Framework for the Techno-Economic Feasibility Assessment of Modular Chemical Plant Projects

Part 1: Foundational Feasibility Framework (Global Application)

This part establishes the baseline parameters applicable to any chemical plant project, regardless of construction methodology or location. It serves as the foundation upon which the specific complexities of modularization and the African context will be layered.

SECTION 1.1: TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY PARAMETERS

This section details the universal technical criteria essential for ensuring a project is physically and operationally viable. A failure in any of these core areas can render a project unfeasible from the outset.

1.1.1. Site Selection & Geotechnical Integrity

The selection of a plant site is a foundational decision that profoundly influences all subsequent project costs, operational efficiencies, and long-term risks.[1] The process transcends simple geography, demanding a multi-faceted assessment of physical, environmental, and logistical conditions. An optimal site minimizes the total cost of production and distribution while ensuring safe and reliable operations.[2]

A primary consideration is the site's physical characteristics and the potential for an optimized layout. The available footprint must be sufficient not only for the initial plant but also for potential future expansions.[3] The topography of the land is critical; an ideal site is flat and well-drained, which minimizes the costs associated with site preparation, grading, and civil works.[5] The layout must accommodate critical factors such as safe separation distances between process units, particularly for hazardous operations, to mitigate the risk of incident escalation.[4] Constructability constraints and proximity to neighboring industrial or residential areas, which may impose restrictions related to noise or potential hydrocarbon leaks, must be thoroughly evaluated during the site optimization process.[4]

A comprehensive geotechnical and natural hazard assessment is non-negotiable. The soil's load-bearing capacity directly determines the foundation requirements; poor soil quality can necessitate expensive piling, significantly increasing civil engineering costs.[4] The site's susceptibility to natural hazards—such as seismic activity, floods, hurricanes, or tornadoes—must be rigorously evaluated.[1] Locations prone to such events require more robust and expensive structural designs to ensure plant integrity.[2] Prevailing weather conditions, including extreme temperature ranges, humidity, and wind, also have a direct impact. Abnormally low temperatures may necessitate additional insulation and heating for equipment and piping, while high humidity can adversely affect certain raw materials (e.g., hygroscopic powders) and the quality of the final product.[1] For example, studies have shown that temperature and humidity significantly influence the bond strength of certain resins, demonstrating how climate metrics are critical to defining the process environment and ensuring product quality.[1]

Finally, accessibility and the quality of surrounding logistics infrastructure are paramount. The site must have reliable access for the transport of both inbound raw materials and outbound finished products. Proximity to at least two major forms of transport—such as road, rail, waterways, or a seaport—is highly desirable as it provides operational flexibility and competitive leverage on transport costs.[2] For bulk chemicals like fertilizers or mineral acids, where transport costs constitute a significant fraction of the final sales price, locating the plant near the primary market or raw material source is often a decisive economic factor.[2]

1.1.2. Process Technology & Licensor Evaluation

The choice of process technology forms the core of the chemical plant's operational identity and profitability. This evaluation is a critical exercise in balancing performance, cost, reliability, and safety. The selection process must be systematic, comparing available technologies, whether licensed or open-art, against a stringent set of criteria.[9]

A robust framework for technology selection, such as the 'SELECT' criteria—Safety, Environmental, Legal, Economics, Control, and Throughput—provides a comprehensive methodology for this assessment.[10] Key evaluation points include the technology's proven track record (number of operational plants), energy efficiency, raw material and catalyst consumption rates, and environmental footprint, particularly the volume and nature of waste generated.[9] The licensor's experience, especially their history of successful scale-ups and their capacity to provide ongoing technical support, is a crucial indicator of reliability.[9]

Once a technology is shortlisted, the feasibility study advances to the development of a detailed design basis.[11] This involves creating complex process simulations using software like Aspen Plus or Aspen Hysys to establish the fundamental Heat and Material Balance (HMB) for the entire plant.[12] These simulations are the source for developing core engineering documents, including

Process Flow Diagrams (PFDs) and, subsequently, preliminary Piping and Instrumentation Diagrams (P&IDs).[12] The P&IDs are particularly important as they begin to define the instrumentation and process control hardware requirements, which are significant cost drivers.[12]

Based on the process simulations and PFDs, the feasibility study must define and size all major unit operations and equipment.[13] This includes critical items like reactors, distillation columns, heat exchangers, pumps, and compressors.[12] For certain processes, such as LNG, the selection and optimization of key turbomachinery like gas turbine drivers and compressors are pivotal to overall plant efficiency and operational success.[4] A detailed major equipment list, specifying key process parameters for each item, is a primary and essential input for the capital cost estimation effort.[12] The technical feasibility of the project hinges on the confidence that the selected technology and equipment can consistently meet the desired production rate and product purity specifications under real-world operating conditions.[11]

1.1.3. Raw Material & Resource Availability

The long-term, reliable, and cost-effective supply of raw materials and essential utilities is a primary determinant of a chemical plant's operational viability and its underlying cost structure. The feasibility study must conduct a rigorous assessment of the entire resource supply chain.[1]

The analysis of feedstock availability is a cornerstone of this assessment. This involves evaluating not just the quantity but also the quality, purity, and long-term price stability of all necessary raw materials.[2] For bulk chemical production, proximity to the raw material source is often a decisive factor in site selection, as it can drastically reduce transportation costs.[6] The purity of the feedstock is a critical technical parameter; impurities can lead to undesirable side reactions, the formation of waste by-products, and contamination of the final product.[1] If the available raw material contains significant impurities, the project may need to incorporate costly upstream purification units, which must be factored into both the CAPEX and OPEX.[1]

Equally important is the evaluation of the utility supply, including water, power, and fuel.[2] Chemical processes invariably require immense quantities of water for cooling, steam generation, and as a direct process input.[1] Therefore, the plant must be located near a reliable and sustainable source of water, such as a river, lake, or accessible wells.[1] The cost and reliability of the electrical power supply are also fundamental. Energy-intensive processes, such as electrochemical operations, must be sited where a stable and competitively priced power supply is available.[2] The feasibility study must analyze the local power grid's reliability and cost, which helps determine whether the project should purchase electricity or invest in its own self-generation facilities.[2] Similarly, a dependable and economically viable source of fuel for steam generation and heating is essential for sustained plant operation.[2]

1.1.4. Environmental, Health & Safety (EHS) & Regulatory Compliance

Environmental, Health, and Safety (EHS) considerations are not secondary objectives but core feasibility parameters that can impose prohibitive costs or halt a project entirely. A thorough understanding of the regulatory landscape and inherent process hazards is critical from the earliest stages of project development.[8]

The feasibility study must begin with a comprehensive analysis of the complete regulatory framework, encompassing all applicable national, regional, and local laws and standards governing environmental protection and occupational safety.[1] In the United States, for example, this would include federal laws like the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act, which set baseline standards, as well as potentially stricter state and local ordinances.[1] The process for obtaining the necessary environmental and construction permits can be lengthy and complex, and these timelines must be realistically factored into the overall project schedule.[8]

A critical component of the technical study is the development of a robust waste management and minimization plan. This process starts with identifying and characterizing all potential waste streams—gaseous, liquid, and solid—that the plant will produce.[1] The study must then determine the size of these streams and evaluate the technology and cost required for their treatment and disposal in compliance with all regulations, such as the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, which holds the waste generator liable from "cradle to grave".[1] Furthermore, the economic viability of various source reduction strategies should be analyzed. These can include purifying feeds to prevent side reactions, improving separation recovery to reduce product loss in waste streams, or recycling side-products, with the goal of ensuring that the savings from waste minimization outweigh the implementation costs.[1]

Finally, an early-stage hazard and risk assessment is essential. This involves systematic processes like Hazard Identification (HAZID) studies to identify potential process risks, such as runaway reactions, equipment failure, or the release of toxic materials.[13] The potential consequences of these events, such as fires or vapor cloud explosions, must be modeled to understand their potential impact on the plant and surrounding area.[7] The results of this risk assessment directly influence fundamental design decisions, including the plant layout, safe spacing between units, and the specification of safety instrumented systems and fire protection measures, all of which have significant cost implications.[7]

Section 1.2: Economic Feasibility Parameters

This section breaks down the financial and market-related criteria that determine if a technically viable project is also a profitable and sustainable business venture. It translates engineering designs and market forecasts into a clear financial case.

1.2.1. Capital Expenditure (CAPEX) Analysis

Capital Expenditure (CAPEX) represents the total one-time investment required to design, construct, and commission the chemical plant, bringing it to a state of commercial operation.[16] An accurate estimation of CAPEX is fundamental for securing project financing and forms the denominator in key profitability calculations like Return on Investment. CAPEX is typically concentrated in the early phases of a project, with most costs incurred before production begins and revenues are generated.[18] The estimation is generally broken down into several key categories.

Direct Costs are expenses directly associated with the physical components of the plant.[14] The largest single component of direct costs is typically the Purchased Equipment (PE) cost, which includes all process machinery such as reactors, vessels, pumps, and heat exchangers.[19] Other major direct costs include equipment installation labor and materials, instrumentation and control systems, piping (which can be a very substantial cost), electrical systems and infrastructure, process and auxiliary buildings, and site preparation activities like yard improvements.[20]

Indirect Costs are expenses that are not part of the final physical facility but are necessary for its realization.[20] These include the costs of engineering design and supervision, fees for consultants and contractors, legal expenses associated with contracts and permits, and construction overheads.[14] A crucial component of indirect costs is the contingency fund, which is an allowance for unforeseen events, design changes, or cost overruns. The size of the contingency is typically a percentage of the total direct and indirect costs and reflects the level of uncertainty in the project estimate.[20]

Other significant capital costs include the cost of land and the requirement for Working Capital.[20] Working capital is the fund needed to finance the initial inventory of raw materials, in-process materials, and finished goods, as well as to cover the gap between selling products and receiving payment (accounts receivable).[20] It is a vital component of the total investment required to start and sustain operations.

1.2.2. Operating Expenditure (OPEX) Analysis

Operating Expenditure (OPEX) encompasses all the recurring costs associated with the day-to-day running of the plant.[12] These ongoing expenses directly determine the plant's cash flow and long-term profitability. OPEX is typically categorized into variable and fixed costs.[23]

Variable Costs are manufacturing expenses that fluctuate directly with the rate of production.[14] The most significant variable costs are the raw materials and feedstocks consumed in the process. Other key variable costs include catalysts and chemicals that are used up during production, and the cost of utilities such as electricity, steam, cooling water, and fuel, which are consumed in proportion to the plant's output.[18]

Fixed Costs are expenses that remain relatively stable and do not change significantly with the production level.[23] These costs are incurred even if the plant is operating at low capacity or is temporarily shut down. Major fixed costs include the salaries and benefits for operating labor, supervision, and clerical staff.[14] Other critical fixed costs are maintenance and repairs (both labor and materials), property taxes, plant insurance, and general administrative and sales overheads.[14] These overheads can include costs for central management, legal, accounting, and R&D functions.[14]

A final, critical component often considered within the total production cost is Depreciation. Depreciation is a non-cash expense that represents the allocation of the plant's capital cost (CAPEX) over its estimated useful life.[14] While it does not involve a direct cash outlay during operation, it is a real cost of production and is essential for calculating taxable income and understanding the true economic performance of the asset.[14]

1.2.3. Market & Revenue Drivers

A project, no matter how technically sound or cost-efficient, is only feasible if a sustainable and profitable market exists for its products. The economic feasibility study must, therefore, be underpinned by a rigorous analysis of market dynamics and a realistic projection of revenues.[15]

The process begins with a comprehensive Market Analysis. This involves a detailed study of the target market, including its current size, historical and projected growth trends, and the competitive landscape.[14] It is crucial to identify key competitors, understand their market share and production costs, and assess the potential for new entrants. The analysis must also cover pricing dynamics, including historical price volatility and factors that influence price setting. For globally traded chemicals, this includes understanding regional price differences, such as the variance between prices quoted as Cost and Freight (CFR) to India versus the US Gulf Coast (GCC), as the plant's location will determine which price is most relevant.[19]

Flowing from the market analysis is a specific Demand Assessment. This step ensures that the proposed plant's production capacity is aligned with current and anticipated future demand from consumers or downstream industrial users.[15] A mismatch between production capacity and market demand can lead to either lost sales opportunities or excess inventory and price pressure.

Based on the projected production volumes from the technical study and the price forecasts from the market analysis, the final step is to develop detailed Revenue Projections.[24] This forecast of future income is the "Value of Products" that forms the top line of the project's profitability calculations.[19] The credibility of the entire economic feasibility case rests heavily on the thoroughness and realism of this market and revenue assessment.

1.2.4. Key Financial Performance Indicators (KPIs)

Key Financial Performance Indicators (KPIs) are standardized metrics that synthesize the vast amounts of data from the CAPEX, OPEX, and revenue analyses into clear, comparable measures of financial viability. They are the ultimate tools for investment appraisal, allowing stakeholders to judge a project's merit and compare it against alternative investment opportunities.[19]

The evaluation often starts with a basic Profitability Analysis to establish fundamental economic potential. This includes calculating the Gross Economic Potential (GEP), defined as the annual value of products minus the annual value of feeds. A positive GEP is a prerequisite for a viable process. This is followed by the Net Economic Potential (NEP), which is the GEP minus the annual production costs (OPEX). The NEP represents the project's annual profit before accounting for the initial capital investment.[19]

Several KPIs are used to evaluate the relationship between this net potential and the required capital investment:

- **Return on Investment (ROI):** Calculated as $ROI=(NEP/CAPEX)\times 100$, this metric expresses the annual net profit as a percentage of the initial capital cost. It provides a simple measure of how effectively the capital is being used. Most companies have a minimum acceptable ROI, often in the range of 10-20%, for a project to be considered.[19]
- **Payback Period:** This is the time required for the project's cumulative net cash inflows to equal the initial capital investment ($PaybackPeriod=CapitalInvestment/AnnualNetProfits$). It is a measure of risk and liquidity; a shorter payback period is generally preferred.[24]
- **Break-Even Point:** This analysis determines the percentage of plant capacity at which total revenues equal total costs (fixed plus variable). It is a critical measure of the project's sensitivity to sales volume and price fluctuations, indicating the margin of safety.[14]

More sophisticated KPIs that account for the time value of money are considered superior for investment decisions:

- **Net Present Value (NPV):** This is widely regarded as the most robust investment criterion. The NPV is calculated by summing the present values of all future cash flows (both inflows and outflows) over the project's lifetime, discounted at a specific rate (the required rate of return or cost of capital). A positive NPV indicates that the project is expected to generate value and exceed the required rate of return, making it financially attractive. A negative NPV indicates the project will result in a net loss.[20]
- **Internal Rate of Return (IRR):** The IRR is the discount rate at which the project's NPV becomes exactly zero. It represents the project's intrinsic rate of return. The project is considered acceptable if its IRR is greater than the company's minimum attractive rate of return (MARR) or cost of capital. The IRR is one of the most widely used methods for

evaluating and ranking projects.[23]

The following table summarizes the primary economic feasibility parameters, providing a comprehensive checklist for financial evaluation.

Parameter Category	Specific Parameter	Definition	Calculation/Formula	Key Considerations
Capital Expenditure (CAPEX)	Purchased Equipment (PE)	Cost of all major process and utility equipment.	Sum of vendor quotes for all equipment.	Forms the basis for factored cost estimates.
	Direct Costs	Costs for installing the physical plant (piping, electrical, civil, etc.).	Often estimated as factors of PE cost (e.g., piping factor f_p =0.31).	Includes installation, piping, electrical, buildings, site prep.
	Indirect Costs	Non-physical costs required for project execution.	Often estimated as factors of total direct costs (e.g., engineering factor $f_{e\&s}=0.32$).	Includes engineering, construction expenses, contractor fees, contingency.
	Working Capital	Funds for initial inventories and operational cash flow.	Typically a factor of Total Capital Investment or annual sales revenue.	Essential for start-up; often overlooked in early estimates.
Operating Expenditure (OPEX)	Raw Material Costs	Cost of all chemical feedstocks.	(Flow rate) x (Unit price).	The largest variable cost component; highly sensitive to market prices.
	Utility Costs	Cost of energy (power, fuel, steam) and water.	(Consumption rate) x (Unit price).	A major variable cost, especially for energy-intensive processes.
	Labor Costs	Salaries and benefits for operators, supervisors,	(Number of staff) x (Average loaded labor rate).	A primary fixed cost; varies significantly by region.

		and maintenance staff.		
	Fixed Costs	Costs independent of production rate.	Sum of labor, maintenance, taxes, insurance, overheads.	Determines the baseline cost of keeping the plant operational.
Market & Revenue	Product Price Forecast	Projected selling price of the plant's output over its lifetime.	Based on market analysis, historical trends, and expert forecasts.	Highly uncertain; sensitivity analysis is crucial.
	Revenue	Total annual income from sales.	(Production rate) x (Product price).	The top line of the profit and loss statement.
Financial KPIs	Net Present Value (NPV)	The sum of discounted future cash flows minus the initial investment.	∑t=1n(1+r)tCFt−C0	The primary metric for investment decisions. Positive NPV is required.
	Internal Rate of Return (IRR)	The discount rate at which NPV equals zero.	Solve for IRR in: 0=∑t=1n (1+IRR)tCFt−C0	Must exceed the company's hurdle rate (MARR).
	Return on Investment (ROI)	Annual net profit as a percentage of the total capital investment.	(NEP/CAPEX)×100	A simpler metric, but useful for quick screening.
	Payback Period	Time required to recover the initial capital investment.	CAPEX/Annual Net Cash Flow	A measure of risk and liquidity.
	Break-Even Point	Production level where total revenue equals total cost.	Point where Revenue = Fixed Costs + Variable Costs.	Indicates the project's resilience to lower sales volumes.

Part 2: Modular-Specific Feasibility Parameters

This part analyzes the unique parameters introduced by a modular construction strategy. It moves beyond the foundational assessment to evaluate the specific advantages, disadvantages, and risks associated with building a plant off-site in modules.

SECTION 2.1: MODULAR DESIGN, FABRICATION, AND EXECUTION PARAMETERS

Adopting a modular construction strategy fundamentally alters the project execution model, shifting from a traditional, sequential on-site workflow to a paradigm of parallel off-site fabrication and on-site preparation.[26] This shift necessitates a distinct set of evaluation parameters that address the unique opportunities and challenges of modularization.

The initial decision to pursue a modular versus a conventional stick-built (CSB) approach is a strategic one, driven by specific project and market characteristics. Stick-built plants are generally better suited for large-scale, high-volume commodity products with long, stable life cycles and predictable market growth.[28] In contrast, modular construction is often favored for projects where speed-to-market is critical, for smaller or more specialized product volumes, or when there is a high degree of market uncertainty, as it allows for a more flexible and phased investment.[28] The feasibility study must explicitly evaluate both construction methodologies to determine the optimal path.

A crucial parameter is the adoption of a Design for Manufacturing and Assembly (DfMA) philosophy. A modular plant is not merely a stick-built design chopped into transportable pieces. True modular design requires a fundamental rethinking of the plant layout, focusing on the creation of standardized, functional building blocks, often referred to as Process Equipment Assemblies (PEAs).[28] This approach necessitates a more intensive and detailed upfront engineering effort compared to CSB projects, as design changes become exceedingly difficult and costly once module fabrication has commenced.[26]

This design philosophy is strongly enabled by Process Intensification (PI). PI involves the use of novel technologies—such as microchannel reactors or advanced separation systems—to drastically reduce the size and footprint of process equipment.[27] The adoption of PI is not merely a technical choice but a powerful economic enabler for modularization. The causal chain is direct:

PI leads to smaller, more compact equipment, which allows for denser plant layouts. This, in turn, enables the entire process or significant portions of it to be housed within smaller, lighter, and more easily transportable modules.[31] The economic benefits are substantial, with case studies demonstrating that a Modular Chemical Process Intensification (MCPI) approach can reduce CAPEX by as much as 87% and shorten project schedules dramatically, allowing capital to be put to work faster and improving the project's Net Present Value.[31] A feasibility study for a modular plant that fails to rigorously evaluate PI opportunities is likely overlooking the most significant potential advantages of the modular approach.

The selection of the fabrication yard is another critical success factor. The yard is the manufacturing heart of the project, and its capabilities directly impact cost, schedule, and quality.[33] The feasibility assessment must include a thorough evaluation of potential fabrication yards based on criteria such as available space, heavy-lifting capacity, a proven quality control system, and access to a skilled labor force familiar with the required construction standards.[30] The choice often involves a trade-off between established international yards with extensive experience and the potential cost and logistical benefits of using a regional or local fabricator.[34] The yard's specific experience with the materials of construction and the type of modules being built is paramount.[34]

Finally, the study must meticulously plan for module interfacing and on-site installation. The success of the final assembly hinges on the precision of the off-site fabrication. High dimensional accuracy is required to ensure that the structural, piping, and electrical connections between different modules align perfectly on-site.[30] The feasibility plan must include detailed lifting and rigging plans for handling the modules and account for the need for specialized, high-capacity cranes at the final installation site, which can be a significant cost and logistical challenge.[30]

The following table provides a comparative analysis of key feasibility drivers for conventional versus modular construction.

Feasibility Parameter	Conventional Stick-Built (CSB) Approach	Modular Construction (MC) Approach	Key Trade-offs & Considerations
Project Schedule	Sequential construction: site prep, then civil, then equipment setting, then piping, etc. Vulnerable to weather delays.	Parallel execution: modules are fabricated off-site while site prep occurs simultaneously. Faster overall completion.	Speed is a primary advantage of MC, leading to faster ROI. However, MC requires more upfront engineering time.
CAPEX Structure	High on-site labor costs. Lower upfront engineering costs. Material logistics are for smaller components.	Higher fabrication and engineering costs. Reduced on-site labor costs. Significant transportation costs	MC can offer overall CAPEX savings, especially with PI, but has a different cost profile (more upfront,

		for large modules.	higher logistics).
Labor Requirements	Requires a large, skilled workforce at the project site, which can be a challenge in remote locations.	Concentrates skilled labor at the fabrication yard in a controlled environment. Fewer on-site personnel needed.	MC mitigates risks of on-site labor shortages and productivity issues, but can face opposition from on-site labor unions.
Quality Control	On-site work is subject to varying weather conditions and field inconsistencies.	Fabrication in a controlled factory environment allows for higher, more consistent quality and easier inspections (FAT).	Quality is generally a significant advantage for MC, leading to better performance and reliability.
Design Flexibility	Offers greater flexibility for design changes during the construction phase.	Design must be frozen early. Changes are very difficult and expensive once fabrication begins.	CSB is superior for projects where the design is likely to evolve. MC demands design finality.
Site Disruption	Significant and prolonged disruption at the final project site due to construction traffic, noise, and large workforce.	Minimal on-site activity until modules arrive for final assembly and hook-up. Less environmental and community impact.	MC is highly advantageous for projects on existing ("brownfield") sites or in sensitive areas.
Risk Profile	Primary risks are related to on-site construction management, labor productivity, weather, and schedule delays.	Primary risks shift to fabrication yard performance, transportation logistics, and heavy-lift operations.	MC trades on-site construction risks for off-site manufacturing and logistics risks.

SECTION 2.2: LOGISTICS AND SUPPLY CHAIN PARAMETERS FOR MODULAR PROJECTS

The supply chain for a modular project is fundamentally different from that of a stick-built one. It shifts the logistical focus from managing a continuous flow of small components and bulk materials to the site, to orchestrating the complex, single-event movement of massive, high-value, pre-assembled units, often across continents.[38] This makes logistics a paramount feasibility parameter that can dictate the viability of a modular strategy.

A critical and often underestimated parameter is the transportation and logistics feasibility. This is a potential showstopper for any modular project.[40] The feasibility study must include a detailed, end-to-end route survey from the fabrication yard to the final installation site.[39] This survey must meticulously assess every kilometer of the route, identifying and analyzing constraints such as road width, bridge load capacities, overhead power line clearances, and turning radii.[30] The cost and complexity of obtaining special transport permits for oversized or overweight modules, which can be a bureaucratic and time-consuming process, must be factored in. In many cases, the logistical challenges and associated costs can be a significant disadvantage of the modular approach, potentially offsetting the savings gained from off-site fabrication.[26]

The logistical constraints of the transport route have a direct and profound impact on the plant's design. The maximum physical dimensions and weight of a module are not determined by what is optimal for the process or what a fabricator can build, but by the single most restrictive point in the entire transportation chain—be it the lowest bridge, the weakest road section, or the capacity of the port crane. This reality means that the transport route survey is not a late-stage logistical task but a critical, early-stage input that must inform the fundamental engineering and design of the plant. If the optimal module size is too large to transport, the design must be compromised, breaking the plant into a greater number of smaller modules. This, in turn, increases the number of on-site connections, reintroducing the very on-site labor, complexity, and risk that modularization was intended to minimize, while also increasing total transport and installation costs.

Heavy-lift and installation planning is another specialized parameter. The project plan must incorporate detailed engineering studies for all heavy lifting and rigging operations, both for loading the modules at the fabrication yard and for off-loading and setting them at the final site.[30] These operations require highly specialized, large-capacity cranes and an experienced team of rigging engineers and supervisors, adding another layer of cost, complexity, and risk to the project execution plan.[39]

While the module itself is assembled in a single location, its constituent parts—specialized equipment like reactors, compressors, and advanced control systems—are often sourced from a global network of suppliers.[41] The feasibility study must therefore assess the risks inherent in this global supply chain. This includes vulnerability to raw material shortages for specialized components (e.g., certain steel alloys or resins), international shipping delays, port congestion, and geopolitical tensions that could disrupt the flow of critical equipment to the fabrication yard.[41]

Finally, the project must adhere to a complex web of international standards and local regulations. Modules and their integrated process skids must be designed and fabricated to meet both international codes (e.g., GMP for pharmaceutical facilities, ASME for pressure vessels) and the specific legal and technical requirements of the destination country.[43] A critical area of compliance is for electrical equipment and wiring in hazardous (classified) locations, which must adhere to standards like the IEC 60079 series, ATEX directives in Europe, or UL standards in the US.[45] Compliance with these myriad standards must be rigorously verified through comprehensive Factory Acceptance Tests (FAT) before the modules are approved for shipment.[43]

Part 3: Contextual Feasibility Analysis for Projects in Africa

This part provides a critical, region-specific layer of analysis, focusing on the unique and often severe challenges of executing a modular chemical plant project in Africa. In this context, non-technical and infrastructure-related risks can often outweigh traditional engineering and economic challenges, becoming the primary determinants of project feasibility.

SECTION 3.1: INFRASTRUCTURE AND OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENT PARAMETERS

The state of local infrastructure in many parts of Africa is a primary constraint that directly impacts project feasibility. It dictates not only CAPEX, through the potential need to build proprietary infrastructure, but also OPEX, through the unreliability of essential services. For modular projects, the infrastructure deficit can be a go/no-go factor for the entire logistics plan.

Power grid stability and availability represent a major challenge across the continent. Africa faces a significant power deficit, with over 600 million people lacking access to electricity, and industrial users in many nations contend with frequent outages and an unstable grid.[46] While efforts are underway to integrate renewable energy and gas-to-power projects to enhance grid stability, these are long-term solutions, and near-term reliability remains a concern.[46] A feasibility study for a project in Africa must therefore include a country-specific assessment of grid reliability, analyzing data on outage frequency and duration. It must realistically assess the need for a dedicated captive (on-site) power plant to ensure uninterrupted operations. While this provides reliability, it also adds a very significant burden to the project's CAPEX.[46]

The capability of the transportation network is arguably the single greatest physical challenge for modular projects in Africa. Many of the continent's major ports suffer from outdated infrastructure, limited berth space for large vessels, inefficient cargo-handling equipment, and severe congestion, which can lead to significant and unpredictable delays in off-loading modules.[49] Inland, road networks are often underdeveloped, poorly maintained, and not designed to handle the extreme weight and dimensions of large process modules.[50] The feasibility study must therefore go beyond a desktop review and include a detailed, on-the-ground survey of the entire route from the port of entry to the final plant site.

This infrastructure deficit has an amplifying effect on the inherent risks of a modular strategy. In a developed market, the benefits of modularization—speed and cost savings from off-site work—are often clear. In an African context, these benefits can be quickly eroded or even reversed. The high cost and extreme risk of transporting a large module over poor infrastructure may necessitate expensive and time-consuming upgrades to roads and bridges, negating the anticipated savings.

The severe delays at congested ports can eliminate the schedule advantage over a stick-built approach. This reality forces a critical strategic re-evaluation. A project team might conclude that the logistical risks of large modules are unacceptably high. This could lead to a decision to design smaller, containerized modules that are easier to transport, or in some cases, to revert to a conventional stick-built approach where smaller, individual components can more easily navigate the weak infrastructure links.[51] The feasibility study must therefore perform a rigorous, quantitative risk analysis of the logistics chain, explicitly calculating the "cost of infrastructure" to make an informed decision.

Beyond power and transport, the availability of other utility infrastructure, such as municipal water supply and waste treatment facilities, is often limited, particularly in the remote rural areas where many resource-based projects are located.[37] The project may need to become self-sufficient, investing in its own water sourcing and purification systems and waste management facilities, adding further to the capital cost.[52] Finally, in many regions, political instability and security threats necessitate significant investment in physical site security to protect both personnel and high-value assets.[5]

The following table outlines a risk assessment framework for the key infrastructure and environmental parameters in an African context.

Risk Parameter	Specific Challenge in African Context	Assessment Metrics	Potential Impact on Modular Project	Mitigation Strategy
Power Supply	Unreliable Grid / Frequent Outages	Grid Uptime (%); Frequency/Duration of Blackouts; Cost of Grid Power ($/kWh).	Production downtime; damage to sensitive equipment. Forces high CAPEX for captive power.	Invest in a captive power plant (gas, diesel, or renewables). Integrate hybrid and storage solutions.
Transportation	Port Congestion & Inefficiency	Average vessel waiting time; container handling rate; customs clearance time.	Severe schedule delays for module arrival, eroding the primary benefit of modularization.	Select less congested ports if possible; build significant schedule float; engage expert local logistics partners.
	Road & Bridge Infrastructure	Road load capacity (tons); bridge clearance (meters); road	Inability to transport large modules, forcing costly design	Conduct detailed, on-the-ground route surveys early in design. Design

		surface condition.	changes (more, smaller modules) or road/bridge upgrades.	modules to fit transport constraints ("logistics-led design").
Utilities	Lack of Reliable Water Supply	Availability and quality of local water sources (river flow rates, groundwater levels).	Requirement to build and operate proprietary water sourcing, treatment, and storage facilities, increasing CAPEX and OPEX.	Develop on-site water sources (wells) and treatment plants. Implement extensive water recycling.
Site Conditions	Remote Location / Lack of Services	Distance to nearest town/services; quality of telecommunications.	Difficulty in sourcing labor and services; higher logistics costs; need for on-site worker accommodation and facilities.	Modular construction is well-suited for remote sites, providing self-contained housing and offices.
	Security Threats	Regional political stability index; history of conflict or crime in the area.	Risk to personnel and assets, requiring significant spending on security measures (fencing, guards, surveillance).	Develop a comprehensive security plan with expert consultants; engage with local community and authorities.

SECTION 3.2: SOCIO-POLITICAL, LEGAL, AND HUMAN CAPITAL PARAMETERS

These so-called "soft" risks are often the most difficult to quantify but can be the most potent source of project delay and failure in the African context. A feasibility study that focuses solely on technical and economic numbers without a deep, nuanced understanding of the socio-political environment is fundamentally flawed.

Political and macroeconomic stability is a paramount concern for any major foreign direct investment (FDI) in Africa.[53] The continent has experienced numerous military coups and significant civil unrest in recent years, and the risk of abrupt and adverse policy reversals by new governments is high.[54] Such instability is a major deterrent to long-term capital commitments, especially for large, fixed-asset projects like chemical plants.[54] The economic risks are equally severe. Countries grappling with hyperinflation and dramatic currency depreciation, such as Zimbabwe, Sudan, and Nigeria, present enormous challenges for forecasting returns and repatriating profits.[54] High levels of sovereign debt in many nations also limit the government's ability to invest in supportive infrastructure and can lead to austerity measures that dampen economic activity.[54] A thorough political risk analysis is therefore an essential component of the feasibility study, and the project's financial model must incorporate mitigation strategies, such as securing political risk insurance from agencies like the World Bank's MIGA.[53]

Navigating the legal and regulatory framework is another complex challenge. Chemical-specific regulations, such as South Africa's Hazardous Substances Act, vary significantly from one country to another and may be less developed or transparent than in other regions.[55] A critical gap for modular projects is the common lack of specific design codes, standards, and permitting processes for modular construction in many developing countries.[56] This creates significant uncertainty and potential for compliance issues and delays during the building inspection and approval phases.

Local Content Requirements (LCRs) are a major and increasingly prevalent feature of the legal landscape for industrial projects across Africa.[57] Governments, through legislation like South Africa's Preferential Procurement Regulations or specific clauses in mining charters, mandate that projects meet specific quotas for hiring local citizens and procuring goods and services from local suppliers.[57] This presents a significant challenge, or a paradox, for high-tech modular chemical plant projects. The core of a modular plant consists of highly specialized, engineered process systems and equipment that are typically sourced from a limited number of expert global suppliers.[41] The assembly of the module itself is a complex task requiring a fabrication yard with advanced capabilities and certifications that are often not available locally.[56] This creates a fundamental gap between the government's LCR mandate and the project's technical and quality requirements. An investor often cannot comply simply by "buying local." This reality transforms the project's feasibility study. It forces the investor to proactively negotiate a detailed and bespoke Local Content Plan with the host government.[57] This plan must go beyond simple procurement and demonstrate a commitment to building local capacity. It typically includes significant investments in training programs to upskill the local workforce, supplier development initiatives to help local companies meet the required standards for less complex goods and services, and other contributions to community development. The cost of this entire "compliance package" must be treated as a direct and material project expense and be fully integrated into the CAPEX and OPEX estimates.

This leads directly to the challenge of workforce skills and availability. A significant barrier to industrial development in many African nations is the shortage of a locally available, trained, and skilled workforce, from certified welders and pipefitters to process technicians and engineers.[56] This skills gap means projects often have to rely on a higher number of expensive expatriate staff, particularly during the construction and commissioning phases, and must budget for extensive local training programs to ensure the long-term operability of the plant.[57]

Finally, gaining and maintaining a "social license to operate" through effective community and stakeholder engagement is critical for long-term success. Projects that fail to engage with local communities and manage expectations can face protests, disruptions, and political opposition that can delay or even derail the entire investment.[57] The feasibility study must include a stakeholder management plan and budget for community development initiatives as a core part of the project's risk mitigation strategy.

Part 4: Integrated Feasibility Assessment and Strategic Recommendations

This concluding part synthesizes the preceding parameters into a holistic decision-making framework and provides actionable recommendations for de-risking modular chemical plant projects, with a specific focus on the complex African operating environment.

SECTION 4.1: THE INTEGRATED FEASIBILITY MATRIX

To move from a qualitative analysis to a quantitative decision-making tool, an integrated feasibility matrix is an invaluable instrument. This tool allows for a systematic and transparent comparison of different project scenarios—for example, a fully modular plant in Nigeria versus a hybrid modular/stick-built plant in Botswana. The methodology involves listing all the critical feasibility parameters identified in this report, assigning a numerical score (e.g., on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 is most favorable) to each parameter based on the detailed assessment for that specific scenario, and then applying a weighting factor to each parameter. The weighting factor reflects the project's unique strategic priorities. For instance, a project focused on rapid market entry would assign a high weight to "Project Schedule," while a project in a politically volatile region would assign a high weight to "Political & Macroeconomic Stability." The sum of the weighted scores for each scenario provides a quantitative basis for comparison, facilitating a more objective and robust investment decision.

SECTION 4.2: STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROJECT DE-RISKING IN THE AFRICAN CONTEXT

The comprehensive analysis of the unique challenges in Africa gives rise to several strategic recommendations designed to mitigate risk and enhance the probability of success for modular chemical plant projects on the continent.

- **Embrace Phased Investment and Scalability:** One of the key advantages of modularization is the ability to "number-up"—that is, to scale production by adding identical, pre-engineered modules or process trains.[27] In the high-risk African environment, this capability should be leveraged as a core de-risking strategy. Instead of a single, large-scale upfront investment, projects should be planned with a phased approach. Start with a smaller initial plant (e.g., one or two process trains) to test the market, prove the technology in the local context, and resolve initial logistical and operational hurdles. This minimizes the initial capital at risk. If the initial phase is successful, the plant can be scaled up by fabricating and installing additional modules, with the confidence gained from the initial deployment.[27]
- **Adopt Hybrid Construction Models:** A "pure" modular approach, where the entire plant is

fabricated off-site, may not always be optimal in the African context due to logistical constraints and Local Content Requirements. A more pragmatic approach is often a hybrid construction model. The most complex, technology-intensive parts of the plant—the core process skids where quality control is paramount—can be fabricated as modules in a specialized international yard. Simpler, bulkier infrastructure components, such as foundations, buildings, storage tanks, and pipe racks, can be constructed on-site using conventional stick-built methods and local labor and materials. This hybrid strategy can optimize the project by balancing the quality and speed benefits of modularization for critical systems with the logistical simplicity and LCR compliance benefits of local construction for ancillary infrastructure.

- **Institute a "Logistics-Led Design" Philosophy:** The logistical challenges in Africa are so significant that they must be treated as a primary design input, not a downstream planning task. The project team should embed logistics experts from the very beginning of the conceptual design phase. A detailed, on-the-ground transportation route survey should be one of the first activities undertaken. The findings from this survey—the maximum permissible weight and dimensions that can be safely and reliably transported from the port to the site—should dictate the fundamental design parameters for the modules. This "logistics-led design" approach ensures that the plant is designed for deliverability from day one, avoiding costly and time-consuming redesigns later in the project.
- **Develop a Proactive LCR and Human Capital Strategy:** Local Content Requirements should not be viewed as a mere compliance hurdle to be addressed late in the process. The LCR compliance plan must be developed as a core component of the overall project strategy and budget. This involves proactively identifying opportunities for local procurement, even if it requires investment in developing local suppliers. Crucially, the plan must include a robust human capital development element. Partnering with local technical colleges and vocational training institutions to create tailored programs to build a pipeline of skilled local technicians and operators should be seen as a long-term investment that reduces reliance on expensive expatriates, builds local goodwill, and creates sustainable value for the host country.[57]
- **Implement a Multi-Layered Financial and Political Risk Mitigation Plan:** Given the high levels of political and economic volatility in many parts of the continent, a comprehensive risk mitigation plan is essential. Project financing should be structured, where possible, with the involvement of Development Finance Institutions (DFIs) and Multilateral Investment Agencies (like the World Bank's MIGA), which bring regional expertise, political leverage, and risk mitigation products.[53] Securing comprehensive political risk insurance is a critical step to protect the investment against the most severe risks, such as expropriation, currency inconvertibility, and political violence.[54] This multi-layered approach provides a crucial buffer against the uncertainties of operating in these challenging but potentially rewarding markets.

REFERENCES

1. Site condition and design - processdesign, accessed June 15, 2025, https://design.cbe.cornell.edu/index.php?title=Site_condition_and_design
2. Lecture 7 Selection of Site For Chemical Plant | PDF | Combustion - Scribd, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.scribd.com/presentation/456824628/Lecture-7-Selection-of-Site-for-Chemical-Plant
3. Introduction To Chemical Engineering Plant Design: Chapter 2: Site Selection - Scribd, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.scribd.com/presentation/467193980/2-0-Site-selection-and-case-study-2
4. Project Feasibility Studies | Bechtel, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.bechtel.com/markets/energy/liquefied-natural-gas/feasibility-studies/
5. Site Selection for Process Plants | OwnerTeamConsultation, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.ownerteamconsult.com/site-selection-for-process-plants/
6. Process location and layout decisions - processdesign, accessed June 15, 2025, https://design.cbe.cornell.edu/index.php?title=Process_location_and_layout_decisions
7. Oil And Chemical Plant Layout And Spacing - AXA XL, accessed June 15, 2025, https://axaxl.com/-/media/axaxl/files/pdfs/prc-guidelines/prc-2/prc252oilandchemicalplantlayoutandspacingv1.pdf?sc_lang=en&hash=996EA28071174510C4DA5D35102A9222
8. 7 Assessing the Technical Feasibility - PPP Certification, accessed June 15, 2025, https://ppp-certification.com/ppp-certification-guide/7-assessing-technical-feasibility
9. Technology Selection For A Chemical Process Guidelines | PDF ..., accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.scribd.com/document/470338304/Technology-Selection-for-a-Chemical-Process-Guidelines
10. Recap of the SELECT Criteria - ACS GCI Pharmaceutical Roundtable, accessed June 15, 2025, https://learning.acsgcipr.org/process-design/route-selection/recap-of-the-select-criteria/
11. Process and plant design CHE432, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.kau.edu.sa/Files/0060757/Subjects/Plant%20design%20CHEN%20451.pdf
12. Feasibility Study - Unitel Technologies, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.uniteltech.com/feasibility-study/
13. What Is Process Design in Chemical Engineering? - Advanced ChemTech, accessed June 15, 2025, https://advancedchemtech.com/process-design-in-chemical-engineering/
14. RECOMMENDED PRACTICE FOR FEASIBILITIES STUDIES (PROJECT STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS), accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.klmtechgroup.com/PDF/ess/PROJECT_STANDARDS_AND_SPECIFICATIONS_fesibiliy_studies_Rev01.1.pdf
15. A Guide to Technical Feasibility and Conceptualization in Industrial Projects - Kewaunee, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.kewaunee.in/blog/a-guide-to-technical-feasibility-and-conceptualization-in-industrial-projects/
16. www.deskera.com, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.deskera.com/blog/a-guide-to-chemical-process-design-and-optimization/#:~:text=Economic%20Feasibility,-In%20addition%20to&text=Here%20are%20some%20key%20factors,to%20cover%20the%20capital%20costs.
17. Conducting Pre-Feasibility Studies for CMM Projects: Module 1, accessed June 15, 2025, https://globalmethane.org/training/CMM_module1/story.html

18. ESTIMATING MANUFACTURING COSTS FOR PRE-COMMERCIAL TECHNOLOGIES - Department of Energy, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2023-01/2022-11-29%20-%20Mfg%20Costs%20PDF%20%281%29_0.pdf
19. Basic Economic Analysis – Foundations of Chemical and Biological Engineering I, accessed June 15, 2025, https://pressbooks.bccampus.ca/chbe220/chapter/basic-economic-analysis/
20. Minimum Production Scale for Economic Feasibility of a Titanium Dioxide Plant - ResearchGate, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/journal/Journal-of-Advanced-Manufacturing-and-Processing-2637-403X/publication/372949004_Minimum_production_scale_for_economic_feasibility_of_a_titanium_dioxide_plant/links/664b1685bc86444c72eef0e7/Minimum-production-scale-for-economic-feasibility-of-a-titanium-dioxide-plant.pdf?origin=journalDetail
21. Common CAPEX and OPEX costs in chemical plants. - ResearchGate, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Common-CAPEX-and-OPEX-costs-in-chemical-plants_tbl4_356670206
22. Understanding the Basics of CAPEX, SUSCAP and OPEX | InEight, accessed June 15, 2025, https://ineight.com/blog/understanding-the-basics-of-capex-suscap-and-opex/
23. How to Calculate Economic Evaluation in Industrial Chemical Plant Design: A Case Study of Gold Mining Using Amalgamation Method, accessed June 15, 2025, https://ejournal.bumipublikasinusantara.id/index.php/ajsem/article/download/414/338
24. Fundamental Principles of Feasibility Study in Engineering Projects - ResearchGate, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/382060398_Fundamental_Principles_of_Feasibility_Study_in_Engineering_Projects
25. Economic Feasibility: Examples & Methods | StudySmarter, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.studysmarter.co.uk/explanations/architecture/real-estate/economic-feasibility/
26. Modular construction advantages and disadvantages - H+M Industrial EPC, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.hm-ec.com/blog-posts/modular-construction-advantages-and-disadvantages-hm
27. Economic Risk Analysis for the Capture of a Distributed Energy Resource using Modular Chemical Process Intensification - OSTI, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.osti.gov/servlets/purl/2274899
28. Cost Engineering for Modular Plants - Dechema, accessed June 15, 2025, https://dechema.de/Cost_Engineering_for_Modular_Plants/_/2024.11.14%20Cost%20Engineering%20for%20Modular%20Plants%20FINAL.pdf
29. Stick-Built Vs. Modular Construction: A comparison - Converge, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.converge.io/blog/modular-vs-traditional-construction
30. Modular construction: Pros and cons - BBA, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.bbaconsultants.com/publications/modular-construction-pros-and-cons
31. Miniaturization of Processing Equipment: - NWCCC, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.nwccc.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/Process-Miniaturization-Presentation.pdf
32. How Modular Chemical Process Intensification Compares with Conventional Approaches, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.construction-institute.org/how-modular-chemical-process-intensification-compares-with-conventional-approaches

33. A Guide to Modular Fabrication - ENG, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.englobal.com/a-guide-to-modular-fabrication/
34. Off-Site and Modular Construction Explained | WBDG - Whole Building Design Guide, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.wbdg.org/resources/site-and-modular-construction-explained
35. Modular Building Planning – Site Selection, Delivery and Installation - iModular.com, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.imodular.com/site-selection-delivery-and-installation/
36. Cost Engineering for Modular Plants - Dechema, accessed June 15, 2025, https://dechema.de/dechema_media/Downloads/Positionspapiere/2024_09_16+Cost+Engineering+for+Modular+Plants+FINAL-p-20010584.pdf
37. How modular solutions are transforming the construction industry in SA - Quarrying Africa, accessed June 15, 2025, https://quarryingafrica.com/how-modular-solutions-are-transforming-the-construction-industry-in-sa/
38. Navigating the Complexities of Chemical Logistics - Intrinsically Safe Store, accessed June 15, 2025, https://intrinsicallysafestore.com/blog/logistics-in-chemical-industry/
39. Project Logistics - LOGISTEED America, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.logisteed-america.com/service/project-logistics/
40. www.hm-ec.com, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.hm-ec.com/blog-posts/modular-construction-advantages-and-disadvantages-hm#:~:text=Design%20and%20Size%20Limitations%3A%20Modules,across%20jurisdictions%20can%20be%20complex.
41. Supply Chain Management in Chemical & Petrochemical Industry - Net Result Group, accessed June 15, 2025, https://netresultsgroup.com/supply-chain-management-in-chemical-and-petrochemical-manufacturing-industry/
42. Overcoming Common Chemical Supply Chain Challenges - Capital Resin Corporation, accessed June 15, 2025, https://capitalresin.com/overcoming-common-chemical-supply-chain-challenges/
43. Process skids | Keyplants.com, accessed June 15, 2025, https://keyplants.com/modular-solutions/process-skids
44. Modular Process Skids - Praj Industries, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.praj.net/businesslines/modular-process-skids/
45. Assemblies, Skids and Machinery in Oil and Gas Compliance Services | UL Solutions, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.ul.com/services/assemblies-skids-and-machinery-oil-and-gas-compliance-services
46. Powering the Future: Energy Leaders to Tackle Africa's Grid ..., accessed June 15, 2025, https://energycapitalpower.com/powering-the-future-energy-leaders-to-tackle-africas-grid-challenges-at-iae-2025/
47. Top 10 African Countries with Stable Power Supply in 2025, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.africanexponent.com/top-10-african-countries-with-stable-power-supply-in-2025/
48. Africa: Interconnected power systems key to energy security aims, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.esi-africa.com/industry-sectors/transmission-and-distribution/africa-interconnected-power-systems-key-to-energy-security-aims/
49. The Role of Ports in Africa: Modernization of Transport and Load Management Services, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.reloadlogistics.com/news/the-role-of-ports-in-africa-

modernization-of-transport-and-load-management-services
50. Addressing Port Congestion: Overcoming Logistical Challenges in South Africa's Fruit Export Industry - Hortgro, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.hortgro.co.za/news/addressing-port-congestion-overcoming-logistical-challenges-in-south-africas-fruit-export-industry/
51. Modular Plants are on the rise in the South African Mining Arena - ProProcess Engineering, accessed June 15, 2025, https://proprocesseps.com/blog/modular-plants-are-on-the-rise-in-the-south-african-mining-arena/
52. Prefabricated Modular Buildings: Revolutionising Mining Infrastructure in Africa, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.afripanels.co.za/prefabricated-modular-buildings-revolutionising-mining-infrastructure-in-africa/
53. 25th AU Summit: Political risk and FDI in Africa - SAIIA, accessed June 15, 2025, https://saiia.org.za/research/25th-au-summit-political-risk-and-fdi-in-africa/
54. Cutting Through The Complexities Of FDI In ... - Bridgewater Advisors, accessed June 15, 2025, https://bridgewatergh.com/blog/cutting-through-the-complexities-of-fdi-in-africa-political-and-economic-risks
55. common regulation Africa - Gpcgateway, accessed June 15, 2025, https://gpcgateway.com/common/regulation/Mzk-/QWZyaWNh/MQ--
56. (PDF) Barriers to modular construction systems implementation in developing countries' architecture, engineering and construction industry - ResearchGate, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/369067249_Barriers_to_modular_construction_systems_implementation_in_developing_countries'_architecture_engineering_and_construction_industry
57. Trends in local content requirements for mining and infrastructure ..., accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.hoganlovells.com/en/publications/trends-in-local-content-requirements-for-mining-and-infrastructure-projects-in-ohada-member-states
58. Access2Markets Barrier: Local Content Requirements - European Commission's trade, accessed June 15, 2025, https://trade.ec.europa.eu/access-to-markets/en/barriers/details?isSps=false&barrier_id=12300
59. Occupational Certificate: Chemical Production Machine Operator - CHIETA, accessed June 15, 2025, https://chieta.org.za/about-us/what-we-do/research-skills-planning/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Qualification-Document-2.pdf
60. chemical engineer - Panda.org, accessed June 15, 2025, https://wwfafrica.awsassets.panda.org/downloads/waste_career_cards_print_ready.pdf
61. Modular method of construction in developing countries: the underlying challenges | Request PDF - ResearchGate, accessed June 15, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/354339308_Modular_method_of_construction_in_developing_countries_the_underlying_challenges