

Abdel-Muiz Nidal Shawar

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering

Imperial College London

Introduction

The Kingdom of Jordan relies almost entirely on imported foreign energy. Syria and Egypt were major suppliers of crude oil products and natural gas respectively. Due to recent the turmoil the Kingdom has therefore had to consider other ways of sourcing energy to meet its energy needs. In recent years with the occurrence of the Arab Spring, and inner turmoil in Syria and Iraq, there has been a large inflow of refugees and foreign nationals, into the Kingdom. As a whole Jordan is now 70% Jordanian and 30% foreign nationals. The consequence of a fast growing population means the Kingdom will have to deal with the ever-increasing production of waste. The focus of the research was to investigate the potential to divert this increased waste to provide a stable local energy source for the Kingdom.

Methodology and Approach

The research involved a three-phased approach to gathering information about waste management in developing countries, and in particular Jordan, technologies for energy and resource recovery: (i) a detailed literature review; (ii) a field study investigation in Jordan focusing on waste management practice in two selected cities, Amman, the Kingdom's capital and Aqaba, the only coastal city in Jordan; (iii) discussions with key representatives from the waste and energy sectors in the UK. Use is made of (i) the Wasteaware Indicator methodology developed by Wilson et al (2015) (a qualitative analysis) to assess the waste management in Jordan and (ii) a methodology developed by Grimes and Tanpoonkiat (2013) to aid planning decisions on the optimum technology mix to deliver an integrated solid waste management system that treats waste as a resource to deliver energy for the Kingdom.



WasteAware Assessments

Background information on the city					
City		Amman			
Country		Jordan			
Date since previous application of indicators:		N/A			
B1	Country income category	World Bank income category	Gross National Income (GNI) per capita		
		Upper Middle	\$5160		
B2	Population of city	Total population of the city	4,007,526		
B3	Waste generation	Total municipal solid waste generation (tonnes/year)	967265		
No	Category	Data/ Benchmark Indicator	Results	Code	Progress
Key Waste-related data					
Data					
W1	Waste per capita	MSW per capita kg per year	241.36	-	-
		kg per day	0.661	-	-
W2	Waste composition:	Summary composition of MSW for 3 key fractions – all as % wt. of total waste generated	-	-	-
W2.1	Organic	Organics (food and green wastes) %	49.7	-	-
W2.2	Paper	Paper %	14.7	-	-
W2.3	Plastics	Plastics %	15.7	-	-
W2.4	Metals	Metals %	1.4	-	-
W2.5	Solid waste density	Solid waste density	-	-	-
W2.6	Moisture content	Moisture content	40.03	-	-
Physical Components					
Benchmark Indicator					
1	Public health – waste collection	1.1 Waste collection coverage	95	█	█
		1.2 Waste Captured by the System	93	█	█
1C		Quality of waste collection service	38	█	█
2	Environmental control – waste treatment and disposal	Controlled treatment and disposal	100	█	█
2E		Quality of environmental protection of waste treatment and disposal	55	█	█
3	Resource Management – Reduce, Reuse, Recycle	Recycling rate	7	█	█
3R		Quality of 3Rs – Reduce, reuse, recycle	13	█	█
Governance Factors					
Benchmark Indicator					
4U	Inclusivity	User inclusivity	38	█	█
4P		Provider inclusivity	30	█	█
5F	Financial sustainability	Financial sustainability	75	█	█
6N	Sound institutions, proactive policies	Adequacy of national solid waste management framework	17	█	█
6L		Local institutional coherence	50	█	█

Background information on the city					
City		Aqaba			
Country		Jordan			
Date since previous application of indicators:		N/A			
B1	Country income category	World Bank income category	Gross National Income (GNI) per capita		
		Upper Middle	\$5160		
B2	Population of city	Total population of the city	188,160		
B3	Waste generation	Total municipal solid waste generation (tonnes/year)	50079		
No	Category	Data/ Benchmark Indicator	Results	Code	Progress
Key Waste-related data					
Data					
W1	Waste per capita	MSW per capita kg per year	0	-	-
		kg per day	1	-	-
W2	Waste composition:	Summary composition of MSW for 3 key fractions – all as % wt. of total waste generated	-	-	-
W2.1	Organic	Organics (food and green wastes) %	55	-	-
W2.2	Paper	Paper %	15	-	-
W2.3	Plastics	Plastics %	16	-	-
W2.4	Metals	Metals %	8	-	-
W2.5	Solid waste density	Solid waste density	0	-	-
W2.6	Moisture content	Moisture content	0	-	-
Physical Components					
Benchmark Indicator					
1	Public health – waste collection	1.1 Waste collection coverage	100	█	█
		1.2 Waste Captured by the System	100	█	█
1C		Quality of waste collection service	79	█	█
2	Environmental control – waste treatment and disposal	Controlled treatment and disposal	100	█	█
2E		Quality of environmental protection of waste treatment and disposal	25	█	█
3	Resource Management – Reduce, Reuse, Recycle	Recycling rate	30	█	█
3R		Quality of 3Rs – Reduce, Reuse, Recycle	33	█	█
Governance Factors					
Benchmark Indicator					
4U	Inclusivity	User inclusivity	42	█	█
4P		Provider inclusivity	45	█	█
5F	Financial sustainability	Financial sustainability	58	█	█
6N	Sound institutions, proactive policies	Adequacy of national solid waste management framework	0	█	█
6L		Local institutional coherence	50	█	█

Technology Mix Analysis

Assumptions of Analysis	
Growth Scenario	Growth Rate
Low Growth	2.5%
Normal Growth	3.1%
High Growth	5.3%

Technology Capacities and Costs		
Technology	Plant Capacity (tonnes per annum)	Cost (GBP/tonne)
Incineration	400,000	1000
Gasification	60,000	1100 (+ 500 for pretreatment)
AD	45,000	500

Technology Mix Results Amman									
Ratio	% Growth	2025 (50MW Scenario) Number of Plants				2060 (Full Diversion Scenario) Number of Plants			
		I	or	G	AD	% Diverted	I	or	G
1:0	2.5	2	13	0	58	8	50	0	0
1:0	3.1	2	13	0	54	10	66	0	0
1:0	5.3	2	13	0	43	26	173	0	0
80:20	2.5	2	10	4	58	6	40	14	14
80:20	3.1	2	10	4	54	8	53	18	18
80:20	5.3	2	10	4	43	21	138	46	46
50:50	2.5	1	6	9	58	4	25	34	34
50:50	3.1	1	6	9	54	5	33	44	44
50:50	5.3	1	6	9	43	13	87	115	115
20:80	2.5	1	3	13	58	2	10	54	54
20:80	3.1	1	3	13	54	2	13	70	70
20:80	5.3	1	3	13	43	6	35	184	184

Technology Mix Results Aqaba					
Ratio	% Growth	2025 (Full Diversion Scenario) Number of Plants		2060 (Full Diversion Scenario) Number of Plants	
		G	AD	G	AD
1:0	2.5	2	0	3	0
1:0	3.1	2	0	4	0
1:0	5.3	2	0	10	0
0:1	2.5	0	2	0	4
0:1	3.1	0	2	0	5
0:1	5.3	0	2	0	13
50:50	2.5	1	1	2	2
50:50	3.1	1	1	2	3
50:50	5.3	1	1	5	7

Summary

- The Kingdom of Jordan has relied on foreign supplies of energy. In recent years these supplies have decreased while the population has increased and security of supply of energy to the country is threatened.
- An in-field investigation of two key cities in the Kingdom, Amman and Aqaba, has shown the scope for improvement in enforcement at the local and national level and, in management of waste as a resource for material and energy recovery
- Analysis of the cities' scope to convert waste to energy has shown that in Amman, in particular, waste can be exploited to provide steady and secure supply of energy locally
- A technology mix analysis has shown that in Amman, incineration can be used to treat waste and produce 50MW of electricity by 2025, and in Aqaba, gasification, which can be operated at a smaller scale can be used to treat waste producing energy to meet needs of the city by 2025.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank: Professor Sue Grimes, Professor Wilson, Stuart Hayward-Higham, Ms. Hilary Stone, Dr. Yahya Al-Majali, Engineer Zaidoun Nsour, Dr. Mohammed Al-Khashashneh, Engineer Ziad Jibril,

References

Abu Salah, S. & Abu Safa, A. (2011) *Municipal Solid Waste Composition Analysis Study*. Greater Amman Municipality: Royal Scientific Society.

Intharathirat, R. & Abdul Salam, P. (2015) "Valorization Of MSW-To-Energy In Thailand: Status, Challenges And Prospects". *Waste Biomass Valor.* 7 (1), 31-57.

Intharathirat, R. & Abdul Salam, P. (2015) "Valorization Of MSW-To-Energy In Thailand: Status, Challenges And Prospects". *Waste Biomass Valor.* 7 (1), 31-57.

Wilson, D. et al. (2012) "Comparative Analysis Of Solid Waste Management In 20 Cities". *Waste Management & Research.* 30 (3), 237-254.