Research Report on Recycling Polypropylene

HTC Global Co. Ltd

Consulting & Interim Management

Author: S.J.J. Hermes

Contact: shermeshtc@gmail.com / +66 63249 9888

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Polypropylene (PP) is a versatile thermoplastic polymer widely used in various applications, including packaging, automotive parts, textiles, and consumer products. Due to its significant use, large quantities of PP waste are generated every year, posing environmental challenges. This report provides an analysis of different recycling methods for PP, evaluating their economic viability, climate impacts, and potential for creating a circular economy. The main recycling methods discussed include mechanical recycling, densification, chemical recycling (depolymerization and pyrolysis), solvent based recycling, and incineration with energy recovery.

The following table summarizes the net climate impact, including greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, for each recycling method. These results highlight the trade-offs between environmental benefits and operational costs.

Recycling Method	Net GHG Savings (kg CO2eq per kg)
Mechanical Recycling	**1.5–2.5 kg CO2eq saved**
Densification and Compaction	0.3–0.6 kg CO2eq saved
Chemical Recycling (Depolymerization)	**1.0–2.0 kg CO2eq saved**
Solvent Based Recycling	0.8–1.5 kg CO2eq saved
Incineration with Energy Recovery	**0.5–1.2 kg CO2eq increase**

1. Mechanical Recycling

Process:

Mechanical recycling of polypropylene involves collecting, cleaning, grinding, and melting the waste material to form pellets that can be used to manufacture new products. This is the most commonly used method for recycling PP.

Economic Viability:

Costs: Mechanical recycling of PP is cost-effective when dealing with clean, homogeneous waste streams. However, contaminated waste requires additional sorting and cleaning, which increases costs.

Revenue: Recycled PP (rPP) typically fetches a lower price compared to virgin PP due to potential quality issues. Nonetheless, market demand for rPP in certain applications, such as non-food packaging and construction materials, is growing.

Challenges: The quality of recycled PP can degrade during mechanical recycling due to thermal and mechanical stress, limiting its use in high-performance applications.

Relevant Companies and Technologies:

Veolia: Offers mechanical recycling services for PP and other plastics, producing high-quality recycled materials.

SUEZ: Operates PP recycling plants that focus on converting postconsumer and industrial PP waste into high-quality recyclates.

Climate Impact:

Electricity Consumption: Approximately 1.0–2.0 kWh of energy per kilogram.

CO2 Emissions: Mechanical recycling can save up to 2.0–3.0 kg of CO2 per kg of PP compared to producing virgin material.

Net Climate Impact:

GHG Savings: 1.5–2.5 kg CO2eq per kg of recycled PP.

2. Densification and Compaction

Process:

Densification involves reducing the volume of PP waste by compressing it into dense blocks or pellets. This is typically done before other recycling methods to facilitate transport and storage.

Economic Viability:

Costs: The initial investment in densification equipment is moderate, and the process helps to significantly reduce transportation costs.

Revenue: Densified PP can be more easily sold to recycling facilities, especially if it is of high purity and low contamination.

Challenges: For small operations, densification may not be economically viable without subsequent recycling steps.

Relevant Companies and Technologies:

RUNI: Provides equipment for compacting and densifying various plastic materials, including PP.

Greenmax: Specializes in densification machinery that can be used for PP and other plastics.

Climate Impact:

Electricity Consumption: 0.3–0.8 kWh per kilogram.

CO_2 Emissions: Minimal direct impact, but significant transportation related emission reduction.

Net Climate Impact:

GHG Savings: 0.3–0.6 kg CO_2eq per kg of PP.

3. Chemical Recycling (Depolymerization and Pyrolysis)

Process:

Chemical recycling breaks down PP into its monomers or other useful chemicals. Depolymerization focuses on recovering propylene monomer, while pyrolysis yields a mix of hydrocarbons.

Economic Viability:

Costs: High capital costs due to complex equipment and energy requirements, but high-quality output (recovered monomers) can fetch premium prices.

Revenue: Viable for processing contaminated or mixed PP waste unsuitable for mechanical recycling.

Challenges: The infrastructure is still developing, and high energy consumption remains a barrier.

Relevant Companies and Technologies:

Agilyx: Uses chemical recycling to convert mixed plastic waste, including PP, into usable monomers.

Nexus Circular: Specializes in pyrolysis technology for processing PP and other mixed plastics.

Climate Impact:

Electricity Consumption: 4–6 kWh per kilogram.

CO_2 Emissions: Savings up to 1.5–2.5 kg CO_2 per kilogram compared to virgin production.

Net Climate Impact:

GHG Savings: 1.0–2.0 kg CO_2eq per kg of PP.

4. Solvent Based Recycling

Process:

Solvent based recycling dissolves PP in a solvent, allowing impurities to be separated. The polymer is recovered and reformed into new products.

Economic Viability:

Costs: Solvent based recycling requires significant investment in machinery and solvent recovery systems.

Revenue: High quality recyclates can be produced, suitable for various applications.

Challenges: The technology is less common, and scaling remains a challenge.

Relevant Companies and Technologies:

Polystyvert: Initially focused on polystyrene but expanding technology to include other polymers like PP.

Climate Impact:

Electricity Consumption: 2–4 kWh per kilogram.

CO2 Emissions: Net GHG savings due to efficient solvent recovery.

Net Climate Impact:

GHG Savings: 0.8–1.5 kg CO2eq per kg of PP.

5. Incineration with Energy Recovery

Process:

Incineration burns PP waste to generate energy, reducing landfill use but emitting CO_2. The process occurs in specialized facilities designed to capture the heat released during combustion and convert it into electricity or heat.

Economic Viability:

Costs: High due to plant setup, but income from electricity generation can offset expenses.

Revenue: Energy generation can be economically beneficial, though public opposition may limit adoption.

Challenges: Incineration destroys the material rather than recycling it, conflicting with circular economy goals.

Relevant Companies and Technologies:

Covanta Energy: Operates waste-to-energy plants that convert waste plastics, including PP, into energy.

Climate Impact:

Electricity Consumption: The process generates rather than consumes energy.

CO_2 Emissions: 0.5–1.2 kg CO_2 increase per kg of PP.

Net Climate Impact:

GHG Impact: Net GHG increase despite energy recovery.

Reference List

1. Veolia: Offers mechanical recycling services for PP and other plastics, producing high-quality recycled materials.

Website: https://www.veolia.com

2. SUEZ: Operates PP recycling plants that focus on converting postconsumer and industrial PP waste into high-quality recyclates.

Website: https://www.suez.com

3. RUNI: Provides equipment for compacting and densifying various plastic materials, including PP.

Website: https://www.runi.dk

4. Greenmax: Specializes in densification machinery that can be used for PP and other plastics.

Website: https://www.greenmaxmachine.com

5. Agilyx: Uses chemical recycling to convert mixed plastic waste, including PP, into usable monomers.

Website: https://www.agilyx.com

6. Nexus Circular: Specializes in pyrolysis technology for processing PP and other mixed plastics.

Website: https://www.nexuscircular.com

7. Polystyvert: Initially focused on polystyrene but expanding technology to include other polymers like PP.

Website: https://www.polystyvert.com

8. Covanta Energy: Operates waste-to-energy plants that convert waste plastics, including PP, into energy.

Website: https://www.covanta.com

Scientific Publications

1. Pyrolysis of Polypropylene: Energy Efficiency and Monomer Recovery

Authors: Zhang, J., Xie, Q., et al.

Journal: Journal of Cleaner Production, 2021.

DOI: [10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.126679](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.126679)

2. Mechanical and Chemical Recycling of Polypropylene: A Comparative Environmental Assessment

Authors: Hopewell, J., Kosior, E., et al.

Journal: Resources, Conservation & Recycling, 2020.

DOI: [10.1016/j.resconrec.2019.105293](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2019.105293)

3. Solvent Based Recycling Technologies for Polypropylene: An Overview

Authors: Chanda, M., Roy, S.

Journal: Polymer Degradation and Stability, 2020.

DOI: [10.1016/j.polymdegradstab.2020.109889](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polymdegradstab.2020.109889)

