119 |

| TAB | LE | PAGE | |
|-----|--|------|--|
| B27 | Results of the impact assessment of feedstock transportation phase | | |
| | for produce 1 kg sugarcane based ethanol (99.5%) by using CML | | |
| | 2 baseline 2000 V2.03 / World, 1990 | 120 | |
| B28 | Results of the impact assessment of feedstock transportation | | |
| | phase for produce 1 kg sugarcane based ethanol (99.5%) by | | |
| | using Eco-indicator 95 V2.03 / Europe e | 120 | |
| B29 | Results of the impact assessment of feedstock transportation phase | | |
| | for produce 1 kg molasses based ethanol (99.5%) by using CML 2 | | |
| | baseline 2000 V2.03 / World, 1990 | 121 | |
| B30 | Results of the impact assessment of feedstock transportation phase | | |
| | for produce 1 kg molasses based ethanol (99.5%) by using | | |
| | Eco-indicator 95 V2.03 / Europe e | 121 | |
| B31 | Results of the impact assessment of feedstock transportation phase | | |
| | for produce 1 kg cassava based ethanol (99.5%) by using CML 2 | | |
| | baseline 2000 V2.03 / World, 1990 | 122 | |
| B32 | Results of the impact assessment of feedstock transportation phase | | |
| | for produce 1 kg cassava based ethanol (99.5%) by using | | |
| | Eco-indicator 95 V2.03 / Europe e | 122 | |
| B33 | Results of the impact assessment of feedstock transportation phase | | |
| | for produce 1 kg sugarcane based PLA resin by using CML 2 | | |
| | baseline 2000 V2.03 / World, 1990 | 123 | |
| B34 | Results of the impact assessment of feedstock transportation phase | | |
| | for produce 1 kg sugarcane based PLA resin by using | | |
| | Eco-indicator 95 V2.03 / Europe e | 123 | |
| B35 | Results of the impact assessment of feedstock transportation phase | | |
| | for produce 1 kg cassava based PLA resin by using CML 2 | | |
| | baseline 2000 V2.03 / World, 1990 | 124 | |

| TABLE | PAGE |
|-------|------|
| TABLE | PAC |

B36 Results of the impact assessment of feedstock transportation phase for produce 1 kg cassava based PLA resin by using Eco-indicator 95

V2.03 / Europe e 124

LIST OF FIGURES

| FIGU | FIGURE | |
|------|--|----|
| 2.1 | The biorefinery concept: from biomass to valuable products via | |
| | low-environmental-impact valorization practices. | 5 |
| 2.2 | Whole plant valorization in biorefinery based on the function of | |
| | Plant. | 6 |
| 2.3 | The multiple synthetic conversion routes of major biofuels | |
| | produced from first and second-generation biomass feedstock. | 9 |
| 2.4 | Schematic of the molasses based ethanol production from a | |
| | biorefinery complex. | 20 |
| 2.5 | A simple process diagram of sugarcane based ethanol production. | 22 |
| 2.6 | Process procedure of sugarcane cultivation. | 23 |
| 2.7 | A simple process diagram of molasses based ethanol production. | 24 |
| 2.8 | Process procedure of sugar milling. | 25 |
| 2.9 | Flow chart for molasses ethanol conversion process. | 27 |
| 2.10 | A simple process diagram of cassva based ethanol production. | 28 |
| 2.11 | The process procedure of cassava cultivation in rainy season | |
| | with water. | 29 |
| 2.12 | Flow chart for cassava ethanol conversion process. | 30 |
| 2.13 | Schematic of the production chain from agriculture to PLA. | 31 |
| 2.14 | A simple process diagram of sugarcane based PLA resin and | |
| | cassava based PLA resin production. | 33 |
| 2.15 | The process procedure of cassava starch production with biogas | |
| | production line. | 34 |
| 2.16 | Flow chart for glucose syrup production from cassava. | 37 |
| 2.17 | Schematic of the PLA resin production. | 38 |
| 2.18 | Life-cycle assessment framework as laid down in ISO 14040:1997. | 40 |
| 2.19 | Cumulative primary energy demand of the biorefmery and fossil | |
| | reference systems. | 47 |

| FIGU | JRE | PAGE |
|------|--|------|
| 2.20 | Industrial processes of ethanol production using sugarcane. | 48 |
| 2.21 | Green house gas emissions. | 49 |
| 2.22 | Normalized impact potentials for fuel ethanol lifecycle. | 51 |
| 2.23 | Comparison of life cycle energy and environmental performance | 31 |
| 2.23 | of E10 and gasoline. | 52 |
| 2.24 | System boundary of the cassava-based E10/E85 fuel life cycle. | 53 |
| 2.24 | Characterization results – Contributions to the environmental | 33 |
| 2.23 | | 52 |
| 2.26 | impacts from ethanol production cycle. | 53 |
| 2.26 | GWP of 1 liter anhydrous ethanol production. | 55 |
| 2.27 | Schematic of the production chain from agriculture to PLA. | 56 |
| 2.28 | GWP involved with the production of PLLA and other polymers. | 57 |
| 2.29 | Primary energy demand involved with the production of PLLA | |
| | and other polymers. | 58 |
| 2.30 | Cradle to polymer factory gate nonrenewable energy use for | |
| | the various Ingeo production systems. | 59 |
| 2.31 | Cradle to polymer factory gate greenhouse gas emissions for | |
| | the various Ingeo production systems. | 59 |
| 2.32 | Simplified flow diagram and system boundary for the | |
| | NatureWorks PLA production system. | 60 |
| 2.33 | Fossil energy requirement for some petroleum based polymers | |
| | and polylactide. | 61 |
| 2.34 | Contributions to global climate change for some petrochemical | |
| | polymers and the two polylactide polymers. | 62 |
| 2.35 | Gross water use by petrochemical polymers and the two PLA cases. | 62 |
| 2.36 | Unit of cassava cultivation and treatment. | 63 |
| 3.1 | The system boundary of biorefinery under study. | 66 |
| 4.1 | Biorefinery model. | 73 |
| 4.2 | Global warming potential of scenarios in this study for each stage | |
| | by using CML 2 baseline 2000. | 78 |

| FIGURE | |
|---|--|
| | |
| Acidification potential of scenarios in this study for each stage by | |
| using CML 2 baseline 2000. | 79 |
| Eutrophication potential of scenarios in this study for each stage by | |
| using CML 2 baseline 2000. | 80 |
| Energy resource of scenarios in this study for each stage by | |
| using Eco-indicator 95. | 81 |
| Comparison of life cycle energy use and environmental | |
| performance for 5 scenarios. | 81 |
| Normalized values for eco-efficiency parameter calculation. | 83 |
| Relationship between the four Eco-efficiency. | 84 |
| Comparison of GWP for each product between biorefinery | |
| process and conventional process. | 87 |
| Comparison of energy consumption for each product between | |
| biorefinery process and conventional process. | 87 |
| | Acidification potential of scenarios in this study for each stage by using CML 2 baseline 2000. Eutrophication potential of scenarios in this study for each stage by using CML 2 baseline 2000. Energy resource of scenarios in this study for each stage by using Eco-indicator 95. Comparison of life cycle energy use and environmental performance for 5 scenarios. Normalized values for eco-efficiency parameter calculation. Relationship between the four Eco-efficiency. Comparison of GWP for each product between biorefinery process and conventional process. Comparison of energy consumption for each product between |