

This article is published in the journal '*Technology in Society*'

Kalbar, P. P., Karmakar, S., & Asolekar, S. R. (2012).
Technology assessment for wastewater treatment using
multiple-attribute decision-making. *Technology in Society*,
34(4), 295-302.
Doi: 10.1016/j.techsoc.2012.10.001

Technology Assessment for Wastewater Treatment using Multiple-Attribute Decision-Making

Abstract:

A framework for technology assessment for wastewater treatment is proposed in this work. A case study of technology selection for high rise buildings in urban centres of India is considered for evaluation. The multiple-attribute decision-making technique is used for ranking the alternatives. Three most commonly used wastewater treatment technologies viz., activated sludge process (ASP), sequencing batch reactors (SBR) and membrane bio-reactor (MBR) are evaluated. Seven criteria having indicators derived from life cycle assessment (LCA), life cycle costing (LCC) and criteria accounting for resource constraints, robustness of the system and sustainability are used for the evaluations. The technology assessment framework used in this work will help identify appropriate wastewater treatment technologies for various decision-making situations encountered while managing wastewaters.

Key words: Technology assessment; Multiple-attribute decision-making; Wastewater treatment; Sustainability assessment; Appropriate technology

Introduction:

Water resources management in the past few decades has focused on meeting needs of the community by directly harnessing natural resources. Newer approaches in water resources management incorporate concepts like sustainable development, life cycle assessment and public participation. Water recycling has been emerging lately as an attractive option where the current water supply through natural resources is already exhausted and cannot meet the demands of urban and industrial development.

Furthermore, wastewater management is one of the biggest challenges faced by developing countries like India. It is estimated that about 36,600 million litres per day (MLD) of domestic wastewater is generated from urban centres in India [1].

However, the treatment capacity available for domestic wastewater is only for 11,500 MLD. These values show that, there is a big gap in the treatment needs for domestic wastewater. In the coming years, the government of India has a mandate to fill this gap through investing in wastewater treatment technologies.

In India water resources have not been utilized efficiently. The available quantity of water is sufficient to cater to the human population in the entire country. For each type of use, the same quality of water (*i.e.* drinking quality of water) is used. The best management practice is to provide a different quality of water for various purposes.

For example water used for toilet flushing or land irrigation can be easily obtained from treating sewage. The matter is more serious concerning the wrong choice of technologies for wrong situations. Increasingly, metropolitan municipalities are gravitating toward multiple locations for the treatment of wastewater as opposed to the practice of pumping all the sewage to a centralized location and providing a mega treatment facility. It has been concluded by Arceivala and Asolekar [2] that the cost effectiveness of wastewater collection, transportation, pumping, treatment and

46 disposal can in fact be optimized by offering treatment after the localized collection of
47 wastewater (10-100 MLD capacity) through treatment plants planned all over
48 landscape of large metropolitan area and the cluster of several suburban communities.

49 Recently in India, the advanced wastewater treatment technologies such as
50 sequencing batch reactors (SBR) and membrane bio-reactor (MBR) are gaining
51 preference. However, the treated water generated from these high-tech plants are
52 disposed off in nearby surface water bodies. This good quality treated water could be
53 very easily put back into the urban water cycle by providing minimal further treatment
54 along with disinfection. This situation suggests that there is a need for decision
55 support to the urban local bodies (municipal corporations, municipal councils) and
56 developmental authorities so that the appropriate kind of technology can be selected
57 for a given situation and problem.

58 The eminent challenge in wastewater management lies in the selection of the best
59 available technology for a particular type of wastewater treatment objective. The
60 selection of wastewater treatment technology is a multi-criteria analysis task. Many
61 factors (criteria) are involved in the decision-making process, and data is available
62 only for a few of these criteria. There can be many candidate technologies for treating
63 particular type of wastewater. Therefore, selecting the “appropriate technology” is the
64 biggest challenge faced by experts in the wastewater management.

65 The concept of “appropriate technology” was firstly introduced by E.F. Schumacher,
66 a British Economist in his famous book *Small Is Beautiful* [3]. The early perception
67 about appropriate technology was limited to include technologies which are small-
68 scale, labor intensive, low capital investment per worker, energy efficient,

69 environmentally sound, and controlled and maintained by the local community [4].
70 However, with the present development targets it is essential to revisit the notion of
71 appropriate technology and include some more properties or characteristics to
72 appropriate technology definition.

73 Recently, Murphy, McBean and Farahbakhsh [4] presented a comprehensive approach
74 for appropriate technology for water and sanitation in developing world. Study
75 reported that in the context of water and sanitation and for that matter any appropriate
76 technology, the definition of appropriate technology does not limit only to physical
77 properties (reported as hard aspects) of the technology but it also include the
78 knowledge transfer mechanisms, capacity building and communication methods as
79 well as social, cultural, and gender implications of technology implementation
80 (reported as soft aspects). Study defined appropriate technology as a strategy that
81 enables men and women to rise out of poverty and increase their economic situation
82 by meeting their basic needs, through developing their own skills and capabilities
83 while making use of their available resources in an environmentally friendly manner.
84 Based on this theoretical foundation, the concept of appropriate technology can be
85 expanded beyond the conventional definition and it can be argued that it is not
86 technology which is appropriate but rather the situation which determines the
87 “appropriateness” of the technology [4]. This theory has been validated in the present
88 study by developing a technology assessment framework for wastewater treatment.

89 A high-tech mechanized technology can be appropriate for a given situation
90 depending upon the factors such as the technological level of the community, labor
91 and resource availability. In the context of wastewater treatment technologies, the
92 concept of appropriate technology needs to be understood more deeply and re-defined

more clearly so that selection of technology will be more rational. The success of implementation and operation of public sanitation facilities including wastewater treatment plants depends upon many stakeholders such as community, urban local bodies and technical experts (who devise a treatment strategy for a particular situation).

This highlights the need to develop a decision support tool that can help decision makers to select appropriate technology from available wastewater treatment technologies. The decision support tool should provide the rationale behind selecting the appropriate technology based on the decisive factors such as sustainability, life cycle assessment (LCA) and life cycle costing (LCC). The multicriteria decision-making techniques can be efficiently used to evaluate the alternatives.

1.1 Multiple-attribute decision-making application for wastewater treatment technology selection

Multicriteria decision-making (MCDM) deals with continuous and discrete problems encountered to select the best strategy or alternative. The MCDM methods use a structured and logical approach to model complex decision-making problems. Hwang and Masud [5] distinguish MCDMs into mainly two categories – multiple-attribute decision-making (MADM) and multiple objective decision-making (MODM).

Discrete decision problems involving a finite set of alternatives are handled by MADMs. There are well defined alternatives available in MADMs which have to be evaluated using a set of attributes. MODM deals with continuous decision problems involving an infinite number of feasible alternatives. In MODM, the alternatives are not predetermined; rather the alternatives have to be developed using MODMs.

MODM methods are multiple objective mathematical programming models in which

a set of conflicting objectives are optimized and subjected to a set of mathematically defined constraints. In the present study, the problem is of a discrete nature, hence the MADM approach is adopted to solve the problem.

MADM has wide applications in environmental decision-making problems. Kiker, Bridges, Varghese, Seager, and Linkov [6] and Huang, Keisler, and Linkov [7] give a comprehensive review of application of multicriteria decision analysis in environmental decision-making. MADM approach has also been used to address the problem of wastewater treatment alternative selection. Tecle, Fogel, and Duckstein [8] firstly applied MADM for selection of wastewater treatment alternative. Three MADM methods, namely, compromise programming (CP), corporative game theory (CGT) and ELECTRE-I were used for the analysis. All three methods produced the same alternative as the most preferred alternative based on 10 criteria used in the study. This study does not take into consideration energy requirements and many other sustainability criteria for the selection. The Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) was used by Ellis and Tang [9] to build a hierarchy model to rank wastewater treatment alternatives which were tested using four wastewater treatment plant data [10]. Twenty criteria were used and eight alternatives were evaluated. These studies show that efforts have been made to address the problem of wastewater treatment alternative selection. However, the indicators or attributes derived from LCA and LCC have not been used in decision-making. There is no rational framework of technology assessment which will identify the appropriate technology for variety of decision situations encountered while selecting wastewater treatment technologies.

1.2 Problem definition

The wastewater treatment technology selection is a multidimensional problem. The decisive factors are decided based on which technology to select. These factors should truly quantify the appropriateness of the technology for the considered situation of decision-making. In this study, a framework for technology assessment for wastewater treatment technologies is developed. The framework will help in selecting the appropriate technologies for various situations encountered while managing wastewaters. A case study of technology selection for high rise buildings situated in the urban centres of India is analyzed. Due to increased growth in the urban centres in India there is fresh water scarcity. Therefore, it is becoming mandatory for high rise buildings to go for recycling of domestic wastewater and use it for the secondary purposes such as toilet flushing, car washing, fire fighting and air conditioning. The three most commonly used wastewater treatment technologies the activated sludge process (ASP), sequencing batch reactors (SBR) and membrane bio-reactor (MBR), are evaluated for assessing appropriateness for this decision situation. The multiple-attribute decision-making technique is used for ranking the alternatives in the context of this decision situation. Seven criteria having indicators derived from life cycle assessment (LCA), life cycle costing (LCC) and criteria accounting for resource constraints, robustness of the system and sustainability are used in the evaluations. Table 1 gives the list of criteria used in this research along with respective indicators. The sustainability indicators and indicators quantifying the robustness of the system have also been incorporated in the decision-making process.

2. Methodology:

Wastewater management is a comprehensive process which includes identifying the need for the wastewater treatment, selecting appropriate technologies to meet the

need, implementing the selected technology and making sure that the technology is operating to produce the desired results. In this study, a technology assessment framework is developed to address the problem of selecting appropriate technologies.

In India, technologies are selected based on past experience and there is no rational framework available to select the wastewater treatment technologies. Selection of appropriate technology is the first step towards achieving sustainability. The incorporation of aspects of sustainability in an environmental decision-making process is challenging because there are many methodological issues in quantifying sustainability. Various qualitative and quantitative criteria and attributes / indicators, which capture technical, economic, and societal priorities, have been developed by researchers to quantify the sustainability of technologies [11,12,13,14], which will help in making appropriate environmental choices.

Arceivala and Asolekar [2] outlined three key tests of ‘affordability, acceptability and manageability’, to be met by a process or treatment defined as “Appropriate Technology” for wastewater treatment. The following are the key tests:

1. The *Affordability Criteria* addresses the community’s financial ability as well as the land and energy requirement availability with the community for which the treatment plant to be constructed.
2. The *Acceptability Criteria* accounts for parameters such as treatment efficiency, performance of the technology, and operational issues (such as odor problems in the local vicinity).

3. The *Manageability Criteria* accounts for factors such as the operation and maintenance of the plant and the required skill level of the plant operator.

In order to quantify the technologies on the basis of these three key tests, it is essential to incorporate newer elements of technology assessments such as LCA, LCC and the sustainability criteria. The proposed technology assessment framework for selection of appropriate wastewater treatment alternative is shown in Fig. 1. The first task in the technology assessment problem is to identify the criteria and their indicators based on which technologies will be evaluated. The selected criteria and indicators are then used to prioritize all the important characteristics of the technologies such as resources consumption, environmental footprint and sustainability.

To characterize the environmental performance of the technology, LCA is the best suited tool. LCA has been widely used for evaluations of the wastewater treatment technologies. LCA captures impacts associated with resource consumption and emissions caused by any given technology for treating the wastewater over the life cycle. However, it does not take into consideration any cost related criteria. Life cycle costing (LCC) specifically deals with the cost issue. All the costs incurred over the life cycle of a technology such as capital cost and operation and maintenance costs can be represented by using a single indicator known as net present worth (NPW).

The sustainability criteria attempts to account for the local, regional priorities, and institutional aspects. This criteria also quantifies whether the technology is suitable for a given decision situation. Conventionally, sustainability is assessed using the following criteria (indicators): environmental (e.g., quality of effluent, quality of sludge), economic (e.g., capital costs, operation and maintenance costs),

208 and societal (e.g., public participation, acceptability) [11,12,13,14]. In the
209 methodology proposed in this research, environmental criteria are substituted with
210 LCA and economic criteria are substituted with LCC.

211 It is necessary to use a mathematical framework to aggregate the above criteria
212 (indicators) and then rank the alternatives based on these criteria. MADM is the most
213 widely used approach for processing such information. MADM deals with discrete
214 problems where a finite set of alternatives are evaluated based on pre-defined criteria
215 and indicators. Large numbers of MADM methods are available in the literature for
216 ranking the alternatives such as the weighted sum method, the Analytical Hierarchy
217 Process (AHP), compromise programming, technique for order preference by
218 similarity to ideal solutions (TOPSIS), and outranking methods (ELECTRE,
219 PROMETHEE). A comprehensive review of MADM methods can be found in
220 Hwang and Yoon [15]. The recent development and classification are reported by
221 Figueira, Salvatore, and Ehrgott [16].

222 TOPSIS was selected as the method to solve this decision-making problem
223 because the available information on attributes is on a cardinal scale. Furthermore, the
224 TOPSIS algorithm can be readily implemented computationally and made available as
225 a decision support tool for the end users - a critical issue in the decision-making
226 process. The target end users may be engineers from urban local bodies, officials from
227 developmental authorities, policy makers, and planning officials.

228 TOPSIS ranks or scores a finite number of alternatives $A_i = (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m)$, based
229 on a set of attributes/criteria/indicators, $X_j = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$. The information

available from the decision makers can be represented in the form of matrix called a decision matrix which is shown below.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{Criteria / Attributes} \\
 \begin{array}{cccccccc}
 & X_1 & X_2 & X_3 & \cdots & X_j & \cdots & X_n \\
 \text{Alternatives / Options} & A_1 & x_1(a_1) & x_2(a_1) & x_3(a_1) & \cdots & x_j(a_1) & \cdots & x_n(a_1) \\
 & A_2 & x_1(a_2) & x_2(a_2) & x_3(a_2) & \cdots & x_j(a_2) & \cdots & x_n(a_2) \\
 & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
 & A_i & x_1(a_i) & x_2(a_i) & x_3(a_i) & \cdots & x_j(a_i) & \cdots & x_n(a_i) \\
 & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
 & A_m & x_1(a_m) & x_2(a_m) & x_3(a_m) & \cdots & x_j(a_m) & \cdots & x_n(a_m)
 \end{array}
 \end{array} \quad [1]$$

After formulation of the decision matrix, it is necessary to transform the attribute data to take care of any qualitative attributes and negative values. Qualitative indicators were transformed using a cardinal or ordinal scale. Many of the compensatory MADM methods such as maximin, simple additive weighting, TOPSIS, ELECTRE require the normalization of data. Many normalization methods to obtain normalized decision matrix are available for different MADM methods and also to deal with different types of attributes [15, 17]. In the present research, the vector normalization method is used. Furthermore, a weighted normalized matrix is obtained by multiplying the weights of each attribute with attribute scores. Weights of the attributes can be given using the cardinal or ordinal scale by decision makers based on their preferences or importance for various attributes.

After developing a weighted normalized decision matrix, the algorithm for TOPSIS was applied. Hwang and Yoon [15] extended the theory of ideal solutions [18,19] and proposed TOPSIS. This method is based on the concept that the chosen alternative should have the shortest distance from the positive ideal solution and longest distance from negative-ideal solution.

250 In real decision-making situations, it is difficult to identify or envisage the true
 251 ideal and non-ideal solutions. Therefore, Zeleny [18, 19] proposed to use the best and
 252 worst values of the scores of the alternatives for each of the criteria as ideal and non-
 253 ideal solutions. This is known as “displaced ideal” approach and used by many
 254 researchers [20,21]. Mathematically it is represented as follows:

255 *positive ideal solution (PIS),* $x_{j,b} = \text{best value of } x_{ij}, \quad \forall j=1, \dots, n$ [2]

256 *negative ideal solution (NIS),* $x_{j,w} = \text{worst value of } x_{ij}, \quad \forall j=1, \dots, n$ [3]

257 TOPSIS uses a unique approach for selecting the best alternative. The
 258 alternative which is nearest to positive ideal solution, [*i.e.*, the point where

259 $D_i^+ = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n (x_{ij} - x_{jb})^2}$, $\forall i = 1, \dots, m$ is minimal], and farthest from the negative

260 (non-ideal) solution, [*i.e.*, the point where $D_i^- = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n (x_{ij} - x_{jw})^2}$, $\forall i = 1, \dots, m$, is

261 *maximum*] will be preferred the most. The alternative with the highest relative

262 closeness (R_i^*), estimated as $R_i^* = \frac{D_i^-}{(D_i^+ + D_i^-)}$ will be chosen as the most

263 preferred alternative.

264 **3. Case Study of Wastewater Treatment Technology Selection for High Rise** 265 **Buildings in Urban Centers of India**

266 India is developing fast with maximum growth at urban centers. In the year
 267 2001, 27.3 % of India’s population (about 286 millions) were staying in urban areas.
 268 The recent census of 2011 reported that, 31.16 % of India’s population
 269 (approximately 377 million people) resided in urban areas [22]. This increase in

270 population exerts tremendous pressure on resource consumption as well as on waste
271 management. One of the solutions is to go vertical *i.e.* build high rise structures.
272 Many experts argue about broadening the roads, adding some more flyovers,
273 improving and modernizing water supply schemes or installing collection, treatment
274 and disposal systems for urban sewage and garbage. In India, the current trend is to
275 build vertically. Therefore, many high rise building are being constructed in cities
276 and metros. High rise buildings are defined as the structures having more than 21
277 storeys construction or having height more than 70 m.

278 The construction of more number of High rise buildings leads to a higher
279 population density in the city and urban local bodies need to increase the water
280 supply. To handle this problem, experts are advising urban local bodies in India to go
281 for the mandatory recycling of municipal wastewater generated by High rise buildings
282 [23]. This created a need for a technology assessment framework to select the right
283 kind of technologies having the potential to produce treated water that can be
284 successfully recycled in the High rise buildings. Another reason to require mandatory
285 recycling is that surface water bodies in urban region are increasingly stressed and
286 have become eutrophic, and hence the practice of disposing treated wastewater into
287 these natural receptors needs to be abandoned.

288 This case study exactly represents the decision-making situation in an urban area
289 where the objective is to recycle treated wastewater, which is the most intended
290 practice in India. The treated wastewater can be given further treatment and used for
291 various applications such as toilet flushing, gardening, car washing, fire fighting and
292 air conditioning. Government authorities are recommending that the sewage
293 generated from the High rise buildings not be discharged directly to municipal sewer

294 lines and instead adequately treated within the High rise buildings premises [23]. The
295 treatment should be of such a standard that it should meet the desired characteristics
296 (BOD < 5 mg/L). The treated wastewater then should be disinfected to achieve the
297 Total coliform < 2 MPN/100 mL.

298 The decision in this case study represents the commonly encountered situation in
299 India. Providing water for various purposes in urban areas such as toilet flushing, air
300 conditioning, landscape irrigation, fire protection and car washing is a challenging
301 task. By adopting the right kind of technologies which will produce the desired
302 quality of treated water, this water demand can be met. The three technologies which
303 are more suitable for this decision situation are ASP, SBR and MBR. These
304 technologies are mechanized systems having the potential to produce a good
305 secondary level of treated effluent. MBR produces exceptional high quality effluent
306 which can be disinfected and directly used for various purposes mentioned above.
307 ASP and SBR produce good quality effluents. However, the effluent requires further
308 treatment such as pressure sand filtration and disinfection to meet the quality
309 objectives of the recycling water.

310 The criteria scores are estimated based on the primary and secondary data collected
311 during the field visits made to the actual field-scale wastewater treatment plants. The
312 criteria weights are given considering this decision situation of providing recycle
313 wastewater to high rise building in urban areas of India. The appropriate technology
314 for this decision situation should have low land requirements, less manpower
315 requirements, high reliability and at the same time should produce good effluent
316 quality.

317 The criteria and indicators to be used for the evaluation should be judicially selected.
318 Too many indicators may dilute the purpose and too less in number, may be
319 inadequate to convey the message [24]. Seven criteria were used for the evaluating
320 technologies. The first two criteria, climate change and eutrophication have Global
321 Warming Potential (GWP) and Eutrophication Potential (EP) as indicators,
322 respectively. These indicators are derived from LCA. The LCA methodology used in
323 this research is per the ISO 14040 series (ISO, 1997) as described in the operational
324 guide to ISO 14040 by Guinee et al. (2001). The CML 2001 characterization factors
325 came from the Ecoinvent data base v2.1 [25]. The GWP primarily represents energy
326 consumption during the operation phase of the plant over the life cycle. Similarly, EP
327 represents the performance of the plant which is estimated based on the release of
328 organics and nutrients in the treated wastewater. The next criterion is derived from
329 LCC carried out as per the present worth method, prescribed in Indian Standards, IS
330 13174, Part II [30]. The LCC resulted in a single indicator, net present worth (NPW)
331 which represents the capital cost and operational and maintenance (O&M) costs of the
332 plant. O&M costs include costs for land, energy, chemicals, manpower. The land
333 requirement (in m²) and the number of people required for the operation of the plant
334 represent the constraint from the resources point of view.

335 The next set of indicators (reliability, durability and flexibility) quantifies the
336 robustness of the plant and hence is grouped under one criteria identified as the
337 “Robustness of the System”. The sustainability of the wastewater treatment alternative
338 has been quantified using four indicators (acceptability, participation, replicability and
339 promotion of sustainable behaviour). For of these seven qualitative indicators were
340 given scores for each technology based on the experience of these technologies in the
341 Indian context. Finally, while applying MADM methods it is necessary to identify the

types of attributes (*i.e.*, cost or benefit types) and accordingly normalize the attributes scores [15]. In this study the GWP, EP, NPW, land requirement and manpower requirement are considered cost attributes. The remaining seven qualitative indicators were benefit type attributes.

The most commonly used MADM methodology, TOPSIS was used to evaluate these three alternatives for the decision situation described here. The criteria and respective indicators used for the evaluation are shown in Table 1. The criteria score and criteria weights are also given in Table 1. The Microsoft Excel based (visual basic for applications VBA) programme was used for the computation. The scores of the each of alternatives and their ranking are given in Table 2.

4. Results and Discussion

As shown in Table 2, MBR is ranked as the most preferred alternative (with a score of 0.8144) while SBR holds the second rank (with score of 0.8066). The ranking is consistent with a decision situation where a wastewater treatment plant location is in the urban area having land constraints. In this case, the treated water has to be recycled. Therefore, it is expected that the quality of treated water should be better. ASP is identified as least preferred alternative owing to the fact that it has higher land footprint compared to MBR and SBR.

In urban centres, land availability is a constraint and definitely no developer is willing to trade land for utility services. Another reason ASP is not preferred is that a lower quality of effluent is produced from ASP than SBR and MBR. The cost analysis of

364 the technologies shows that MBR has higher capital and O&M costs than SBR and
365 ASP. However, MBR is the preferred alternative for the decision situation since the
366 capital funding availability is not an issue for the High rise buildings project. These
367 projects have very high investment (about 200 million US Dollars) and utility services
368 like wastewater treatment will not affect the project economics.

369 The multicriteria decision-making approach proposed in this work helps urban local
370 bodies to screen the technologies available in the market. The decision-making
371 method clearly identifies the most appropriate alternative among the available ones.
372 The added advantage of this method is that it gives scores which suggest how much
373 each of the technologies considered is preferred compared to the other alternatives.
374 This approach will help urban local bodies to efficiently manage wastewater through
375 selecting appropriate technologies.

376 The MADM method used in this work is TOPSIS. The method is based on a
377 compensatory approach and utility is estimated by comparing each alternative directly
378 depending on data in the decision matrices and weights. The method assumes that
379 each attribute has a monotonically increasing or decreasing utility. The best
380 alternative is identified by considering both the positive ideal solution and negative
381 ideal solution. The disadvantage or unfavourable value in one attribute is offset by an
382 advantage or favourable value in some other attribute. This mimics human thinking
383 where humans always think of both positive and negative qualities of the alternative
384 and choose the best available among all. The geometric concept of distance measure
385 is used in TOPSIS as a proxy for human preference. This approach is suitable for the
386 decision situation with regard to wastewater management.

387 According to Kim, Park, and Yoon [26] and Shih, Shyur, and Lee [17], advantages of
388 TOPSIS are:

- 389 (i) a sound logic that represents the rationale of human choice;
- 390 (ii) a scalar value that accounts for both the best and worst alternatives
391 simultaneously;
- 392 (iii) a simple computation process that can be easily programmed into a
393 spreadsheet; and
- 394 (iv) the performance measures of all alternatives on attributes can be visualized on
395 a polyhedron, at least for any two dimensions.

396 These advantages make TOPSIS a major MADM technique as compared with other
397 related techniques. It has been reported by Zanakis, Solomon, Wishart, and Dubish
398 [27] that TOPSIS has the fewest rank reversals among the eight similar MADM
399 approaches. TOPSIS has disadvantages like not providing weight elicitation and
400 consistency checking for judgments.

401 The technology assessment framework developed in this work is simple and easy to
402 implement. This approach can easily be applied to a variety of decision-making
403 situations encountered while managing wastewaters in India. The potential areas of
404 applications are identifying appropriate technologies for rural areas, city centres,
405 commercial complexes, industrial complexes, academic institutions. Each of these
406 areas of application have their own priorities and can be taken into account using
407 criteria such as land availability, financial budget, treated water quality objectives and

technological savviness of the community. The appropriate criteria and indicators along with their preference weights will rationally select the appropriate technology through the proposed methodology.

5. Conclusions:

This research focuses on the development of a framework for technology assessment for wastewater treatment alternatives for high rise buildings in India. Two criteria were derived from LCA, and one criterion was derived from LCC. A set of criteria accounting for resource constraints, robustness of the system and sustainability were used for the evaluations. Among the three technologies (ASP, SBR and MBR) evaluated, MBR was identified as the most preferred alternative for the wastewater recycling in high rise buildings because MBR has lower land requirements, a lower manpower requirement, higher reliability and at the same time can produces good effluent quality.

The technology assessment methodology developed in this work can be applied to various decision-making situations encountered while managing wastewater. The TOPSIS method, used for ranking, was simple to understand and easy to implement in a user-friendly computing environment. TOPSIS was suitable for the decision situation considered in this work since the decision makers in real-life always consider both the aspects (positive and negative) of the alternatives and select the best available alternative.

The findings shows that technologically advanced alternatives, such as MBR, can be appropriate for the decision situation considered in this study. This validates the theory that it is the decision situation which decides the appropriateness of the

431 technology and not the technology itself. Hence, the definition of appropriate
432 technology given by Murphy et al. [4] is more convincing for water and sanitation
433 technologies. Appropriate technologies are in fact needed to be considered as
434 strategy, implementation of these will help developing countries to achieve
435 sustainable development. This study, while limited through the application of this
436 methodology to just one case, validates current theory and also provides a practical
437 tool for decision-makers who need to make critical decisions regarding wastewater
438 treatment technology selection.

439 **Acknowledgments:** The authors convey gratitude to the editor, two anonymous
440 reviewers for their insightful comments, which helped in revising the manuscript to
441 bring more clarity. Authors are thankful to the Swiss Centre for Life-Cycle
442 Inventories, Dübendorf, Switzerland who have provided educational license to use the
443 Ecoinvent database without which this work would not have been completed.

Table 1 Criteria with respective indicators and scores used for selection of appropriate wastewater treatment technology

Sr No.	Criteria	Indicator	Weights ^a	ASP	SBR	MBR
1	Global warming ^b	Global warming potential (kg CO ₂ -Eq./ p.e.-year)	40	18.2	31.97	42.44
2	Eutrophication ^b	Eutrophication potential (kg PO ₄ ³⁻ -Eq./ p.e.-year)	90	3.76	1.38	1.34
3	Life Cycle Costs ^c	Net Present Worth (Rs. Lakh / MLD)	20	137	127	160
4	Land requirement	Land requirement (m ² / MLD)	90	1400	353	300
5	Manpower requirement for operation	Number (for operation of medium scale plant)	40	10	6	4
6	Robustness of the System ^d	Reliability	90	80	80	100
		Durability	40	80	60	60
		Flexibility	40	80	60	60
7	Sustainability ^d	Acceptability	20	30	30	30
		Participation	20	30	30	30
		Replicability	20	40	40	40
		Promotion of Sustainable Behavior	20	40	40	40

^aCriteria weights are given using a cardinal scale of 0 and 100, with 0 being the lower preference and 100 the highest preference.

^bEstimated using ISO 14040: 1997 [28] using CML 2 baseline 2000 methodology [29], only operation phase is considered for the analysis

^cLife cycle costs estimated as per the present worth method prescribed in IS 13174 [30]

^dThese indicators do not have units as they are qualitative in nature. To quantify these indicators, a cardinal scale of 0 and 100 is used with 0 being the worst score and 100 the best score.

Table 2: Scores and ranking generated using TOPSIS

Alternative	Score	Rank
MBR	0.8144	1
SBR	0.8066	2
ASP	0.1849	3




Fig. 1. Framework for selection of appropriate wastewater treatment technology

459 **References:**

- 460 [1] Central Pollution Control Board Status of Water Supply, Wastewater
461 Generation And Treatment In Class-I Cities & Class-II Towns of India Control
462 of Urban Pollution, Series: CUPS/ 70 / 2009 – 10. Central Pollution Control
463 Board, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India, Delhi; 2009.
- 464 [2] Arceivala SJ, Asolekar SR. Wastewater treatment for pollution control and
465 reuse. 3rd Ed., New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill; 2007.
- 466 [3] Schumacher EF. Small is beautiful: economics as if people mattered. New York:
467 Harper and Row; 1973.
- 468 [4] Murphy HM, McBean EA, Farahbakhsh K. Appropriate technology - A
469 comprehensive approach for water and sanitation in the developing world.
470 Technol. Soc. 2009; 31(2):158-167.
- 471 [5] Hwang CL, Masud ASM. Multiple Objective Decision Making - Methods and
472 Applications - A State of the Art Survey. New York: Springer-Verlag; 1979.
- 473 [6] Kiker GA, Bridges TS, Varghese A, Seager PT, Linkov I. Application of
474 multicriteria decision analysis in environmental decision making. Int. Environ.
475 Assess. Manag. 2005; 1:95-108.
- 476 [7] Huang IB, Keisler J, Linkov I. Multi-criteria decision analysis in environmental
477 sciences: Ten years of applications and trends. Sci. Total Environ. 2011;
478 409:3578–94.

- 479 [8] Tecle A, Fogel M, Duckstein A. Multicriterion Selection of Wastewater
480 Management Alternatives. *J. Water Resour. Plan. Manag.* ASCE 1988; 114:
481 383-98.
- 482 [9] Ellis KV, Tang SL. Wastewater treatment optimization model for developing
483 world, I: model development. *J. Environ. Eng.* ASCE. 1991; 117:501-18.
- 484 [10] Tang SL, Ellis KV. Wastewater treatment optimization model for developing
485 world. I: model testing. *J. Environ. Eng.*, ASCE 1994; 120:610-24.
- 486 [11] Balkema AJ, Preisig HA, Otterpohl R, Lambert FJD. Indicators for the
487 sustainability assessment of wastewater treatment systems. *Urban Water* 2002;
488 4:153-61.
- 489 [12] Mels AR, Van Nieuwenhuijzen AF, Van der Graaf JHJM, Klapwijk B, De
490 Koning J, Rulkens WH. Sustainability criteria as a tool in the development of
491 new sewage treatment methods. *Water Sci. Technol.* 1999; 39:243–50.
- 492 [13] Muga HE, Mihelcic JR, Sustainability of wastewater treatment technologies. *J.*
493 *of Environ. Manag.* 2008; 88:437–47.
- 494 [14] Singhirunnusorn W, Stenstrom MK. Appropriate wastewater treatment systems
495 for developing countries: criteria and indicator assessment in Thailand. *Water*
496 *Sci. Technol.* 2009; 59:1873-84.
- 497 [15] Hwang CL, Yoon K. *Multiple Attribute Decision Making*, Berlin: Springer-
498 Verlag; 1981.
- 499 [16] Figueira J, Salvatore G, Ehrgott M. (Eds.) *Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis:*
500 *State of the Art Surveys*. New York: Springer; 2005.

- 501 [17] Shih HS, Shyur HJ, Lee ES. An extension of TOPSIS for group decision
502 making. *Math. and Comput. Model.* 2007; 45:801-13.
- 503 [18] Zeleny M. Multiple criteria decision making. New York: McGraw-Hill; 1982..
- 504 [19] Zeleny M. A concept of compromise solutions and the method of the displaced
505 ideal. *Comput. Oper. Res.* 1974; 1:479–96.
- 506 [20] Duckstein L, Opricovic S. Multiobjective optimization in river basin
507 development. *Water Resour. Res.* 1980; 16(1):14–20.
- 508 [21] Yoon K. A Reconciliation among Discrete Compromise Solutions Source. *The*
509 *J. Oper. Res. Soc.* 1987; 38:277-86.
- 510 [22] Census of India, Office of The Registrar General and Census Commissioner,
511 India, New Delhi; 2011. (<http://censusindia.gov.in/>).
- 512 [23] Asolekar SR, Kalbar PP, Tilwankar AK. Framework for Sustainable Urban
513 Environmental Services: Successful Application to High Rise Buildings in
514 Mumbai. In the proceedings of Indo-US Workshop on Designing Sustainable
515 Products, Services and Manufacturing Systems organized by Indo-US Science
516 and Technology Forum, Indian Institute of Science (IISc), Bangalore; August 18
517 – 20; 2009.
- 518 [24] Hippu SK, Nathan B, Reddy S. Criteria selection framework for sustainable
519 development indicators *Int. J. of Multicriteria Decision Making* 2011; 1(3):257–
520 79.
- 521 [25] Swiss Centre for Life-Cycle Inventories (2009). Ecoinvent database, Dübendorf,
522 Switzerland. <<http://www.ecoinvent.org>>.

- 523 [26] Kim G, Park CS, Yoon KP. Identifying investment opportunities for advanced
524 manufacturing systems with comparative-integrated performance measurement.
525 Int. J. of Prod. Econ. 1997; 50:23–33.
- 526 [27] Zanakis SH, Solomon A, Wishart N, Dublish S. Multi-attribute decision making:
527 A simulation comparison of selected methods. Eur. J. Oper. Res. 1998;
528 107:507-29.
- 529 [28] ISO, Environmental management - Life cycle assessment - Principles and
530 framework: International Standard 14040. International Standards Organization,
531 Geneva; 1997.
- 532 [29] Guinee JB, Gorree M, Heijungs R, Huppes G, Kleijn R, de Koning, A, van Oers
533 L, Wegener Sleeswijk A, Suh W, Udo de Haes H. Handbook on Life Cycle
534 Assessment. Operational Guide to the ISO Standards. Dordrecht: Kluwer
535 Academic Publishers; 2001.
- 536 [30] Indian Standard for Life Cycle Costing, Part 2, Methodology, IS 13174. Bureau
537 of Indian Standards, New Delhi; 1994.