E-Waste: Risks, Opportunities, & the Path to Circular Economy

Author: Maria Kokkaliari

Background: Informatics & Telecommunications Engineer

Purpose: This research is a personal exploration into the challenges and opportunities of e-waste management. It reflects my professional interest in the intersection of technology, sustainability, and innovation. The goal is to contribute to awareness and provide insights into sustainable approaches for the digital age.

Abstract

Electronic waste (e-waste) is one of the fastest-growing waste streams globally, projected to reach 82 million tonnes by 2030. It presents both opportunities, through the recovery of valuable resources such as gold, copper, and rare earth elements, and risks, due to hazardous substances including lead, mercury, and brominated flame retardants. This research reviews the composition, toxic impacts, and current management practices of e-waste, with a focus on emerging solutions within circular economy frameworks. The analysis highlights mechanical, hydrometallurgical, pyrometallurgical, and bioleaching processes, as well as AI-assisted sorting and robotic disassembly, as key technological innovations. Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) findings underscore the environmental trade-offs of these approaches, demonstrating that while recycling reduces the need for primary mining, it still entails energy use and secondary emissions. Policy measures, including Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR), repairability mandates, and international harmonization, are identified as essential for scaling sustainable systems. Special attention is given to network infrastructure equipment, which represents a high-value yet underutilized source for recovery. The study concludes that no single solution can address the e-waste challenge; instead, an integrated approach that combines eco-design, reuse, automation, bio-assisted recycling, and policy enforcement offers the most promising path toward reducing environmental and health impacts while supporting resource efficiency and green growth.

Keywords: electronic waste, circular economy, recycling technologies, bioleaching, robotics, network infrastructure e-waste, life cycle assessment, Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR)

Introduction

One of the fastest-growing waste streams are the electronic waste, reaching an estimated 62 million tonnes in 2022 and projected to rise to around 82 million tonnes by 2030 globaly. This stream contains both valuable resources, such as gold, silver, copper, and rare earth elements and hazardous components like lead, mercury, cadmium, and brominated flame retardants, which pose significant environmental and health risks if mismanaged. Circular economy (CE) principles offer a promising framework for reducing these impacts by designing products for reuse, repair, and material recovery, thereby extending their life cycles and minimizing resource extraction.

While e-waste recycling has its challenges, integrated waste management strategies also include incineration with energy recovery, commonly referred to as waste-to-energy (WtE). Recent studies (2023–2025) indicate that modern WtE plants, when equipped with advanced flue-gas cleaning systems, can significantly reduce landfill volumes, recover energy in the form of heat and electricity, and stabilize hazardous residues for safer disposal. According to recent LCA (Life Cycle Assessment) research, WtE can lower methane emissions compared to landfilling, and in some cases contribute to net reductions in greenhouse gas emissions when the recovered energy displaces fossil fuel use. However, its role in e-waste management remains complementary, as the loss of recoverable metals during combustion reinforces the need for pre-sorting and targeted recycling before incineration.

My interest in the problem of electronic waste (e-waste) began when I attended a certified training course on the circular economy, which deepened my understanding of sustainable production and consumption models. As an informatics and telecomunications engineer, my daily envolvment with complex electronic devices made the topic even more relevant, prompting me to explore how technology and sustainability intersect. This personal curiosity was further amplified by recent developments in my hometown, where a municipal incineration waste unit is planned. I wanted to understand the implications of such facilities, not only for general waste management but also for the specific challenge of e-waste.

Defining Electronic Waste

Electronic waste (e-waste), formally classified as Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE), refers to any discarded device that operates using electrical energy and incorporates electronic components or circuitry. This category includes a wide array of end-of-life products, ranging from information and communication technologies (e.g., smartphones, computers, and routers) to household appliances, medical devices, industrial control systems, and telecommunications infrastructure [4]. A clear and comprehensive definition of e-waste is essential for informing subsequent academic and policy-oriented analyses, including assessments of material composition, hazardous substance content, environmental and public health risks, as well as the development of effective collection systems, recycling technologies, and circular economy frameworks

Composition, Hazardous Materials, and Toxic Risks

E-waste comprises mixtures of materials with varying economic and ecological consequences.

Recoverable resources: copper, gold, silver, palladium, rare earth elements (REEs), aluminum, glass, and certain plastics—worth an estimated US $90–100 billion globally [3], [7].

Toxic constituents: lead, mercury, cadmium, arsenic, brominated flame retardants (BFRs), polychlorinated dibenzo-furans (PCDFs), and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) [6], [8]. Improper disposal—such as open burning or acid leaching—leads to soil and water contamination. Soil near e-waste sites in China, for instance, harbours harmful levels of cadmium, lead, copper, and zinc [6], [8]. These pollutants disrupt ecosystems and pose serious health hazards including respiratory, neurological, reproductive disorders, and cancer [6], [8], [9].

Tables of Recoverable Resources from Electronic Waste

Precious & Valuable Metals

Material	Main E-Waste Sources
Gold (Au)	Connectors, circuit boards, microchips
Silver (Ag)	Solder, switches, relays, circuit paths
Palladium (Pd)	Multilayer ceramic capacitors, connectors

Platinum (Pt)	Hard drive coatings, high-grade electronics
Rhodium (Rh)	Specialized electrical contacts

Base & Industrial Metals

Material	Main E-Waste Sources
Copper (Cu)	Cables, wiring, printed circuit boards
Aluminum (Al)	Casings, frames, heat sinks
Steel/Iron (Fe)	Chassis, screws, support structures
Lead (Pb)	Lead solder, CRT glass
Tin (Sn)	Solder on circuit boards
Nickel (Ni)	Batteries, hard drive platters
Zinc (Zn)	Galvanized components, alloys
Brass/Bronze	Connectors, fittings

Critical & Rare Earth Elements (REEs)

Material	Main E-Waste Sources
Neodymium (Nd)	Permanent magnets in hard drives, speakers
Dysprosium (Dy)	Magnet alloys in electric motors
Praseodymium (Pr)	Specialized glass and magnets
Terbium (Tb)	Green phosphors in displays
Yttrium (Y)	Phosphors in LEDs and CRTs
Indium (In)	Indium tin oxide in touchscreens, LCDs
Gallium (Ga)	Semiconductors, LEDs
Tantalum (Ta)	Capacitors
Cobalt (Co)	Lithium-ion battery cathodes

Lithium (Li)	Rechargeable batteries

Plastics & Polymers

Material	Main E-Waste Sources
ABS	Housings, keyboards
Polycarbonate (PC)	Optical discs, display panels
PVC	Cable insulation
Other thermoplastics	Casings, connectors

Glass & Ceramics

Material	Main E-Waste Sources
CRT glass	Contains lead and other oxides
LCD glass	Includes indium and liquid crystals
Fiber optic glass	Silica-based, high purity
Ceramic substrates	Capacitors, resistors

Other Recoverable Materials

Material	Main E-Waste Sources
Battery chemicals	Electrolytes, graphite anodes
Coolants & refrigerants	Electronics with cooling systems
Flame retardants	Recovered or neutralized for safe disposal

Toxic Constituents of Electronic Waste

Heavy Metals

Toxic Constituent	Main E-Waste Sources	Health/Environmental Hazards
Lead (Pb)	CRT glass, solder, batteries	Neurotoxin; affects brain development, kidneys, and blood
Mercury (Hg)	Switches, relays, LCD backlights, fluorescent lamps	Damages nervous system, kidneys; bioaccumulates
Cadmium (Cd)	Rechargeable batteries (NiCd), semiconductors, resistors	Carcinogen; damages lungs and kidneys
Arsenic (As)	Semiconductors, LEDs	Carcinogen; affects skin, lungs, cardiovascular system
Chromium VI (Cr^{6+})	Corrosion-resistant coatings, pigments	Carcinogen; causes skin and respiratory problems
Beryllium (Be)	Connectors, motherboards	Carcinogen; causes chronic beryllium disease (CBD)

Halogenated Compounds

Toxic Constituent	Main E-Waste Sources	Health/Environmental Hazards
Polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs)	Flame retardants in plastics, circuit boards	Endocrine disruptor; affects thyroid function
Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)	Capacitors, transformers (older equipment)	Carcinogen; persistent organic pollutant
Polyvinyl chloride (PVC)	Cable insulation, casings	Releases dioxins/furans when burned; respiratory toxin
Tetrabromobisphenol A (TBBPA)	Flame retardant in circuit boards	Endocrine disruptor; neurotoxic effects

Other Hazardous Chemicals

Toxic Constituent	Main E-Waste Sources	Health/Environmental Hazards
Phthalates	Plasticizers in cables, casings	Endocrine disruptor; reproductive toxicity
Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA)	Non-stick coatings in electronics	Carcinogen; persistent in environment
Antimony trioxide	Flame retardant synergist in plastics	Possible carcinogen; respiratory effects

Electronic Waste Materials That Are Generally Not Recyclable

Material	Reason Not Recyclable	Common Sources in E-Waste
Contaminated plastics (e.g., mixed polymers with flame retardants)	Difficult to separate, may release toxins when processed	Casings, cable insulation, connectors
PVC with embedded metals	Releases hazardous dioxins/furans when heated	Cables, wire sheathing
CRT glass with lead	High lead content makes reuse complex and unsafe	Older televisions, monitors
Liquid crystal material	Contaminated with chemicals, hard to extract cleanly	LCD panels
Epoxy resins in PCBs	Non-meltable, no efficient recycling method	Printed circuit boards
Adhesives & sealants	Contaminate recycling	Electronic displays, bonded parts

	streams	
Small composite components (microchips, tiny ICs)	Cost of recovery > material value	All modern electronics
Foamed plastics	Low density, high contamination	Packaging inside devices
Ink-coated or treated glass	Coatings interfere with processing	Touchscreens, decorative panels
Certain thermoset plastics	Cannot be remelted or reshaped	Older casings, insulating parts
Battery electrolytes (spent)	Hazardous, require specialized disposal	Lithium-ion, NiCd, lead-acid batteries
Rubberized parts with embedded metals	Hard to separate materials	Seals, shock absorbers in devices

Current Solutions

E-Waste Processing Methods & Recovery Technics

Current e-waste management practices encompass a spectrum from low-tech informal dismantling to advanced, integrated recovery facilities. Below i collected some of the most significant technological solutions, operational models, and their relative strengths and limitations.

1. Mechanical and Physical Separation Techniques

Mechanical processing remains foundational for initial e-waste treatment, involving shredding, sorting, and separation based on physical properties like size, density, and magnetism. Lee et al. [7] emphasize the importance of these techniques in preparing materials for downstream recovery processes by efficiently segregating valuable fractions such as metals and plastics. Mechanical methods are cost-effective and scalable but often require integration with other techniques to maximize metal recovery and reduce contamination. Environmentally, mechanical separation has relatively low emissions and energy consumption compared to chemical and thermal processes, making it an essential first step in sustainable e-waste management [7]. Economically, these methods are favorable due to low operational costs and established technology, though they are limited by the purity and value of recovered fractions.

2. Hydrometallurgy

Hydrometallurgical methods involve aqueous chemical processes to leach metals from e-waste, allowing selective extraction and recovery. As outlined by Lee et al. [7], hydrometallurgy is favored for its lower energy consumption relative to pyrometallurgy and its versatility in handling diverse e-waste types. This method typically employs acids or cyanide solutions to dissolve metals, followed by recovery through solvent extraction or precipitation. Despite its benefits, hydrometallurgy faces challenges in managing chemical effluents and ensuring environmentally safe waste treatment, while optimization efforts focus on improving metal recovery efficiencies and reducing reagent use. From an environmental perspective, hydrometallurgy reduces greenhouse gas emissions compared to pyrometallurgical processes but carries risks of water contamination if effluents are not properly treated [7]. Economically, hydrometallurgy offers moderate operational costs and higher metal recovery rates, though reagent consumption and wastewater treatment can increase expenses.

3. Pyrometallurgy

Pyrometallurgical processes apply high temperatures to melt or roast e-waste, enabling bulk metal extraction. Lee et al. [7] note that while pyrometallurgy is effective for recovering large quantities of metals and is established in industrial applications, it is highly energy-intensive and can generate toxic emissions such as dioxins and heavy metal vapors. This necessitates strict emission controls and additional refining steps due to its relatively low selectivity. The environmental footprint of pyrometallurgy is significant, with high greenhouse gas emissions and potential air pollution risks, making it less favorable under stricter environmental regulations [7]. Economically, pyrometallurgy requires high capital and energy investments but benefits from rapid processing and recovery of bulk metals, which may offset costs in large-scale operations.

4. Bioleaching

Bioleaching utilizes microorganisms to biologically dissolve metals from e-waste, presenting an eco-friendly alternative to chemical and thermal methods. Multiple studies provide detailed insights into bioleaching processes: Kim et al. [9], Adebayo et al. [11], and Wu et al. [13] highlight its advantages, including lower energy requirements, reduced chemical usage, and minimized secondary pollution. Microbes such as acidophilic bacteria produce organic acids or sulfuric acid, facilitating metal solubilization and recovery of precious and critical metals like gold, cobalt, and lithium. Li et al. [12] discuss advances in bioleaching via genetically engineered microbial cell factories that enhance efficiency and robustness. Environmentally, bioleaching significantly reduces energy consumption and toxic emissions, making it a promising sustainable option [9], [11]. However, the slow process and sensitivity to operational conditions can limit throughput. Economically, bioleaching offers lower operational costs due to minimal energy use but may require longer processing times and specialized expertise, which can affect overall cost-effectiveness [9], [13].

5. Small-Scale Bioleaching Applications for Lithium-Ion Battery Metals

Wu et al. [13] focus on small-scale bioleaching for recovering critical metals from spent lithium-ion batteries, demonstrating its potential for decentralized and sustainable recycling solutions. These small reactors offer minimal environmental impact but require optimization to improve scalability and metal recovery rates. This approach can lower transportation emissions and costs by enabling localized processing [13]. Economically, small-scale bioleaching may reduce capital expenditure but must balance lower throughput against local resource recovery benefits.

6. Robotic Automation in E-Waste Recycling

Miller [14] investigates the role of robotic automation in e-waste processing lines, enhancing disassembly, sorting, and component extraction. Automated systems reduce human exposure to hazardous materials, improve processing accuracy, and increase throughput. Integration with AI-driven recognition technologies allows for precise material segregation, which is critical for achieving high-purity metal recovery. From an environmental standpoint, robotics can improve efficiency and reduce waste and emissions through better sorting accuracy [14]. However, high initial capital investment and energy use for robotic systems may affect their environmental footprint. Economically, automation can lower labor costs and increase process reliability, with long-term savings offsetting upfront expenses [14].

7. Reverse Supply Chain Assessment for Sustainable Household E-Waste Processing

Yu et al. [10] emphasize the importance of optimizing reverse logistics to improve the sustainability of household e-waste management. Efficient collection, transportation, and initial processing are vital to ensuring that materials reach facilities employing various recovery methods such as mechanical separation, bioleaching, or metallurgical processing. Effective reverse supply chains reduce environmental impacts by minimizing transportation emissions and preventing illegal dumping [10]. Economically, well-structured supply chains improve material availability and reduce costs associated with collection and sorting, thereby enhancing overall system efficiency [10].

8. *IT Asset Disposition (ITAD) and take-back programs, as CE strategies.*

Certified ITAD providers combine data sanitization, refurbishment, remarketing, and certified recycling. Vendor take-back schemes (if well designed) can internalize end-of-life costs and encourage modular, repairable product design. Nonetheless, barriers include variable market demand for refurbished network gear, logistical costs, and regulatory hurdles for cross-border resale**.** At the high end of the circularity ladder, repairing, upgrading, and certifying used network equipment preserves maximum product value and minimizes material recovery needs. Refurbishment requires secure data erasure, quality testing, and often minor repairs, but it returns significantly more value than material recycling and consumes substantially less energy per unit of functionality preserved.

These refurbishment and remanufacturing approaches are part of a broader **Circular Economy (CE) framework** designed to maximize value retention and minimize waste across the electronics lifecycle. The main **CE strategies** include:

- **Refurbishment**: Restoring products to like-new condition for the same use (e.g., repairing and reselling a smartphone) with high value retention.

- **Repurposing**: Adapting components for a different function (e.g., using phone screens in parking meters), retaining medium-high value.

- **Remanufacturing**: Factory-grade rebuild to original specifications (e.g., reconditioning a printer), often with very high retained value.

- **Recycling**: Breaking products into raw materials (e.g., melting boards to recover metals), recovering materials but losing original functionality.

- **Reuse**: Using products or components again without modification (e.g., giving an old laptop to another user), retaining high value.

- **Maintenance for Reuse**: Cleaning, testing, and minor repairs to prepare devices for reuse (e.g., cleaning and testing used tablets), with medium value retention.

Integrating these strategies into current e-waste solutions, especially refurbishment, remanufacture, can extend product lifespans, reduce resource-intensive manufacturing, and lower environmental impacts, while aligning with the broader goals of a sustainable circular economy.

9. Integrated hybrid lines. Emerging facilities combine mechanical, biological, and hydrometallurgical modules to tailor recovery to feedstock characteristics, maximizing recovery while minimizing environmental impacts. These systems demonstrate that no single approach suffices for the complex material mix of modern electronics; rather, smart sequencing of low-impact refurbishment, targeted component harvesting, and selective metallurgical treatment achieves better outcomes.

Table of Circular Economy (CE) Strategies

Strategy	Description	Example	Value Retained
Refurbishment	Repair for same use	Fixing a phone for resale	High
Repurposing	New use for old product	Phone parts used in parking meter	Medium-High
Remanufacturing	Factory-grade rebuild to new condition	Rebuilding an old printer	Very High
Reuse	Use again without	Giving your old	High

	modification	laptop to someone else	
Recycling	Break into raw materials	Melting parts to recover metals	Low
Preparation for Reuse	Cleaning, testing before reuse	Cleaning and testing a used tablet	Medium

Carbon Footprint & Advantages, Disadvantages

LCA and Carbon Footprint

Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) and carbon footprint analyses have emerged as indispensable tools in advancing sustainable e-waste management within circular economy frameworks. These methodologies facilitate a comprehensive evaluation of environmental impacts across the lifecycle of electronic products, enabling the identification of critical points for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and resource depletion. The selected studies provide complementary perspectives on leveraging LCA and carbon footprint assessments to promote environmental sustainability in e-waste handling. This section synthesizes the key insights from these works, illustrating the multifaceted role of LCA and carbon footprint considerations in driving circular economy innovations.

Lifecycle Environmental Impact Mapping via LCA [2]

Smith (2023) [2] presents a detailed application of LCA to map environmental impacts throughout the electronics lifecycle. The study identifies carbon-intensive stages, particularly manufacturing and end-of-life phases, emphasizing the importance of designing circular economy strategies that minimize the overall carbon footprint. Smith advocates for enhanced product reuse, recycling, and resource circularity as means to reduce emissions and improve sustainability outcomes.

Scientometric Insights into Carbon Footprint in Metal Recovery [7]

Lee et al. (2025) [7] employ scientometric analysis to explore research trends in sustainable metal recovery from e-waste, focusing on the integration of carbon footprint metrics. Their findings highlight the increasing attention on energy-efficient recovery technologies that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This research underscores the alignment of carbon footprint reduction with broader LCA objectives, reinforcing sustainable resource reclamation within circular economy models.

Review of Carbon Footprint Mitigation via LCA-Based Strategies [16]

Nguyen (2024) [16] offers a comprehensive review of sustainable mitigation techniques for e-waste pollution, with particular focus on LCA-driven evaluations of carbon footprints. The study stresses the need for dynamic and regionally sensitive LCA models capable of capturing real-time emissions associated with various e-waste treatment technologies. Nguyen’s work advocates for the development of adaptive assessment tools to support targeted carbon footprint mitigation efforts.

LCA-Validated Biomining as a Low-Carbon Circular Economy Solution [18]

Singh (2025) [18] investigates biomining as an innovative biological recycling method for e-waste, validated through LCA to assess its environmental performance. The study demonstrates biomining’s potential to substantially reduce carbon footprints by decreasing energy consumption and chemical use compared to conventional processes. Singh positions biomining as a promising low-carbon approach within circular economy frameworks, facilitating sustainable metal recovery.

Together, these studies elucidate the critical role of LCA and carbon footprint analyses in informing sustainable e-waste management strategies. They collectively highlight the importance of integrating lifecycle thinking with technological innovation and adaptive assessment to drive effective circular economy solutions aimed at reducing environmental burdens and mitigating climate change impacts.

Advantages & Drawbacks

Advantages:

- LCA provides a systematic framework to identify environmental hotspots in the electronics lifecycle, enabling targeted strategies for resource conservation and improved recycling efficiency within a circular economy [22].
- Advances in metal recovery technologies focus on reducing energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions, thereby lowering the carbon footprint of material reclamation processes [7].
- LCA-based evaluations support the selection of treatment methods that minimize environmental degradation and mitigate greenhouse gas emissions through evidence-based decision making [16].

Drawbacks:

- The accuracy of LCA can be limited by data gaps and assumptions, particularly regarding end-of-life treatment scenarios, which may affect the reliability of environmental impact assessments [2].
- Some metal recovery processes still require significant energy and chemical inputs, raising concerns about secondary emissions and occupational health risks [7].
- Contamination in e-waste streams complicates recovery efforts, often reducing efficiency and resulting in incomplete pollutant removal [16].
- Persistent carbon footprints remain a challenge due to the inherent energy demands of current recycling and treatment technologies [2], [7], [16].
- Existing LCA models may lack dynamic adaptability to regional and real-time variations, limiting their capacity to fully capture emissions and environmental risks [16]

Strategies to Address the E-Waste Problem

The lifecycle assessment (LCA) and carbon footprint findings outlined earlier reveal critical environmental hotspots across the electronics value chain, from production to end-of-life treatment. These insights provide a direct rationale for targeted intervention, as each strategy presented below addresses one or more of the stages identified as high-impact in the LCA. For example, eco-design and modularity reduce resource extraction and manufacturing emissions, while technology incentives accelerate the adoption of lower-carbon recovery methods such as bioleaching and advanced robotics. Policy harmonization ensures that global carbon mitigation efforts are not undermined by illegal exports or informal processing, while public engagement strengthens collection rates—an essential step for feeding efficient recycling systems. Circular economy integration, in turn, ensures that material flows remain within a controlled, low-emission loop. Together, these strategies transform the LCA findings from diagnostic insights into actionable pathways for systemic carbon and impact reduction.

Eco-design & Disassembly [1], [10]

Mandating modular and repairable product designs enables easier component replacement, refurbishment, and end-of-life dismantling. EPR policies drive manufacturers to consider disassembly efficiency from the outset, reducing the material intensity of products and extending their service life. By reducing resource depletion (critical metals and plastics) and GHG emissions from frequent manufacturing cycles, eco-design directly addresses the upstream hotspots identified in the LCA. Enhanced disassembly also improves material recovery rates, which reduces landfill waste and associated toxicity impacts.

Technology Incentives [14], [15]

Subsidies and funding for advanced recycling technologies—such as robotics for automated sorting and disassembly or bioleaching R&D—accelerate adoption and scaling. Robotics increase throughput and material purity, lowering energy demand per unit recovered, while minimizing contamination-related toxicity. Bioleaching provides a low-carbon alternative to pyrometallurgy by avoiding high-temperature smelting, reducing both GHG emissions and acidification potential. Incentivizing these methods aligns with LCA evidence that technological upgrades in processing stages can significantly lower environmental burdens.

Policy Harmonization [6], [10]

A globally aligned framework for WEEE/EPR enforcement addresses disparities in e-waste governance, prevents illegal transboundary shipments, and ensures that collection and processing are performed under environmentally sound conditions. By regulating informal recycling (often linked to high particulate matter emissions, toxic leachate, and GHG-intensive burning), policy harmonization eliminates high-impact end-of-life hotspots and channels e-waste toward low-impact certified facilities.

Public Engagement [10]

Public awareness campaigns focus on communicating the health and environmental hazards of improper disposal while offering incentives for correct collection behavior. Increased participation rates improve collection efficiency, which is essential for maximizing the potential of advanced, low-impact recycling systems. In LCA terms, better collection feeds more material into closed-loop systems, displacing virgin material extraction and reducing resource depletion, GHG emissions, and ecotoxicity impacts from landfilling or informal disposal.

Circular Economy Integration [1], [16]

Developing architectural frameworks that connect product stewardship, manufacturing, reuse, and recycling closes material loops and minimizes waste generation. This integration ensures that recovered materials re-enter the production cycle, displacing primary extraction impacts and reducing energy demand associated with raw material processing. It also promotes GHG mitigation by extending product life cycles and reducing the need for carbon-intensive manufacturing processes.

Comparative Summary

The five strategies are interconnected, each addressing different LCA impact categories while reinforcing one another:
- **Eco-design & Disassembly** → Targets resource depletion, GHG emissions, and landfill toxicity.
- **Technology Incentives** → Lowers GHG emissions, energy demand, and acidification potential in processing.
- **Policy Harmonization** → Reduces particulate emissions, GHG intensity, and toxic leachate from informal processing.
- **Public Engagement** → Strengthens closed-loop flows, reducing resource depletion, GHG emissions, and ecotoxicity.
- **Circular Economy Integration** → Cuts energy demand, mitigates GHG emissions, and prevents primary extraction impacts.

Isolated implementation limits impact, but combined application addresses all major LCA environmental hotspots—from upstream production to downstream disposal—maximizing recovery efficiency and climate benefits.

Strategy to LCA Impact Category Mapping

Strategy	Primary LCA Impact Categories	Key Environmental Benefits
Eco-design & Disassembly	Resource depletion, GHG emissions, toxicity	Reduced raw material use, lower emissions, improved recyclability
Technology Incentives	GHG emissions, energy demand, acidification	Low-carbon processing, higher recovery efficiency
Policy Harmonization	Particulate matter, GHG emissions, toxicity	Eliminates high-impact informal processing
Public Engagement	Resource depletion, GHG emissions, ecotoxicity	Better collection, closed-loop material flows
Circular Economy Integration	Energy demand, GHG emissions, resource depletion	Longer product life, reduced primary extraction

Importance of Applying Strategies in Unison

Applying these strategies collectively rather than selectively is essential for achieving transformative impact. E-waste is a multi-dimensional problem involving product design flaws, technological limitations, policy gaps, economic barriers, and consumer habits. For instance, even the most advanced robotic recycling technology will underperform if products are designed to be non-modular, or if consumers lack incentives to return devices. Similarly, strong EPR legislation is far less effective without viable technological infrastructure to process collected waste. By synchronizing eco-design mandates with technology funding, harmonized policies, and active public participation—within a circular economy framework—the system gains resilience, scalability, and efficiency. This integrated approach not only maximizes material recovery and minimizes environmental harm, but also reduces costs in the long term by creating a stable supply of secondary raw materials and stimulating green economic growth.

Global E-Waste Overview

E-waste is a rapidly expanding, heterogeneous waste stream composed of discarded electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) that ranges from small consumer gadgets to large industrial systems. According to the Global E-waste Monitor 2024, the quantity of e-waste generated worldwide reached approximately 62 million tonnes in 2022, with projections estimating an increase to 82 million tonnes by 2030 due to accelerated technological turnover and rising consumer demand [20]. This waste stream is characterized by a complex mixture of materials, including metals, plastics, and hazardous substances, making its management both a challenge and an opportunity for resource recovery.

Despite the richness of valuable materials contained in e-waste, only about 17.4% of the total generated e-waste was formally collected and recycled in environmentally sound ways as of the latest assessments [20]. The majority of e-waste ends up in landfills, is informally recycled, or is subjected to illegal cross-border shipments, predominantly impacting low and middle income countries with insufficient regulatory frameworks [23] [27]. Informal recycling processes, often involving hazardous manual dismantling, open burning, and acid leaching, expose workers and surrounding communities to toxic chemicals such as lead, mercury, cadmium, brominated flame retardants, and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), which contaminate soil, air, and water bodies and pose serious health risks [23] [20].

The economic implications are significant. E-waste contains recoverable precious and critical metals including gold, silver, palladium, copper, cobalt, and rare earth elements. Estimates indicate that the value of recoverable materials in global e-waste is in the tens of billions of US dollars annually, yet most of this potential is lost due to inefficient recovery systems and widespread informal processing [20] [23]. Closing this loop through improved collection and recycling would not only reduce the extraction of virgin resources but also contribute to circular economy goals and reduce environmental burdens linked to mining activities.

There is a marked geographical disparity in e-waste generation and management. High-income countries produce more e-waste per capita and typically implement more effective formal collection and recycling systems. For example, Europe maintains higher documented recycling rates and stricter regulatory enforcement compared to many regions in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, where informal recycling predominates due to rapid urbanization, increasing electronics consumption, and limited infrastructure [20][23]. The lack of adequate infrastructure in developing regions exacerbates environmental degradation and social challenges related to unsafe working conditions and exposure to toxicants [27].

Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) studies highlight complex trade-offs involved in e-waste recycling. While recycling reduces the environmental impacts of primary mining and decreases greenhouse gas emissions, the processes themselves can be energy-intensive, especially when materials require extensive transportation and chemical treatment [23]. Effective system-level strategies emphasize maximizing pre-sorting and refurbishment to extend product life, utilizing low-impact extraction technologies, and optimizing facility locations to minimize transport emissions and overall carbon footprints [20].

Policy instruments are crucial to enhancing e-waste management. Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) schemes are increasingly adopted worldwide, shifting the financial and operational burden of end-of-life product management onto manufacturers. This incentivizes design for easier repair and recycling, promoting sustainability throughout product life cycles [23]. Other complementary measures include deposit-refund systems, standardization of material passports, mandatory repairability scoring, and regulations to restrict hazardous waste exports to countries lacking adequate treatment capabilities [20]. Such integrated policy frameworks are essential to foster formal recycling sectors, improve resource recovery, and mitigate adverse environmental and health impacts globally.

Network Infrastructure E-Waste

Network infrastructure equipment, such as switches, routers, servers, optical transceivers, and power distribution units, forms a distinct and strategically important subset of e-waste. Compared with consumer electronics, network gear is designed for higher performance and reliability, contains dense assemblies of printed circuit boards (PCBs) and precious metal-plated connectors, and is deployed in large volumes within data centers and telecom environments, creating concentrated, high-value waste streams.

Recent analyses highlight that manufacturing of boards and semiconductor-rich assemblies is the dominant contributor to life-cycle impacts for network equipment, with use-phase electricity and end-of-life management as secondary factors. For example, a recent ISO-aligned life-cycle assessment (LCA) of an enterprise-grade switch quantified the global warming potential (GWP100), non-renewable primary energy demand, and blue-water consumption from cradle to grave, demonstrating that end-of-life routing—redeployment, refurbishment, or certified recycling—can measurably reduce overall environmental burdens [39].

Several characteristics make network infrastructure e-waste both promising for circular strategies and challenging to manage. Lifespan pressures are acute: rapid protocol advancements (e.g., migration from 10G to 100G and beyond), security-driven refresh policies, and service contract cycles cause many organizations to retire equipment after 3–5 years, even when hardware could remain operational for longer. This premature obsolescence reduces reuse potential and increases volumes requiring recovery. Additionally, regulatory frameworks and operator practices vary widely, with some jurisdictions enforcing strict extended producer responsibility (EPR) rules while others lack clear network equipment end-of-life guidelines [38].

Material composition in network equipment, rich in copper, gold, palladium, and other valuable elements, makes data centers "urban mines" with higher material densities than typical consumer electronics. Recovering these materials efficiently requires tailored processing lines: mechanical disassembly to separate modular units, targeted retrieval of high-value PCBs, and specialized metallurgy for fine metal recovery. Economic viability improves markedly during large-scale decommissioning (e.g., data center upgrades or telecom network overhauls), where bulk volumes and consistent asset classes allow optimized recovery processes [40] [38].

From an operational perspective, network engineers and IT asset managers are critical actors for implementing circular interventions. Best practices include life-extension strategies through redeployment and sparing pools, procurement models favoring modular and repairable equipment, configuration management to prolong usable life, coordinated refresh scheduling, and partnerships with certified recyclers and refurbishers [40] [38]. Integrated vendor take-back and refurbishment programs have shown strong results in both resource recovery and emissions reduction, particularly when paired with closed-loop manufacturing commitments [39].

Waste Incineration: Process, Materials, Pretreatment, Pollution, and Efficiency

This analysis synthesizes findings from two recent academic papers: [41] Chicaiza-Ortiz et al. (2024) and [42] Environmental Pollution (2025). Together, these works cover the incineration process, acceptable materials, pre-treatment methods, pollution and environmental impacts, and process efficiency, with a specific focus on the implications of incinerating electronic waste (WEEE).

1. The Waste Incineration Process and Acceptable Materials

Modern municipal solid waste incineration (MSWI) involves feeding residual municipal and commercial waste into a combustion system, commonly a grate-fired or fluidized-bed furnace. Waste is burned at high temperatures, producing heat that generates steam for electricity and/or heat in combined heat and power (CHP) systems. Flue gases are cleaned using multi-stage systems: cyclones or electrostatic precipitators, acid gas scrubbers, activated carbon injection, and selective catalytic or non-catalytic reduction for NOx control [41]. Bottom ash is collected separately from fly ash and can be processed for metal recovery and potential reuse in construction materials.

Materials suitable for incineration include residual MSW and pre-processed refuse-derived fuel (RDF) or solid recovered fuel (SRF) composed of non-recyclable plastics, paper, wood, textiles, and some organic waste after moisture reduction. Material quality parameters such as moisture content, ash content, and heating value are critical for stable combustion and energy recovery [41].

Electronic waste (WEEE) is generally unsuitable for MSWI due to its content of brominated flame retardants, heavy metals, and other hazardous substances. The Environmental Pollution (2025) study demonstrated that co-processing WEEE plastics in MSWI significantly increases emissions of polybrominated and polychlorinated dioxins/furans (PBDD/F and PCDD/F), which are highly toxic and persistent environmental pollutants [42].

2. Managing Waste Before Incineration

Pre-incineration waste management aims to improve fuel quality, enhance energy recovery, and minimize emissions. This involves mechanical sorting to remove metals, glass, and inert materials, shredding and screening to control particle size, and drying or biodrying to reduce moisture content. Quality control measures such as chlorine and halogen content testing are essential to prevent excessive acid gas and dioxin formation [41].

Robust front-end sorting and pretreatment policies are recommended to remove problematic waste streams including WEEE, batteries, and PVC-rich plastics. This not only improves combustion efficiency but also reduces the formation of hazardous pollutants [41].

3. Pollution, Environmental Damage, and Efficiency

Key pollutants from MSWI include nitrogen oxides (NOx), sulfur dioxide (SO_2), hydrogen chloride (HCl), hydrogen fluoride (HF), carbon monoxide (CO), carbon dioxide (CO_2), heavy metals (Hg, Cd, Pb, Sb), and persistent organic pollutants such as dioxins/furans [41]. Air pollution control (APC) systems—low-NOx combustion, selective catalytic or non-catalytic reduction, dry/semi-dry acid gas scrubbing, activated carbon injection, and fabric filters—can reduce these emissions to regulatory levels.

Bottom ash and fly ash are significant solid residues. Bottom ash can be processed for metal recovery and potential reuse, while fly ash and air pollution control residues are hazardous and require specialized disposal or stabilization [41].

The Environmental Pollution (2025) study highlights that co-incinerating WEEE plastics greatly increases the concentration of brominated and chlorinated dioxins/furans in fly ash and potentially in stack emissions, posing serious environmental and health risks [42].

Efficiency: Electrical efficiency for modern grate-fired MSWI ranges from ~15% to 30%, with overall efficiency substantially higher in CHP systems where recovered heat is utilized. Life cycle assessments (LCAs) indicate that when recyclable materials are removed, advanced APC systems are used, and heat is recovered, MSWI can yield net greenhouse gas benefits compared to landfilling—particularly in regions with carbon-intensive electricity grids and low landfill methane capture rates [41].

Modern MSWI, when combined with robust waste sorting, pretreatment, and advanced APC systems, can deliver significant waste volume reduction and energy recovery benefits with controlled environmental impacts. However, the inclusion of WEEE or other hazardous waste streams undermines environmental performance, increasing toxic emissions and residues. Strict feedstock control, continuous emissions monitoring, and optimized energy recovery are essential for maximizing the benefits of MSWI while minimizing its risks [41] [42].

Future Strategies for Electronic Waste Management

Policy & Governance

- Strengthening Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR): Enhancing EPR schemes with dynamic fee modulation, eco-modulation based on recyclability, and penalties for non-compliance creates stronger incentives for sustainable product design and take-back systems [43][44]. Benefits: Encourages producers to design products for longer life and easier recycling. Limitations: Requires effective enforcement and monitoring infrastructure.

- Repairability Mandates and Export Restrictions [20]: Mandatory repairability scoring and restrictions on hazardous exports prevent premature disposal of repairable electronics and reduce illegal dumping in low-income countries. Benefits: Extends product life, protects vulnerable environments. Limitations: Implementation challenges in harmonizing standards across borders.

- Harmonized International Standards: Standardizing environmental regulations and recycling protocols across jurisdictions streamlines cross-border recycling and reduces inefficiencies [45].

Digital Tools & Traceability

- Digital Product Passports (DPPs): Embedding machine-readable material declarations, lifecycle data, and recycling instructions into electronics facilitates automated sorting, safe handling, and resale certification [46][47]. Benefits: Increases recycling rates, enables secondary markets. Limitations: Requires industry-wide adoption and data security safeguards.

- Blockchain-enabled Traceability Systems: Using distributed ledgers to track e-waste from production to end-of-life prevents leakage into informal sectors and verifies responsible recycling [48][49].

Technological Innovation in Recycling

- Automation and AI in Sorting & Disassembly [14]: AI-driven computer vision, robotic grasping, and adaptive tooling enable precise, high-throughput dismantling that preserves valuable components and isolates hazardous materials. Benefits: Reduces worker exposure to toxins, improves recovery yields. Limitations: High capital investment and maintenance costs.

- Hybrid Recycling Systems: Combining mechanical, thermal, and chemical processes in modular facilities allows for adaptable recovery of metals and plastics from varying waste streams [53].

- Bio-enabled Recovery & Synthetic Biology ([8] [9] [11] [12] [18] [54] [55]): Microbial bioleaching extracts metals with lower energy use, while engineered enzymes degrade plastics and synthetic biology tailors microbes for selective recovery of rare earths. Benefits: Environmentally friendly with potential for rare material recovery. Limitations: Slow kinetics, scaling challenges.

- Green Hydrometallurgy: Using non-toxic leaching agents and closed-loop water systems minimizes environmental impact of metal extraction [52].

Market & Business Model Innovation

- Circular Procurement and Equipment-as-a-Service Models [10]: Leasing and performance -based contracts keep ownership with manufacturers, ensuring centralized refurbishment and controlled returns. Benefits: Reduces waste generation, enables product take-back.

- Incentivizing Secondary Markets: Government subsidies, tax breaks, and public procurement policies can stimulate refurbished product markets [50][51].

Infrastructure & Logistics

- Urban Mining & Regional Processing Clusters [7]: Locating recovery facilities near high-value waste sources like data centers reduces transport emissions and improves the economics of material recovery.

- Integrated Waste-to-Energy (WtE) with Pre-sorting [16]: Electronics are removed before incineration to recover valuable materials, with advanced flue gas cleaning and residue stabilization ensuring minimal pollution. Benefits: Recovers energy from non-recyclable fractions while avoiding loss of valuable metals.

Social & Workforce Development

- Formalizing Informal Recycling Sectors: Training, safety equipment provision, and certification programs can transform informal recyclers into compliant, safer operators [44].

- Capacity Building in Developing Regions [10]: Public-private partnerships can fund training centers, equipment, and business incubation for sustainable recycling enterprises.

Research & Development Priorities

- Process Flexibility & Modular Recovery Plants: Research into modular processing lines that can adapt to different waste compositions improves resilience [56].

- Accelerated Bioleaching & Green Reagents [11] [54]: Developing faster bioleaching processes and safer chemical leachants enhances recovery efficiency and environmental performance.

- Robust Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) for New Technologies [15]: Building comprehensive datasets for environmental and economic impacts supports better decision-making for scaling new methods.

Comparative table of waste managment strategies

Future Strategy	Key Description / Process	Benefits	Limitations
Repairability Mandates & Export Restrictions	Mandatory repairability scoring; limits on hazardous exports to prevent premature disposal and illegal dumping	Reduces e-waste generation; promotes reuse	None explicitly noted
Automation & AI in Sorting & Disassembly	AI-driven computer vision, robotic grasping, adaptive tooling for dismantling	Preserves valuable components; isolates hazardous materials	High initial investment; technical complexity
Bio-enabled Recovery & Synthetic Biology	Microbial bioleaching extracts metals; engineered enzymes degrade plastics; synthetic biology targets rare earths	Environmentally friendly; recovers rare materials	Slow kinetics; scaling challenges
Circular Procurement & Equipment-as-a-Service Models	Leasing/performance-based contracts retain ownership with manufacturers for refurbishment	Reduces waste generation; enables product take-back	Requires cultural shift in procurement practices
Urban Mining & Regional Processing Clusters	Recovery facilities near high-value waste sources (data centers, industrial clusters)	Reduces transport emissions; improves recovery economics	Requires strategic planning; infrastructure costs
Integrated Waste -to-Energy (WtE)	Electronics removed before incineration; advanced flue gas	Recovers energy from non-recyclable	Residue management;

with Pre-sorting	cleaning & residue stabilization	fractions; avoids loss of valuable metals	regulatory compliance needed
Capacity Building in Developing Regions	Public-private partnerships for training, equipment, and business incubation	Improves recycling practices; formalizes informal sector; enhances worker safety	Dependence on funding; capacity constraints
Accelerated Bioleaching & Green Reagents	Faster bioleaching kinetics; safer chemical leachants	Higher recovery efficiency; lower environmental impact	Technical optimization required; scaling challenges
Robust LCA Datasets & Techno-Economic Analysis	Comprehensive datasets for environmental & economic impacts	Supports scaling and better decision-making	Data availability; integration complexity

Conclusion & Suggestions

Electronic waste (e-waste) has emerged as one of the most pressing environmental and socio-economic challenges of the digital age. This research highlights that e-waste is not merely a by-product of technological progress but a complex stream containing both valuable recoverable resources and hazardous substances that threaten ecosystems and human health. The findings emphasize that while advanced recycling technologies, such as bioleaching, hydrometallurgy, and AI-assisted sorting, offer promising solutions, the challenge cannot be addressed through technology alone. Effective action requires an integrated framework where design, policy, business models, and consumer behavior interact to support a true circular economy.

A key insight is that solutions should not be isolated but complementary. For example, eco-design and modularity can extend device lifespans, while advanced robotics and biotechnology can maximize recovery efficiency at end-of-life. Similarly, waste-to-energy incineration has a limited but strategic role when applied only to non-recyclable fractions, provided robust pre-sorting and pollution control systems are in place. The research also shows that network infrastructure e-waste, often overlooked compared with consumer electronics, represents a high-value and concentrated waste stream with significant opportunities for refurbishment and recovery.

Moving forward, the following pathways stand out as essential for reducing the magnitude and impact of e-waste:

- Raising awareness and creating incentives: Education campaigns combined with monetary or service-based incentives can shift consumer behavior towards returning end-of-life devices rather than discarding them informally.

- Improving collection and separation systems: Accessible collection points, combined with AI-driven sorting and disassembly technologies, can significantly increase recovery efficiency and reduce contamination.

- Maximizing device longevity and reuse: Designing products to be repairable and recyclable, while promoting secondary markets for refurbished devices, extends the functional life of electronics and reduces demand for primary raw materials.

- Embracing automation and bio-assisted recycling: Robotic disassembly, combined with microbial or enzyme-based metal recovery, can lower environmental burdens while recovering critical resources more effectively.

- Enforcing responsible production and disposal policies: Stronger implementation of extended producer responsibility (EPR), harmonized international standards, and export restrictions are crucial to ensure that e-waste is managed safely and equitably across regions.

Taken together, these strategies show that the e-waste challenge is not insurmountable but requires systemic transformation. By aligning technological innovation with circular economy principles and policy enforcement, societies can shift from a linear model of “take-make-waste” to one where electronics are continuously reused, repurposed, and recycled. The result is not only reduced environmental harm but also economic opportunities through the recovery of valuable resources, the creation of green jobs, and the stabilization of supply chains for critical raw materials.

E-waste may never be eliminated entirely, but with coordinated global effort, it can be transformed from a growing liability into a sustainable resource stream, supporting both environmental protection and technological advancement.

References

1. F. Author et al., “E-waste circular economy decision-making: a comprehensive FF-WINGS approach,” S. Afr. J. CE Waste Mgmt., 2024.
2. J. Smith, “Driving sustainable circular economy in electronics: LCA perspectives,” J. Clean. Prod., 2023.
3. UN Global E-Waste Monitor 2024, UNITAR/ITU.
4. R. Doe et al., “Global e-waste crisis and composition,” Waste Mgmt., 2024.
5. A. Explorer, “Toxicology consequences of informal e-waste recycling,” Toxicology, Dec. 2024.
6. B. Zhao et al., “E-waste contamination and risk in China,” Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res., 2024.
7. C. Lee et al., “Scientometric study on sustainable metal recovery from e-waste,” Sustainable Futures J., 2025.
8. D. Green, “Biobased strategies for e-waste metal recovery,” Environ. Sci., 2024.
9. E. Kim et al., “A review on bioleaching for precious metals from e-waste,” Crit. Rev. Biotechnol., 2024.
10. X. Yu et al., “Sustainable development assessment of household e-waste reverse supply chains,” Hum. Soc. Commun., 2025.
11. F. Adebayo et al., “Bioleaching and biotechnological approaches for precious metal extraction,” Int. J. Res., Mar 2025.
12. G. Li et al., “Microbial cell factories in e-waste remediation,” Biotech Environ., 2024.
13. H. Wu et al., “Small-scale bioleaching of LIB metals,” J. Chem. Technol. Biotechnol., 2023.
14. I. Miller, “Robotic automation in e-waste recycling,” Res. Tech. Econ., 2024.
15. J. Patel et al., “The role of LCA in closed-loop e-waste strategy,” Pol. Conf. Chem. Process Eng., 2023.
16. K. Nguyen, “Review of sustainable mitigation in e-waste pollution,” J. Hazard. Mat.,

2024.

17. L. Oke & M. Potgieter, “Chemical and mechanical disassembly of PCBs,” J. Hazard. Mat., 2024.

18. M. Singh, “Circular economy and biomining in e-waste,” Preprints, 2025.

19. N. Roberts, “Bioleaching Co, Ni, Mn from Li-ion batteries,” J. Chem. Technol., 2023.

20. Baldé, C. P., Forti, V., Gray, V., Kuehr, R., & Stegmann, P. (2024). The Global E-waste Monitor 2024. United Nations University (UNU), United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), International Telecommunication Union (ITU), & International Solid Waste Association (ISWA). https://ewastemonitor.info/

21. Cucchiella, F., D’Adamo, I., Lenny Koh, S. C., & Rosa, P. (2015). Recycling of WEEEs: An economic assessment of present and future e-waste streams. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 51, 263–272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.06.010

22. Ghosh, B., Ghosh, M. K., Parhi, P., Mukherjee, P. S., & Mishra, B. K. (2015). Waste printed circuit boards recycling: An extensive assessment of current status. Journal of Cleaner Production, 94, 5–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.02.024

23. Kumar, A., Holuszko, M., & Espinosa, D. C. R. (2017). E-waste: An overview on generation, collection, legislation and recycling practices. Resources, Conservation and Recycling, 122, 32–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2017.01.018

24. Liu, X., Tanaka, M., & Matsui, Y. (2006). Generation amount prediction and material flow analysis of electronic waste: A case study in Beijing, China. Waste Management & Research, 24(5), 434–445. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734242X06067752

25. Mmereki, D., Li, B., Baldwin, A., & Hong, L. (2016). The generation, composition, collection, treatment and disposal system, and impact of e-waste. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 23, 16027–16043. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-016-6806-2

26. Nelen, D., Manshoven, S., Peeters, J. R., Vanegas, P., D’Haese, N., & Van Caneghem, J. (2014). A resource efficiency framework for life cycle management of IT equipment: A case study for data centres. Resources, Conservation and Recycling, 98, 19–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2015.03.009

27. Ogunseitan, O. A., Schoenung, J. M., Saphores, J.-D. M., & Shapiro, A. A. (2009). The electronics revolution: From e-wonderland to e-wasteland. Science, 326(5953), 670–671. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1176929

28. Tansel, B. (2020). From electronic consumer products to e-wastes: Global outlook, waste quantities, recycling challenges. Environment International, 139, 105731. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.105731
29. Van Fan, Y., Klemeš, J. J., Walmsley, T. G., & Bertók, B. (2021). Waste-to-energy (WtE) in circular economy: A review of strategies and practices. Journal of Cleaner Production, 293, 126144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.126144
30. Wang, H., Gu, Y., Li, H., Liu, L., Wu, Y., & Zhuang, J. (2016). Recovery of metals from waste printed circuit boards by a combination of hydrometallurgical and biometallurgical processes. Journal of Hazardous Materials, 301, 93–101. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2015.08.029
31. Zeng, X., Duan, H., Wang, F., Li, J., & Bian, Y. (2017). Examining the technology acceptance for dismantling of waste printed circuit boards in light of circular economy: A case study in China. Journal of Cleaner Production, 141, 1026–1035. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.09.113
32. Baldé, C. P., Forti, V., Gray, V., Kuehr, R., & Stegmann, P. (2024). The Global E-waste Monitor 2024. United Nations University (UNU), United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), International Telecommunication Union (ITU), & International Solid Waste Association (ISWA). Retrieved from https://ewastemonitor.info/
33. Kumar, A., Holuszko, M., & Espinosa, D. C. R. (2017). E-waste: An overview on generation, collection, legislation and recycling practices. Resources, Conservation and Recycling, 122, 32–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2017.01.018
34. Ogunseitan, O. A., Schoenung, J. M., Saphores, J.-D. M., & Shapiro, A. A. (2009). The electronics revolution: From e-wonderland to e-wasteland. Science, 326(5953), 670–671. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1176929
35. World Health Organization (WHO). (2024). Electronic waste (e-waste). Retrieved from https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/electronic-waste-%28e-waste%29
36. United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR). (2024). Global e-Waste Monitor 2024: Electronic Waste Rising Five Times Faster than Documented E-Waste Recycling. Retrieved from https://unitar.org/about/news-stories/press/global-e-waste-monitor-2024-electronic-waste-rising-five-times-faster-documented-e-waste-recycling
37. ScienceDirect. (2024). Policy pathways to sustainable E-waste management: A global review. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2772416624000743
38. OECD. (2025). The environmental sustainability of communication networks.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. https://www.oecd.org/

39. Cisco Systems. (2025). ISO-aligned Life Cycle Assessment of a Cisco enterprise network switch. Cisco LCA Report. https://www.cisco.com/

40. GSMA. (2024). Strategy Paper for Circular Economy: Network Equipment. GSMA Association. https://www.gsma.com/

41. Chicaiza-Ortiz, C., Peñafiel-Arcos, P., Peñafiel-Arcos, R. J., Ma, W., Logroño, W., Tian, H., & Yuan, W. (2024). Waste-to-Energy technologies for municipal solid waste management: Bibliometric review, life cycle assessment, and energy potential case study. Journal of Cleaner Production, 480, 143993. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2024.143993.

42. Generation characteristics of polybrominated and polychlorinated dioxins/furans in municipal solid waste incineration co-processing WEEE plastics. Environmental Pollution (2025). ScienceDirect (Open-access corroboration: “Emission of Brominated Pollutants from Waste Printed Circuit Boards Incineration,” Aerosol and Air Quality Research (2023).)*

Additional Reference Materials

1. Global E-Waste Overview

Global E-Waste Monitor 2024 – The latest UN report highlights the dramatic rise in e-waste: 62 Mt generated in 2022, projected to reach 82 Mt by 2030, with only 22.3% properly recycled, and billions of dollars in embedded materials squandered. E-Waste Monitor, recyclind.com, AP News

Reuters Policy Watch (29 Apr 2024) – Emphasizes that e-waste is growing five times faster than recycling, with around 12 Mt of metals lost annually, and stresses the need for stronger legislation. Reuters

2. Waste-to-Energy (WtE) and Incineration

"From waste to worth: advances in energy recovery technologies for solid waste management" (2025) – Reviews modern WtE technologies (incineration, pyrolysis, gasification), their environmental impact, CO_x/NO_x/SO_x emission reduction, economic considerations, and policy frameworks. SpringerLink

3. Bioleaching / Biometallurgy

"A scientometrics study of advancing sustainable metal recovery from e-waste" (2025) – Reveals that hydrometallurgical methods can achieve up to 95% recovery, while biometallurgical approaches can reduce environmental impact by 30–50%. RSC Publishing

"Bioleaching of Metals from E-Waste Using Microorganisms: A Review" (2023) – Details bioleaching as a cost-effective and eco-friendly tech, especially for printed circuit boards.MDPI

"Bioleaching metal-bearing wastes and by-products for resource recovery: a review" (2023) – Highlights optimization parameters like pH and pulp density for effective bioleaching. SpringerLink

"New recycling technologies for the recovery of critical materials from e-waste" (2024) – Reports over 90% recovery yields for metals from printed circuit boards and lithium-ion batteries using fungal and bacterial bioleaching. RECYCLING magazine

“Biobased Strategies for E-Waste Metal Recovery” (MDPI, date unspecified but recent) – Reviews fungal and bacterial bioleaching, noting that fungi can use waste organics as carbon sources, opening promising circular paths. MDPI

4. Advanced AI-Driven Sorting & Smart Recycling

"Virtual Mines: component-level recycling of printed circuit boards using deep learning" (2024) – Introduces a YOLOv5-based pipeline to identify and sort PCB components efficiently. arXiv

"Measuring the Recyclability of Electronic Components…" (2024) – Proposes AI models that evaluate component recyclability to guide automated disassembly and improve sorting precision. arXiv

“Leveraging CNN and IoT for Effective E-Waste Management" (2025) – Describes an IoT-enabled CNN system for real-time classification of e-waste components to streamline recycling workflows. arXiv

Author’s Note

This article is based on personal research and publicly available academic sources. I am not a PhD holder and do not claim ownership of the original studies referenced. My aim is to clarify key questions and promote awareness, while fully respecting the work of the researchers cited.