



## FLORE

## Repository istituzionale dell'Università degli Studi di Firenze

## Evaluation of the end-of-life performance of a hybrid scooter with the application of recyclability and recoverability assessment methods

Questa è la Versione finale referata (Post print/Accepted manuscript) della seguente pubblicazione:

Original Citation:

Evaluation of the end-of-life performance of a hybrid scooter with the application of recyclability and recoverability assessment methods / Berzi, Lorenzo; Delogu, Massimo; Pierini, Marco; Romoli, Filippo. - In: RESOURCES, CONSERVATION AND RECYCLING. - ISSN 0921-3449. - STAMPA. - 108:(2016), pp. 140-155. [10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013]

Availability:

This version is available at: 2158/1023796 since: 2021-03-30T22:27:01Z

Published version: DOI: 10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

*Terms of use:* Open Access

Open Access

La pubblicazione è resa disponibile sotto le norme e i termini della licenza di deposito, secondo quanto stabilito dalla Policy per l'accesso aperto dell'Università degli Studi di Firenze (https://www.sba.unifi.it/upload/policy-oa-2016-1.pdf)

Publisher copyright claim:

Conformità alle politiche dell'editore / Compliance to publisher's policies

Questa versione della pubblicazione è conforme a quanto richiesto dalle politiche dell'editore in materia di copyright. This version of the publication conforms to the publisher's copyright policies.

(Article begins on next page)

#### https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

#### **Evaluation of the End of Life performance** 1 of a hybrid scooter with the application of 2 Recyclability Recoverability and 3 assessment methods 4

- 5 Lorenzo Berzi<sup>1</sup>, Massimo Delogu, Marco Pierini, Filippo Romoli.
- 6 Department of Industrial Engineering - University of Florence, Via di S. Marta, 3, 50139 Firenze – Italy.

#### Abstract 7

8 The waste treatment related to the End of Life phase of durable goods such as Electric and Electronic 9 Equipment and road vehicles is increasingly regulated both from an European and a Worldwide point of 10 view. Regarding the transport sector, most L-class vehicles, (mopeds, motorcycles, tricycles, quadricycles 11 as defined in Regulation 168/2013/EU) are not fully subjected to the Directive 2000/53/EC, which is the 12 reference for other light vehicle categories. The recent introduction of novel archetypes and innovative 13 powertrains for L-vehicles suggests that such products represent an actual alternative to full conventional 14 vehicles for urban mobility; however only limited data are available regarding their their Recyclability and 15 Recoverability. In order to cover such gap, a comprehensive view of L-class vehicle characteristics from 16 End of Life perspective is proposed. The objectives of the study are the definition and the critical analysis 17 of the context in which L-class vehicles are supposed to be treated, the identification of End of Life 18 assessment methodologies and the application on a case study. Two different methodologies are 19 compared; both come from other transport sectors. The methodologies differ in terms of performance 20 assessment of recycling and recovery processes.

21 The treatment of the vehicle has been reproduced in controlled condition to obtain a detailed inventory of 22 parts. Furthermore, four different hypotheses regarding the accuracy of the treatment have been 23 formulated. The data have been used to estimate vehicle Recyclability and Recoverability rates under the 24 proposed scenarios. The results demonstrate the compliance of Recyclability and Recoverability rates 25 according to the most demanding regulation adopted for automotive products, even if such characteristics 26 are not type approval requirements. The comparison between the two assessment methods shows that

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Corresponding author. Tel. + 39 055 2758698. Email address: lorenzo.berzi@unifi.it.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

27 satisfactory Recyclability and Recoverability values can be achieved also considering technological 28 limitations, at the cost of increased dismantling effort. The variability of results on the basis of external 29 conditions is calculated, estimating four cases from "worst" to "best" case. The discrepances between 30 the results of the two assessments methods and the relation to realistic limitations are discussed.

31 Using the first assessment method – ISO22628 - it is calculated that the dismantling of the bodywork is 32 sufficient to achieve a 85% Recyclability result, and higher values are obtained in case of favorable 33 scenario; Recoverability is also assessed to be above 95%. Using a method taking into account 34 technological limitations - UNIFE assessment, adapted from railway sector -lower values are calculated, 35 the reduction being from 1% to 3% for Recyclability and from 3% to 15% for Recoverability, depending on 36 the boundary conditions considered.

- 37 Further research should be done to improve the assessment methods and to estimate the effective waste
- 38 production arising from vehicle treatment, thus identifying physical and technological limits in relation to
- 39 the product and to the context under study. For the sector of L-class vehicles, the study should be
- 40 extended to a range of products, validating data through on-field trials.
- 41

42 Keywords: End of Life; Scooter; Motorcycle; Three wheeler; Recyclability; Recoverability; Dismantling.

#### Acronyms 43

44	3R	3R rates - used in the article to indicate RR and RRR rates toghether
45	ASR	Automotive Shredder Residue
46	ATF	Authorized Tratment Facility
47	CAE	Computer Aided Engineering
48	CNG	Compressed Natural Gas
49	ELV	End of Life Vehicle
50	ELV-L	End of Life Vehicle - L class
51	EoL	End of Life
52	EPD	Environmental Product Declaration
53	EPR	Extended Producer Responsibility
54	ERF	Energy Recovery Factor
55	EV	Electric Vehicle
56	GF	Glass Fiber
57	GHG	Green House Gas
58	HEV	Hybrid Electric Vehicle
59	ICE	Internal Combustion Engine
60	IDIS	International Dismantling Information System
61	IMDS	International Material Data System
62	LCA	Life Cycle Assessment
63	LPG	Liquified Petroleum Gas

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

64	MRF	Material Recycling	g Factor
65	PCB	PolyChlorinated B	iphenyl (pollutants, e.g. fluids)
66	PCB	Printed Circuit Bo	ards (components)
67	PCR	Product Category	Rules
68	PST	Post Shredder Teo	chnologies
69	PTW	Powered Two Who	eeler
70	RR	Reuse and Recycl	ing
71	RRR	Reuse, Recycling	and Recovery
72	WEEE	Waste Electrical a	nd Electronics Equipment
73			
74	Plastic m	naterial acronyms	please refer to ISO 1043:19

please refer to ISO 1043:1998, Plastics - Symbols and abbreviated terms Plastic material acronyms

75

#### 1 - Introduction 76

77 From citizens to industry, from local authorities and governments to international organization, nowadays 78 there is a growing interest on environmental topics. Industry at any level has to deal with environmental 79 impact estimation and reduction. To achieve these targets, a number of methods have been developed to 80 measure or to assess the impact of any product or process in terms of degradation of air, water, soil; to 81 assess the depletion of natural resources and to analyze the influence on human life (Klinglmair et al., 82 2013). The evaluation of environmental impact from the production to EoL is then called LCA; a framework 83 for the application of LCA methodology have also been formalized through the ratification of ISO 14000 84 technical notes (Mayyas et al., 2012). Considering the whole life cycle of a generic product, at least four 85 main phases can be recognized (Delogu et al., 2015): raw material extraction, manufacturing, use and 86 EoL; transportations also have to be considered. The present paper is focused on the analysis of waste 87 production during the EoL phase.

88 The attention of Authorities has been increasingly focusing on the transport sector, that is responsible for a significant environmental impact at worldwide level. Assuming GHG emissions as main indicator, the 89 90 global transport system accounts for about 23% of total emissions (Saboori et al., 2014); more in detail, 91 approximately 10% of global energy consumption (amongst all sectors, including industry, transportations, 92 residential consumptions etc.) and a similar rate of GHG emissions are related to light duty vehicles 93 (Hawkins et al., 2012). It has been demonstrated through a number of researches that Use phase is 94 responsible for the main impact, but that considering the externality of waste production EoL phase is 95 also relevant (Schmidt et al., 2004). The management of the final waste is also an open issue both due to 96 practical issues and economic factors; landfilling is a frequent destination, even if viable technological 97 solutions for material separation and energy recovery have been identified (Cossu et al., 2014).

98 In relation to waste criticality, The European Union set ambitious Reuse, Recycling and Recovery targets 99 for some categories of ELV through the definition of the Directive 2000/53/EC. The final target defined

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

100 by such "ELV Directive" is in force: from 1 January 2015, the RRR rate percentage has to be a minimum 101 of 95% by an average weight per vehicle and year, while the RR rate has to be a minimum of 85% by an 102 average weight per vehicle and year.

103 The 2000/53/EC does not only describe the treatments to be applied on ELVs to protect the environment 104 from contamination, but also indicates main criteria to be met during vehicle design to enable the 105 achievability of RRR target, that is a challenging technological issue. In addition, the 2000/53/EC aims at 106 reducing the hazardousness of final waste through a number of restrictions on the use of some substances 107 (e.g. heavy metals). EPR criteria are introduced: according to the "polluter pays" principle, the producer 108 should meet all or a relevant part of the costs related to take-back measures implementation. Therefore, 109 the ELV Directive has been a significant improvement driver for vehicle manufacturers and for their 110 supplier, since new alternatives for banned substances have been introduced and since the Recyclability 111 and Recoverability characteristics became a requirement for vehicle homologation. It also has to be 112 highlighted that RRR results are affected not only by the material used for components, but also by the 113 manufacturing solutions adopted by the vehicle. The achievement of good Recyclability is therefore a 114 design issue, so that specific methodologies to include EoL requirements in the design process and to 115 analyze the interdependency of any choice on all life cycle phases have been proposed (Grujicic et al., 116 2008; Witik et al., 2011). Such methodologies are usually defined as "ecodesign" or "Design for X" (X being

- 117 EoL, Recycling, Dismantling) procedures (Go et al., 2011).
- 118 The most restrictive prescriptions of the ELV Directive currently only applies to two vehicle categories:
- 119 Passenger cars and light freight transport vehicles whose maximum mass does not exceed 3.5t; • 120 they are defined as M1 or N1
- 121 three wheel motor vehicles, but motor tricycles are explicitly excluded. •
- 122 A summary of the vehicle categories subjected to 2000/53/EC is illustrated in Table 1.

123 One of the reasons for the exclusion of other vehicles is certainly that M1 and N1 vehicles are by far the 124 most relevant in Europe in terms of total circulating fleet and yearly renewal. However, as explained in 125 next paragraphs, other categories of vehicles are usually subjected to EoL treatments which are very 126 similar to those applied on N1 and M1 ELVs. In addition, recent market trends highlight the request for 127 pure urban-commuting vehicles, and new architectures have been proposed in the latest decade.

128 Starting from this observation, an activity focused on the EoL treatment L vehicles, with particular regard 129 to a tilting motor tricycle vehicle (L3e or L5e category depending on the version, according to Regulation 130 168/2013) is presented. The aim of the proposed study is to offer an overview on EoL scenarios for these 131 kind of vehicles, defined as ELV-L, assessing the potential impact in case of full extension of ELV Directive 132 to such vehicles through the calculation of Recyclability and Recoverability indexes. The activity has been 133 performed through an approach that takes into account both the typical EoL vehicle management and the 134 application and comparison of two existing and suitable calculation methods. The selected case study is 135 an L-vehicle which is representative of recent design trends for urban mobility and includes electric 136 traction components.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 describes the relevance of the topic and offers a brief 137 138 literature review; general EoL topics and Recyclability/Recoverability assessment methods are 139 introduced. Section 3 describes the methodologies to be applied for 3R rates estimation, including the boundary conditions of the activity. Section 4 illustrates the application on the selected case study and 140 141 shows detailed results. Concluding observations are finally presented.

142

Category	Short description	Covered by 2000/53/EC targets	Type Approval
M1	Light Four wheels vehicles up to 3.5t, passengers	Yes	Directive 70/156/EEC Directive 2007/46/EC
N1	Light Four wheels vehicles up to 3.5t, freight	Yes	Directive 70/156/EEC Directive 2007/46/EC
L1e	Light two-wheel powered vehicle	No	Directive 92/61/EEC Reg. 168/2013/EC
L2e	Three-wheel moped	Yes	Directive 92/61/EEC Reg. 168/2013/EC
L3e	Two-wheel motorcycle	No	Directive 92/61/EEC Reg. 168/2013/EC
L4e	Two-wheel motorcycle with side-car	No	Directive 92/61/EEC Reg. 168/2013/EC
L5e	Powered tricycle	No	Directive 92/61/EEC Reg. 168/2013/EC
L6e	Light quadricycle	No	Directive 92/61/EEC Reg. 168/2013/EC
L7e	Heavy quadricycles	No	Directive 92/61/EEC Reg. 168/2013/EC

143

Table 1 – Summary of motor vehicle coverage by 2000/53/EC.

#### 2 - End of Life L-vehicles 144

By today, the general prescriptions of 2000/53/CE (excluding those regarding binding RR and RRR targets) 145 146 apply to all the road vehicles in most national transposition, but restrictions in terms of Recyclability and Recoverability until today have not affected the field of motorcycles, mopeds and L-class vehicles. 147

148 According to the growing environmental sensibility, the scope of the study is to assess the potential results 149 of the full application of 2000/53/EC to ELV-L; in case of unsatisfactory RR and RRR targets, new 150 measures could be needed in order to respect the limits. Improvements can be in terms of management 151 of the ELV treatment processes or, if these were not sufficient, in terms of vehicle innovation. It has been 152 demonstrated that the application of Eco-Design criteria such as design-for-disassembly precautions, in 153 fact, have a large potential for waste reduction; however, they also imply the modification of the product 154 (Schiavone et al., 2008) and the use of environmental impact assessment tools.

#### 2.1 - Relevance of the problem 155

Although ELV-L are not covered by RRR binding targets, a certain attention on their EoL impact analysis 156 can be found in applied research. Communications by motorcycle manufacturers association (ACEM, 157

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

2015a) state that the problem is not critical due to a number of reasons; two relevant ones are the 158 159 existence of a well-established business of reused spare parts from ELV-L and the small amount of waste 160 generated by the category. The market of L-vehicles and the related circulating fleet in Europe is, in fact, 161 about one order of magnitude smaller than the one of M1 and N1 vehicles. To confirm such data an 162 estimation through hypotheses is needed, since ELV-L waste flows are not included in Eurostat database. 163 As shown in Table 2, the data related to M1 class vehicles registrations and deregistrations (Eurostat, 164 2014a, 2014b) have been used to calculate a yearly deregistration rate. The number of expected ELV-L is 165 then calculated assuming that a similar rate applies to L-vehicle; statistics for L-class sales are provided 166 by Manufacturers' Association (ACEM, 2015b). The average mass for L-vehicles shown in Table 3 is based 167 on the technical data of a number of models which represents about 10% of the market sales, according to recent data for the EU28 countries (ACEM, 2015c). The final results confirm the predominance of other 168 169 vehicles waste flows in comparison with ELV-L ones.

- 170 Such elements are still not sufficient to exclude the need for a specific analysis on ELV-L. According to
- 171 the literature data presented in this paragraph, a few relevant reasons arise, main being:
- 172 on a world basis, the number related to the EU context do not apply; the amount of waste material • 173 coming from L-sector is therefore absolutely relevant also in comparison with other vehicle 174 classes, especially for the Asian area (Naomoto et al., 2004)
- 175 the need to improve the environmental profile of any product is motivated not only by the amount • of waste produced, but also from other drivers such as the sensitiveness of the customers; this 176 177 element has been highlighted by the existence of voluntary recycling programs
- 178 certain L-class vehicles have been identified as possible alternatives to other passenger vehicles 179 categories, thus having a large market increase potential.

180 Early research on the topic of ELV-L in EU date behind the introduction of the 2000/53/CE Directive 181 (Corso et al., 1999). An assessment of waste quantities arising from the EoL treatment of all kinds of 182 vehicles circulating has also been proposed (Giannouli et al., 2007); such very complete work therefore 183 represents main reference for any kind of analysis on motorcycle treatment activities, but the mass values 184 for ELV-L appears to be overestimated and significantly differ from the assessment performed in the 185 present study (see Table 3). Former analysis of waste input-output flows in the Asian context (Japan and 186 Thailand) includes Trucks and Motorcycle waste together with automotive ones, thus highlighting the 187 need to take into account all the possible sources and categories of ELVs (Fuse and Kashima, 2008). In 188 relation to the European context, it has been highlighted that some EoL operators (dismantlers and 189 shredders) can handle M1 and N1 together with other kinds of vehicles such as scooters and motorcycles, 190 so that the final RRR rate is also influenced by the presence of such similar, but differently regulated 191 scraps (Berzi et al., 2013). In specific contexts (e.g. large Italian cities) the amount of ELV-L waste is a 192 significant share of the total amount processed by the plants: the estimation is about 10% in mass. Only 193 a limited number of studies have been analyzing the Recyclability of a whole ELV-L; however, particular 194 waste flows such as motorcycle tire have been considered (Rofigul Islam et al., 2008).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

195 According to the fact that the corporate image has been found as a relevant driver for the improvement 196 of product environmental impact (Mathieux et al., 2008), EoL scenarios for motorcycles have been 197 presented on the basis of voluntary activities, thus testifying the interest of the industry to the problem. 198 The assessment of vehicle Recyclability is in fact proposed on manufacturer sustainability 199 communications (HD, 2012; Piaggio&C, 2012); industrial initiatives regarding the improvement of the 200 environmental profile of motorcycle products have also been described in scientific literature (Simboli et 201 al., 2014).

- 202 Looking at the initiatives at a world level and, in particular, in relation to the Asian context, JAMA 203 association introduced a voluntary recycling program in Japan since 2004 (Hiratsuka et al., 2013; JAMA, 204 2008) involving motorcycle manufacturers in a take back system for motorcycle and three-wheel 205 commercial vehicles. ELV-L are also included in the Taiwan recycling program since the early 90s years, which implies that they are subjected to a mandatory recycling target; the system is based on a payback 206 207 supply chain funded by manufacturers (Lee, 1997). The Taiwanese ELV-L recycling program is still under 208 application (EPA-TW, 2015; Fan et al., 2005) and recent assessments claim that the number of recycled 209 motorcycles overpasses the number of recycled cars (Cheng et al., 2012). In recent years the L-vehicle 210 supply chain reorganization for the achievement of satisfactory EoL performances has been proposed 211 using scientific approaches (Kuo et al., 2012; Phornprapha et al., 2010)
- 212 The evidence coming from such brief review is that a few scenarios for waste production from motorcycle 213 sector have been proposed, thus highlighting the interest on the topic. However, it can also be said that 214 a common method for the description of ELV-L characteristics is missing. As an example, a work focused 215 on ELV-L issues (Simboli et al., 2011) shows a material inventory table for a large diffusion scooter, but 216 material classification differs from the ISO22628 standard (ISO, 2002), that is the reference method for 217 the calculation of RR and RRR rates of M1 and N1 vehicles.
- 218 Regarding the choice of the vehicle to be studied, the Piaggio MP3 tilting three-vehicle is particularly 219 interesting due to its technical characteristics and due to its potential growth on the market, since it can 220 be considered an alternative both to conventional PTWs and, partly, to passenger cars. PTWs vehicles are 221 an interesting option for urban and inter-urban personal mobility in comparison with full-size M1 vehicles 222 due to the possibility to limit surface use for parking, to reduce congestion, energy consumption and air 223 pollution (Will et al., 2011). Main known drawbacks are related to their protection and comfort 224 characteristics in comparison with cars (Festini et al., 2011). The proposal of "alternative" vehicles such 225 as tilting ones (three and four wheelers) is therefore gaining interest at a European level; their safety and 226 comfort capabilities have the potential to be more satisfactory in comparison to PTWs. The ability to tilt 227 is a feature that enhances dynamic performances in comparison with rigid, very "narrow" vehicles, whose 228 maximum lateral acceleration is limited by the risk of roll-over (Barker et al., 2009); different architectures 229 have been proposed in the last decade (Bertoluzzo et al., 2008; Edelmann et al., 2011; Kidane et al., 2007). 230 A recent work (Cahill et al., 2013) also highlights a large growth potential for L-vehicles in megacities
- 231 within emerging markets.
- 232 In the context described above, the Piaggio MP3 scooter is one of the few market available products 233 representative of the new sector. In particular, the MP3 hybrid powertrain is the one example of 234 commercial hybrid system for L-vehicles (Hutchinson et al., 2014); its complexity is beyond the typical

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

235 technology of ICE PTWs, but it is also proposed as a pure ICE. Furthermore, the Piaggio MP3 vehicle is 236 available both as L3e or L5e version; the difference between the two models is related to small technical 237 changes. Thus, the platform is representative of a wide range of similar products. For these reason, the vehicle has been used for a Recyclability analysis, aiming to find a reference value for the almost new 238 239 category of the vehicle. The powertrain under examination is representative of a possible evolution path 240 for L-vehicles; its technological content implies additional effort during EoL treatment, since the removal 241 of parts such as batteries, power electronics and rare-earth motors is needed. The curb mass is relevant 242 in comparison with other PTW products, but the vehicle adopts the same technology of most scooters and 243 PTWs, using a plastic bodywork over a metallic frame. Such bodywork, differently from typical M1 vehicles, 244 has an high potential for the production of ASR if not properly treated. The achievement of high recycling 245 rate is conditioned by such complexity; specific dismantling phases are therefore needed to encourage 246 material recycling.

247

Year	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
EU - Countries considered	20	23	23	21	21	22	19
M1class registrations n.°	11,177,368	14,429,385	15,686,046	14,486,027	13,366,112	13,108,573	9,304,788
M1 class ELV n.°	3,537,032	5,218,748	5,973,404	8,419,040	6,584,018	6,270,691	4,308,098
M1 class ELV (t)	3,296,389	4,804,156	5,654,533	7,778,404	6,384,308	6,228,507	4,236,727
Ratio M1 ELV/registrations	32%	36%	38%	58%	49%	48%	46%
L class registration (EU28)	2,300,382	2,460,440	2,328,215	1,934,874	1,669,777	1,510,320	1,313,260
ELV-L estimated n.°	727,946	889,880	886,608	1,124,517	822,516	722,485	608,037
ELV-L estimated mass (t)	129,611	158,443	157,860	200,220	146,449	128,638	108,261

248 249

Table 2 - Estimation of total waste flow related to L-vehicles. Due to lack of data for some countries, the numbers do not refer to the whole EU-28 market (ACEM, 2015b; Eurostat, 2014a).

250

Size	Stroke (cc)	Estimated mass (kg)	Estimated market share
Moped	0 to 50	102	20%
Light	50 to 250	141	25%
Average	250 to 750	199	30%
Large	750 and more	235	25%
Average	all	174	-

251 252

Table 3 - Estimation of the average mass for different size of L-class vehicles (all categories, excluding quadricycles) sold in EU-28. Adapted from ACEM data (ACEM, 2015c).

#### 2.2 - Vehicle End of Life treatment 253

254 The recycling of road vehicles is performed in ATFs, which have to comply to specific regulation for 255 environmental protection. The treatment, according to 2000/53/EC and to good practices, is based on three main steps: depollution, dismantling and shredding, this latter being followed by material separation. 256 257 The depollution phase deals with the removal of main pollutants and hazardous materials, while the 258 dismantling phase includes the separation of all those components suitable for reuse. Direct reuse without

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

259 remanufacturing often occurs. The removal of parts in order to promote the recycling of the material is 260 encouraged by the 2000/53/EC; a certain arbitrariness is permitted to the operator also depending on the subsequent treatments. The shredding of the vehicle is performed to comminute the body and all the 261 262 remaining parts in small fragments, which can be segregated and successfully recycled. In general, almost all the metal content is separated with widespread available technologies, while the other materials (e.g. 263 264 organics) are going to constitute the so-called ASR. Such mixed material waste can be addressed to 265 various form of material and energy recovery if PSTs are available, but most shredding plants still do not 266 perform material separation due to the complexity of the process and to the heterogeneity of the waste. 267 Many studies regarding the evaluation of ASR characteristics and their variability are available in literature (Boughton and Horvath, 2006; Cossu et al., 2014; Vermeulen et al., 2011). Most suitable process often 268 269 include thermal treatments (Sakai et al., 2007; Taylor et al., 2013; Vermeulen et al., 2012) and the 270 economic sustainability of such PST has been verified for certain applications, but it still depends on the 271 context (Ruffino et al., 2014). It can be stated that the achievement of satisfactory RRR rates depends on 272 the successful reduction of the final amount of ASR produced and of any residual that has to be landfilled. 273 If PSTs are not applied, the dismantling phase has to be highly accurate in order to promote the recycling 274 of all the materials, most critical being non-metal ones. A general ELV treatment process is synthetized 275 in the Figure 1, which has been adapted from previous work (Berzi et al., 2013) and comes from on-field 276 observation. The main phases have to be performed for all the road vehicles, but the accuracy and the 277 detail level of each sub-phase depend on vehicle type.



https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

Figure 1 – General EoL treatment for vehicles; upgraded and adapted from (Berzi et al., 2013).

The evidence coming from the on field investigation is that the material flows coming from M1, N1, L and heavy vehicles are frequently mixed together; such activity is not in contrast with the regulation, but can cause inaccuracy in terms of the calculation of final rates. The presence of other type of waste (e.g. urban waste residuals, WEEE) is one of the reasons that can cause contamination of automotive waste, such as PCB pollutants presence (Mancini et al., 2010). Regarding ELV-L, they are subjected to a treatment procedure that is conceptually similar to the one applied to any other ELV; however, since binding RR and RRR rates and not requested, the dismantling operations to promote material recycling can be neglected.

## 287 **2.3 - The need for a disassembly procedure**

288 In case of automotive products covered by the Directive 2000/53/EC, a list of parts to be removed and of their constituting material is usually suggested to the operators through the IDIS (IDIS, 2015), whose 289 290 information come from the manufacturers. For the class of the vehicle under study, such documentation 291 is not available and it is therefore necessary to build up an appropriate treatment sequence. This task has 292 been performed on the three wheeler taking into account the suggestions coming from the experiences 293 and the information acquired during an investigation conducted on ATFs on the Italian territory; the 294 scenarios are described in detail in Section 4. Considering that the dismantling of vehicle parts is labor 295 consuming, various analysis have been proposed in literature to estimate the effort (in terms of cost and 296 time) needed for such phase; however, it can be highlighted that for most products a standardized EoL 297 assessment method is still missing (Mathieux et al., 2014). For main automotive categories parts, for 298 example, empirical time estimation procedure have been proposed in literature (Coates and Rahimifard, 299 2007; Fang et al., 2014). Other analysis are based on the dismantling time estimation through the build-300 up of a precise disassembly sequence. Data describing the type and number of fastenings, the tools 301 needed, the mass of the parts are needed; specific CAE tools are available (Santini et al., 2010).

The cited analyses, however, do not seem to take into account the occurrence of "destructive" operations in case of dismantling for recycling, in which the parts can be cut or broken. In case of recycling, the occurrence of damage (e.g. cracks) of plastic parts is irrelevant; however, a certain material loss in comparison with accurate part dismantling is possible. The consequence of such practices will be shown in the results of the present study.

## 307 2.4 - Reference standard and approaches for the 308 assessment of 3R rates

Considering that a mandatory regulation for the achievement of any 3R target does not exist for L-vehicles,
 a methodology for the assessment of expected value has to be defined from the ones used in other
 transport sectors. The two existing methods in the land transport field are:

• The ISO 22628:2002 standard for road vehicles

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

#### 313 The UNIFE method for Railway vehicles characterization.

314 The ISO22628:2002 method (ISO, 2002) is the only method currently included within existing technical 315 regulation for road vehicles, since it is part of type approval for class N1 and M1 (Directive 2005/64/EC). 316 A reason for the use of this method is the evident analogy between PTWs and automobiles in terms of 317 technology and materials; such similarity is also highlighted by the habit of mixing motorcycle and 318 automotive scraps in ATFs, as described in previous paragraph. The ISO22628 has been already used for 319 the Recyclability assessment of PTW products within the industry, resulting, for the specific manufacturer 320 (Honda motors, 2011), in an overall RR rate of 86.1% and 87.8% for scooter and motorcycles respectively, 321 aggregated result being 86.9%. A case study for the application of this methodology has also been 322 presented in scientific literature (Millet et al., 2012). According to recent studies (Maris and Froelich, 323 2013) the methodology defined by ISO22628 is affected by a number of deficiencies; amongst others, 324 three main criticalities emerged:

- 325 Recyclability indicators should take into account the preservation of the mass of secondary raw • 326 materials in respect of primary ones
- 327 the treatment should be described in accordance with the reference recycling network for a certain ٠ 328 product; in particular, the geographical context, the existence of regulation and the product 329 category can cause different results for parts made of the same materials
- 330 the scope of the calculation itself is not clarified in detail. •

331 Taking into account the whole context of vehicles for inland transport, the other relevant method for the 332 3R rates calculation is the one proposed for railway rolling stock by the Association of Railway 333 Manufacturers UNIFE. The method has been prepared by an expert committee within the proposal of PCR 334 for railway vehicles (EPD Consortium, 2009; UNIFE, 2013) and has to be applied for the proposal of a 335 realistic EoL scenario while performing LCA analysis (Del Pero et al., 2015). Its application, however, is 336 currently not mandatory according to the legislation. Nevertheless, this second choice is particularly 337 interesting for a number of reasons. First of all, it is supposed to be applied by railway vehicles 338 manufacturers on a voluntary basis, in order to satisfy the need of their customers about environmental 339 certification beyond the requirements of regulations. The scopes of the assessment are therefore strongly 340 similar to those of the case study here presented. As a second point, the UNIFE method is related to the 341 performances of industrial recycling and recovery processes.

342 RecyclabilityUNIFE calculation method assumes the ISO22628 as his basis (Merkisz-Guranowska et al., 343 2014) but it has been defined in recent years, so that it can be considered as a possible evolution of the 344 ISO22628 standard . In particular, the description of material inventory is more detailed (16 classes are 345 used instead of 7) and it takes into account a number of technological limitations through the definition 346 of appropriate Material Recycling and Energy Recovery Factors (MRF and ERF). A simple example clarifies 347 such difference: the ISO22628 considers that metal parts are 100% recyclable, while the UNIFE method 348 introduces 98% MRF. The factors are defined according to process losses, that are almost unavoidable 349 due to thermodynamics and technological limits; a description of main causes for the phenomena (e.g.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

350 inaccuracy in material separation, slag production during recycling, quality loss due to contamination) can 351 be found on literature (Froelich et al., 2007a; Graedel et al., 2011; Passarini et al., 2013). Topics related 352 to the assessment of metal recyclability are also gaining interest due to recent trends in vehicle 353 manufacturing, which lead to a different use of aluminum alloys (Hatayama et al., 2012) and to the 354 increased use of steels containing elements such as manganese, chromium, nickel, and molybdenum 355 (Diener and Tillman, 2015; Ohno et al., 2015). A RRR rate of 100% is not achievable in any case according 356 to the UNIFE method, since it sets an upper limit for the value that cannot be exceeded even in case of 357 optimal vehicle treatment; the practical occurrence of such limitation is well known in literature (Reuter 358 et al., 2006; Schmid et al., 2013). The UNIFE method also takes into account the peculiarities of Electric 359 and Electronic components, whose quantity is relevant on EVs and HEVs. In this study, the factor used to 360 assess the Recyclability of power electronics and mechatronics is the one suggested by UNIFE method, 361 even if the assessment of such value is still an open issue and specific dismantling methods are currently 362 under development (Li et al., 2014); the assessment of battery Recyclability is also a topic under 363 discussion in applied research (Richa et al., 2014).

- 364 The formalization of loss factors focuses the approach on the calculation of realistically achievable 3R 365 rates instead of theoretical ones; such assessment is in accordance with latest trends in the sector of 366 recycling. The use of loss factors to estimate effective Recyclability, in fact, has also been applied in 367 studies related to other kind of durable goods, relevant ones being WEEE. The factors can also vary 368 depending on the local context in which the item is supposed to be dismantled (Mizuno et al., 2012), 369 demonstrating the flexibility of the approach and its applicability to different contexts.
- 370 As a final observation, it has to be noted that the assessment of both methods are affected by a strong 371 uncertainty level; the reason is that the decision to dismantle certain vehicles parts is defined through 372 qualitative or arbitrary estimations (e.g. accessibility of the part, availability of recyclers on the local 373 market). The coefficients proposed by the UNIFE document are representative of current technological 374 context in Europe; however, it is not excluded that an update could be necessary depending on the area 375 of application and the technological improvement in next years. Literature studies highlighted the need 376 for the manufacturer to investigate on the recycling industry to define their own guidelines (Froelich et 377 al., 2007b), and, consequently, the need to compare different contexts (Camañes et al., 2014).
- 378 In the present study both the methods will be applied; the ISO22628 is needed to get an index to be 379 compared with existing experiences, while the UNIFE methodology and its corrective factors will be used 380 to calculate an improved index that is expected to be more realistic and, in any case, more restrictive.
- 381 The study presents a set of different hypotheses regarding the accuracy of the treatment; the results 382 therefore include a range of values instead of a unique RRR rate.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

## **383 3** - Method for vehicle dismantling and

384

## 3R rates assessment

This section describes all the phases performed to analyze the three wheeler and perform 3R rates calculation. The topics include the definition of main treatment steps according to the selected methodologies; after that, the vehicle has been fully dismantled and analyzed, as described in next section.

According both to ISO22628 and UNIFE method, the process has to be described through the list of those parts and materials removed during main treatment steps, in accordance with the sequence usually adopted in ATFs:

- 392 a) pretreatment
- 393 b) dismantling
- 394 c) separation of metals
- 395 d) processing of non-metallic residue

The material breakdown is also described through the use of pre-defined classes. The methodology, as described by the standards, is formulated in such a way that it can deal with the EoL process of different types of land vehicles.

### **399 3.1** - Material breakdown phase

Both the methods propose a list of material classes which include all the typical ones for automotive and railway components. The two methods use different material classes, the UNIFE proposal being more detailed. Table 4 illustrates the two proposed approaches; regarding UNIFE one, the coefficients MRF and ERF have to be used as described in Table 5. MRF and ERF values are based on the know-how on current technological limitations. Notably, a low ERF (less than 20%) is used for the non-metal materials mixed in ASR; such value can be justified by the high ash production related to thermal valorization, that has been demonstrated even considering the significant organic content of the ASR (Vermeulen et al., 2011).

ISO22628		UNIFE method					
Class	Description	Class	Description	MRF	ERF	Residue	
1	Metals	1	FE Metals	98%	0%	2%	
2	Polymers	2	Non-FE Metals	98%	0%	2%	
3	Elastomers	3	Elastomers	80%	20%	0%	
4	Glass	4	Thermoplastics (unfilled)	100%	0%	0%	
5	Fluids	5	Thermoplastics (GF filled)	67%	33%	0%	
	Modified Organic Natural		Thermosete				
6	Materials (MONM)	6	memosets	100%	0%	0%	

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

.

	Others (Compounds, Electric,						
7	etc.)	7		Thermosels (GF IIIed)	67%	33%	0%
		8		Carbon or natural fiber reinforced polymers	67%	33%	0%
		9		Glass	100%	0%	0%
		10		Safety Glass	94%	0%	6%
		11		Lubricants	0%	100%	0%
		12		Other service Fluids	83%	0%	17%
		13		Modified Organic Natural Material (MONM)	95%	5%	0%
		14		Electric and electronics	79%	19%	2%
		15		Ceramics	43%	0%	57%
		16		Mineral wool	97%	0%	3%
		All	non-	Mixed non-motel meterials in ASP			
		metal		wixeu non-metal materials in ASK	14%	19%	67%

408Table 4 – Material categories for both considered methods and material factors to be used for409UNIFE calculations. Considering those parts that are not dismantled, MRF and ERF for ASR have410to be used.

## 411 3.2 - Pretreatment phase

412 The pretreatment of the vehicle is mainly determined by safety reasons and implies the removal from the vehicle of all the potentially harmful substances. When the substance cannot be extracted, whole parts 413 414 are removed. The pretreatment step is extremely critical because the accuracy of its execution affects the 415 subsequent stages. In particular, an inappropriate pretreatment may involve the presence of pollutants 416 recognized as dangerous in the residue obtained after vehicle shredding; hydrocarbons contamination is a typical example. All the removed elements usually need other treatment processes such as 417 418 neutralization, reuse, recycling or recovery, depending on their characteristics; such operations are most 419 time performed by specialized operators different from the ATF. 420 Components prescribed to be removed include:

- 421 batteries
- all vehicle fluids
  - engine oil, fuels, coolant, service fluids
- 424 gas tanks (LPG, CNG), if present
- oil filters
- 426 tyres

423

• catalytic converters

428 In addition, it is mandatory to remove any other component containing hazardous substances or materials.

429 Typical examples are lead weights, mercury switches, electric parts containing PCB fluids; however, all

this parts are typical of old production vehicles. The ISO22628 describes the pretreatment phase in such

431 a way that the operations to be done are almost univocally determined.

The sum of the masses of the components, materials and fluids removed at this stage is considered to be
 reusable or recyclable; according to ISO22628, the abbreviation is conventionally m<sub>P</sub>. According to UNIFE

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

434 method, no relevant differences arise;  $m_P$  has to include other parts typical of rolling stock vehicles (e.g. 435 fire extinguisher).

#### 3.3 - Dismantling phase 436

According to both the ISO 22628 and the Directive 2000/53/EC, the manufacturer has to identify the 437 438 vehicle components that have to be disassembled for the purpose of their reuse and/or recycling as 439 material. None of the two prescribe exactly which components have to be disassembled, but only the 440 criteria for the selection are declared. In the ISO22628 the first criterion of selection is based on the easiness of dismantling, which depends on the accessibility of the part, on the type of fastening used and 441 442 on the existence of proven dismantling technologies. As a second element, the part can be selected if a 443 proven recycling technology is available according to its material composition.

444 The use of indicators to quantify "easiness of dismantling" is still under discussion and this characteristics 445 is therefore subjected to qualitative estimations or, in any case, it is related to the know-how of the 446 manufacturer rather than to public standards. Also, the availability of technologies for dismantling and 447 recycling depends on the local context on which the dismantling phase is performed and could vary with 448 the progress of technological status; it has already been highlighted that it is up to the manufacturer to 449 be aware about the suitable options (Millet et al., 2012). As a conclusion, these evaluations are partially 450 arbitrary and different choices are possible.

The Directive 2000/53/EC contains additional information since it includes in its Annex I the categories 451 452 of components to be considered for dismantling, such as:

- 453 Catalysts •
- Metal components containing copper, aluminum and magnesium if these metals are not 454 • 455 segregated in the shredding process
- 456 Glass •
- 457 Tyres and large plastic components (bumpers, dashboard, fluid containers, etc) if these materials • are segregated in the shredding process in such a way that they can be effectively recycled as 458 459 materials

460 A few observation are necessary to understand the consequence of the notes declared in this list for the 461 calculation of RR and RRR rates. The prescription regarding the catalyst is coherent with ISO 22628, which indicates its removal during the pretreatment phase; in practice this is always done due to the high 462 463 economic value of the scrap resulting from such component.

464 The removal of metal parts is not critical due to the fact that post-shredding segregation methods for 465 metals are technologically mature. In any case, the ISO 22628 always includes metal parts in the list of mass to be recycled, so that the occurrence of metal parts dismantling does not influence the calculation 466 467 of RR and RRR rates; next paragraphs clarify this point. In any case, operators usually dismantle metal 468 parts if they can recognize the presence of an alloy having an high economic value.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

469 The removal of glass parts is usually performed due to their accessibility, but this material is not used in 470 the vehicle under examination, as usual for ELV-L.

The last elements of the list include organic materials; in this case, the occurrence of dismantling is critical 471 472 for recycling. Considering the large number of existing families (elastomer, thermoplastic and thermoset polymers), only a few of them are suitable for recycling. In addition, polymers can be effectively recycled 473 474 if the purity of the scrap is high, that means low presence of contaminants and high level of separation of 475 each polymer from the others. Even if post-shredding segregation technologies are available at an 476 industrial level, the amount and the quality of processed material can be lower in comparison with those 477 obtained by manual dismantling of the parts. Since a large number of plastic parts are usually installed 478 on vehicles (up to a few hundreds, considering also small mass parts), the 100% removal is not feasible 479 and a compromise is necessary (Tian and Chen, 2014). It is therefore evident that the choice of the plastic 480 components to be dismantled is critical for the achievement of satisfactory 3R rates. In the application 481 phase of this study different scenarios are proposed depending on the amount of dismantled plastics.

482 The ISO 22628 indicates the sum of the masses of the components disassembled at this stage with the 483 symbol  $m_{\rm D}$ . The same approach is proposed by to the UNIFE method; in addition, this latter introduces 484 additional guidelines to suggest to the operator which components are best candidates for dismantling.

#### 3.4 - Metals separation 485

After the disassembly phase, all the ferrous and non-ferrous metals that were not removed in the previous 486 487 phases are considered as recyclable. These mass is mainly constituted by vehicle body and powertrain; it 488 is identified by the symbol  $m_M$ . The metal parts included in  $m_M$  are therefore considered recyclable as well 489 as those manually removed and included in m<sub>D</sub>. In practice, the dismantling of metal parts is not really 490 influencing the final 3R rates. As said before, however, the manual dismantling can avoid the mixture of 491 special alloys with other metal scraps and it is certainly a good option to preserve the characteristics of 492 the material. Nevertheless, the RR rate calculation is not conceived to distinguish between different 493 quality levels of recycling.

#### 3.5 - Non-metals residues treatment 494

All the materials remaining from previous steps are subjected to shredding together with the metal part 495 496 of the vehicle and are therefore constituting the ASR. The ISO22628, and similarly the UNIFE method, 497 identifies for this residuals the following destinations:

- 498 additional treatment with separation and recycling: the mass subjected to this selection is • 499 identified by the symbol  $m_{Tr}$
- use for energy recovery: the mass potentially usable for this purpose is indicated by the symbol 500 • 501 m<sub>Te</sub>.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

503 The determination of m<sub>Tr</sub> is, again, dependent on existing technologies and therefore it is estimated on 504 the basis of the available know-how. According to the notes in ISO22628, polymers, elastomers and MONM are considered *potentially* usable for the recovery of energy. Within the present activity such 505 506 materials are supposed to be always subjected to thermal recovery if not included in  $m_D$  or  $m_{Tr}$ . As a consequence, the sum of  $m_D,\,m_{Tr}\,$  and  $m_{Te}$  is constant and the choices determining  $m_D$  and  $m_{Tr}\,are$  not 507 508 influencing the final RRR rate. In addition, since  $m_{Te}$  is based on the amount of material addressed to 509 recovery processes, the effective performances of such technology (e.g. production of waste residuals 510 such as bottom ashes) are not explicitly considered.

511 On the contrary, the UNIFE method uses two constant parameters for the evaluation of m<sub>Tr</sub> and m<sub>Te</sub>; these are calculated as 14% and 19% (MRF and ERF, respectively) of the mass of non-metal materials not 512 included in m<sub>D</sub>. Due to the use of such factors, within the UNIFE method the RRR rate is expected to vary 513

514 and to be dependent on the assumptions regarding dismantling effort.

#### 3.6 - Recyclability and Recoverability rates 515

516 The calculation of the RR and RRR rates takes into account the masses defined in the previous steps. The 517 RR and RRR rates are respectively indicated by the R<sub>cvc</sub> and R<sub>cov</sub> coefficients. Different definitions are possible for the initial mass of the vehicle  $m_{V_i}$  in this application it is constituted by the total shipping 518 519 mass of the vehicle as defined by ISO1176 - Standard on road vehicles masses (ISO, 1990). The mass  $m_{y}$ includes the masses of lubricants, service fluids, fuel (it is assumed that the reservoir is filled at least 90% 520 521 of the capacity specified by the manufacturer) and equipment such as spare wheels, standard 522 accessories, tool kits. Such definition is in accordance with ISO22628.

523 The two methods differ on the basis of the use of loss factors (MRF and ERF for the UNIFE), as described 524 in Table 5; the final RR and RRR values have to be rounded to the unit, but in the present document a one 525 decimal approximation is used for enhanced precision.

526 As already discussed, the consequence of the use of the UNIFE factors is that the 100% result is not 527 achievable in any case.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013



528 Table 5 – Comparison between calculation criteria for the two methods (ISO22628 Vs. UNIFE 529 method).

### 530 3.7 - Scenario definition

531 The application of the ISO standard in order to calculate the RR and RRR rates implies the definition of a 532 dismantling scenario for EoL; it should be as consistent as possible with the actual treatment in the ATFs. 533 Dismantling operations, in fact, are subjected to an uncertainty which depends, amongst others, on the 534 technology available for post-shredding operations. As described in paragraph 3.4 -Metals separation, the 535 dismantling of metal parts is not influencing the RR and RRR rates; also, the pretreatment phase is 536 prescribed in detail both by ISO 22628 and Directive 2000/53/EC and is therefore completely defined. As 537 a consequence, the element that differentiate final results for a realistic scenario is the amount of organic 538 materials dismantled, since only this choice has a significant impact on the calculation results.

539 Therefore, the proposal of a list of parts to be dismantled by the manufacturer is partly based on arbitrary 540 considerations, which are aimed at the achievement of satisfactory recycling indexes; it is possible that other recyclable parts are excluded, if not strictly necessary to achieve the binding threshold. During 541 542 dismantling in plants, the choice suggested by the manufacturer can therefore vary depending on 543 operators' attitude. In order to consider the variability of the process, different scenarios are considered 544 in the present work. Assuming the point of view of the manufacturer, the analysis can be used to identify 545 the parts of the vehicle to be listed in the ISO22628 which are essential for the achievement of RR and 546 RRR targets, while the non-priority ones could be considered only for post-shredding treatments.

Assuming the point of view of the Authority, the analysis estimates what is going to happen in terms of waste production in case of inappropriate or incomplete treatment of the vehicle in the ATFs. This can occur due to the heterogeneity of such plants, which are mostly using craft-type dismantling methods.

# 4 - Application on the three wheeler case study

552 This section describes the approach followed for the evaluation of the 3R rates for the case study and 553 compares the outcomes obtained from the application of the two different standards. The vehicle under

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

554 study has been fully dismantled and analyzed to obtain the parts and materials inventory; documentation 555 such as workshop manual has also been used. Starting from such data, the material breakdown has been expressed according to the two different classification proposed by ISO22628 and UNIFE standards. Then, 556 557 a typical treatment sequence - including pretreatment and dismantling - is formulated. On the subsequent step, four scenarios have been identified considering different dismantling effort and the context of the 558 559 ATFs. This phase generates the list of parts to be dismantled and to the estimation of RR and RRR rates 560 for the two methods.

561 The last step introduces additional hypotheses to the scenarios (i.e. increased ERF coefficient for ASR

562 and loss of material in case of destructive dismantling) in order to calculate the variability of the RR and

563 RRR rates.



564

565

Figure 2 – Methodology adopted for the EoL analysis of the three wheeler.

#### 4.1 - Vehicle description 566

567 The vehicle used for the case study is an L-class three wheeler; depending on technical details, it is 568 assimilated to L3e type (motorcycle vehicles) or L5e type, while most part of the model remain the same. The layout of the vehicle is typical of scooters: the engine is rear and integrated with the swingarm, the 569

570 central part of the frame is structured as a foot platform and the rider is protected by a large front shield. 571 The structural part is composed by a steel frame, while the bodywork is constituted by plastic covers. The 572 vehicle is equipped with a tilting system on the front part that significantly increases its curb weight (about 573 279kg) in comparison with scooters having similar displacement. The powertrain includes a gasolineelectric hybrid unit. After the removal of harmful substances, the three wheeler has been disassembled 574 575 obtaining the complete separation of body parts, fittings, chassis and engine. Complex subsystems (shock 576 adsorbers, engine, bearings) have not been further dismantled, since such detail is not needed at the 577 dismantling stage. Finally, the inventory of parts included 178 elements, which have been singularly 578 weighted.



579

580

Figure 3 – Vehicle "Piaggio MP3 125 Hybrid" exploded components

581 As shown in Figure 4, the total vehicle mass is constituted by about 70% of metals (mainly frame and 582 engine), followed by a 19% of plastic parts, particularly used for the bodywork. The 5% is then constituted by rubber parts (tires, pipes, transmission belt, seals, etc.) and followed by 4% of fluids (fuel, coolant, 583 584 engine oil and brakes fluid); 2% is constituted by electronic parts (small PCB used in control units). High 585 voltage electric parts such as the battery and the power converters have been further dismantled to list 586 their constituting materials (plastic, metals and others). As illustrated in Figure 6, steel is the predominant 587 metal (80%), followed by aluminum (about 16%); these fraction are supposed to be separated at the end 588 of the process, consequently to the shredding phase.

589 The classification according to the material categories proposed by the UNIFE method is shown in Figure 590 5; in this subdivision, electric parts include all batteries and power converters; further classification is not 591 necessary since the method proposes a specific MRF for electrical compounds.

592

593 Focusing the attention to the plastic components (mainly thermoplastic, with the exception of PU foam 594 used for the seat), the most used polymers are constituted by polypropylene-based compounds (PP 595 sometimes including fillers such as glass fibers and glass dust), representing 65% of the total mass of 596 plastics. Within other polymers, the most used is ABS, that is about 12% of total polymers.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013



597

598 Figure 4 – Vehicle "Piaggio MP3 125 Hybrid" mass composition according to ISO22628.

599



600

601Figure 5 - Vehicle mass composition according to UNIFE categories. Only most representative602categories are shown (8 out of 16), while the remaining (thermosets, glass, MONM etc.) are603included in "others".

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013



605

606 Figure 6 – Metals contributions to the whole metal fraction. Lead is used for the low-voltage 607 battery.

608



609

610

Figure 7 – Contribution of each plastic polymer to the whole plastic mass composition.

## 611 4.2 - Dismantling scenarios

According to the possibility of process variability, 4 different End of Life scenarios have been proposed: for each of them, the same depollution operations have been considered, but then the accuracy level of

- dismantling is varied, as described in paragraph 3.7 -Scenario definition.
- The 4 scenarios have been hypothesized as follows:
- scenario n° 1: in this case no dismantling is considered, so after the pretreatment, the whole
   remaining vehicle is directly subjected to the shredding operation. Consequently, at the end of the
   whole EoL process, all plastic components will be included in the ASR fraction. This scenario
   represents the *"worst case"* and is representative of an inappropriate treatment

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

- <u>scenario n° 2</u>: the dismantling of PP-based components has been considered in addition to the treatment provided in the scenario n° 1. PP-based materials are the most used plastics in the vehicle, accounting for 34.3 kg (12.3% of total vehicle mass); the availability of recycling technologies for PP is proven (Froelich et al., 2007b). The removal of the parts, according to the structure of the vehicle, also implies the disassembly of some additional parts (mainly metal-based, e.g. aluminum radiator, front supports, etc.). Most PP is localized on the bodyworks, that is directly accessible. This case is defined as the *"PP dismantling scenario"*.
- <u>scenario n° 3</u>: the treatment includes the dismantling of plastic parts made with the two most used thermoplastic polymers, namely PP and ABS, in addition to the treatment provided in scenario n° 1. ABS parts account for 6.3 kg (2.3% of total vehicle mass); this second material has been chosen because it is mostly localized on the exterior body of the vehicle, thus being accessible. It is named *"PP & ABS scenario"*.
- <u>scenario n° 4</u>: in this last case, it has been considered the dismantling of all the components
   made with other thermoplastic polymers or recyclable ones in addition to the treatment provided
   in scenario n° 1. This case represents the best scenario, called *"Accurate dismantling"*.
- 635 Concerning the scenario from 2 to 4, few assumptions are necessary. The removal of some components 636 has been considered unfeasible due to their accessibility difficulties, which imply high disassembly time, 637 or instead for its low mass. It was therefore assumed that they are left on the vehicle and subject to 638 shredding together with the metal parts, thus contributing to the formation of ASR. The list of these 639 components is summarized in the Table 6.
- Table 7 includes the components made of polymeric materials that have not been disassembled in the scenario 2 and 3. This components are included in the dismantling list for the scenario 4. The PP and ABS components to be removed, as expected in the scenario 2 and 3, are described in the graphical summary presented in Figure 8.
- 644 In addition to the four main scenarios, a few additional boundary conditions have also been formulated. 645 The disassembly of plastic parts is usually partially destructive (e.g. through cutting, breaking, ripping), 646 allowing the removal of only a portion of the mass of the components. In the present work, all the scenarios 647 are therefore also presented including the possibility of such partial removal; the hypothesized removed 648 mass percentage is 95%. In this way, the remaining amount (5%) is intended to contribute to the formation 649 of the ASR. Regarding ASR, two ERF factors are used for comparison: the standard UNIFE one, that is 19%, and an enhanced one, that is 50%; such value is used in order to evaluate which improvement should 650 651 be necessary to the PST process to achieve the 95% RRR target. Another variation has been done 652 considering the reduction of MRF to 0%, that is still a probable option in some contexts.
- Reasonable assumptions are also necessary for those parts made of more than one material which are closely bonded; for these, it was assumed that the organic part is thermally recoverable and that the remaining part is recyclable as metal. The ratio between organic and inorganic was obtained by weighting (see Table 8). It should be noted that wire harness is about 2.5% of total vehicle mass, that is quite remarkable; a relevant contribution comes from the hybrid powertrain system. According to ISO22628, the

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

658 mass of complex components that are supposed to be dismantled in the pretreatment (e.g. high voltage 659 battery) is considered recyclable, even if such hypothesis is almost unrealistic.

39 <sup>1</sup> 38

<sup>19</sup> 18 14 <sup>13</sup>

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

PP or ABS components	Mass [kg]	24
Lower helmet compartment	4.260	- 11
Rear cover helmet compartment	1.140	27
RH passenger grab handle	0.322	20
LH passenger grab handle	0.315	23
Closure backrest support	0.288	12 16
Rear luggage closure	0.178	31 3649 29 29 18 14
Central part front wheels compartment	0.135	30 30 30 30 21 20
Electric fan bracket	0.101	
RH switch support	0.087	37
LH switch support	0.084	43 3 35 8 .34
Radiator fan	0.047	11 42 54
RH side front suspension cover	0.029	41 20 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1,
LH side front suspension cover	0.029	4217
Closure passage wiring helmet comp.	0.028	
Licence plate light	0.017	2 0 3 1
Bracket wiring helmet comp.	0.010	44
		48 48 39 40 40 40

Table 6 - List of PP and ABS components that have been evaluated unsuitable for disassembly. On the right column, an example of underseat ones (n° 1, 41 and 50). Source: Piaggio Spare Parts Catalogue.

#### 

Component	Material	Mass [kg]
Seat foam	PU foam	1.55
Fuel tank	PE-HD	1.53
Headlamp	PPT40, PA66, PES PC, EPDM	1.48
Windshield	PMMA	1.20
Rubber pipes (various)	Rubber n.d.	1.11
Passenger backrest	PU foam, PVC	1.11
Meter combination	PC	0.93
Seat cover	PVC	0.49
Plastic bands, rubber seals and caps	Various rubbers and plastics	0.35
Cooling fan	Plastic n.d.	0.34
Ignition coil cover	PBT 30GF	0.32
Muffler protection	PA66 30SV	0.28
Table 7 – List of components not disas	sembled, and thus considered only for ene	rgy recovery (m <sub>Te</sub>

- mass contribution) in the EOL scenario 2 and 3. Small parts (below 0.25kg) are not reported.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

Component	Total Mass on vehicle (kg)	Ratio
Wire harness (plastic/copper), (plastic/steel)	5.5	Organics 45%; Copper 55%
Bowden flexible cables	1.3	Organics 15%; Steel 85%
Table 8 – Components constituted by closel	v bonded materials and t	therefore not easy to separe

Such data have been used to estimate  $m_{Tr}$  and  $m_M$  contributions for the ISO22628 calculation.

669 670

671

## 4.3 - Results

The calculation of the RR and RRR rates for each of the four vehicle End of Life scenarios and for the different boundary conditions described in the previous paragraph generates the results summarized in Table 9 and Figure 8. The outcomes of both calculation methods are included, the UNIFE one being more conservative in comparison with ISO22628, as expected.

676

	Method Boundary Conditions			RR					RRR			
		% dismantling	MRF ASR	ERF ASR	Worst	PP	PP+ABS	Accurate	Worst	PP	PP+ABS	Accurate
1	ISO22628	100%	-	-	79.3%	85.3%	87.4%	89.4%	98.1%	98.1%	98.1%	98.1%
2	UNIFE	100%	14%	19%	79.1%	83.9%	85.7%	87.2%	85.6%	89.6%	91.0%	92.3%
3	UNIFE	100%	14%	50%	79.1%	83.9%	85.7%	87.2%	91.3%	93.4%	94.2%	94.9%
4	UNIFE	100%	0%	19%	76.5%	82.2%	84.3%	86.0%	88.7%	91.7%	92.8%	93.7%
5	ISO22628	95%	-	-	79.3%	85.0%	87.1%	88.9%	98.1%	98.1%	98.1%	98.1%
6	UNIFE	95%	14%	19%	79.1%	83.7%	85.4%	86.8%	85.6%	89.4%	90.7%	92.0%
7	UNIFE	95%	14%	50%	79.1%	83.7%	85.4%	86.8%	91.3%	93.4%	94.1%	94.7%
8	UNIFE	95%	0%	19%	76.5%	81.9%	83.9%	85.6%	83.0%	87.6%	89.2%	90.7%

677Table 9 – Final RR and RRR rates achieved in the different scenarios according to the described678boundary conditions. Case 1: ISO22628 calculation on the four scenarios. Case 2: UNIFE679calculation on the four scenarios. Case 3: UNIFE calculation, on the hypothesis of 50% ERF for680ASR. Case 4: UNIFE calculation, on the hypothesis of 0% MRF for ASR. Case 5 to 8: same681hypotheses of case 1 to 4, additional hypothesis being 95% dismantling rate for non-metal parts682(e.g. due to destructive dismantling).



https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

#### 684 Figure 8 - RR rate in the four analyzed EoL scenarios, according with the different methodologies 685 applied. Buondary conditions applied: 95% dismantling rate for plastic parts, standard UNIFE MRF 686 and ERF factors for the ASR (case 5 and 6 in Table 7).

687 Looking at ISO22628 results, the RR rate changes significantly depending on the scenario considered. No 688 dismantling intervention (scenario 1) produces a RR rate of 79.5%, while the hypothesis of dismantling 689 only the PP components appears to be sufficient to comply with the 85% limit required by EoL Directive. 690 In the cases of the scenario 3, where PP and ABS components are disassembled, and in the scenario 4, 691 where an accurate dismantling phase has been hypothesized, the RR rate significantly exceeds the 85% 692 limit, respectively being 87.4% and 89.4%. Figure 9 illustrates material flow for the different phases for the 693 scenario 3 under the adoption of ISO22628 method.



694 695 696

697

Figure 9 - Sankey diagram illustrating EoL material flow for the case study - method adopted: ISO22628, scenario PP+ABS dismantling. Masses corresponds to the symbols introduced in Table 5.

698 Looking at the Pareto chart in Figure 10, if the disassembly is conducted without breaking the plastic 699 bodywork components, the target of RR=85% is obtained removing only the first n° 30 heaviest PP and 700 ABS components (graphically, this scenario corresponds with the point of intersection between the green 701 curve with the horizontal blue line). However, the experience suggests that a partially destructive 702 dismantling can occur in certain ATFs. Such case is modeled assuming that 95% of material for each part 703 is effectively removed, while 5% remains on the vehicle frame, thus becoming ASR after shredding. With 704 this additional hypothesis, it is necessary to consider an higher number of PP and ABS components in 705 order to achieve to the same Recyclability value.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013



#### Pareto chart on Disassembly phase (PP and ABS components)

706

## 707Figure 10 – List of all ABS and PP components suitable for dismantling (scenario 2, 3 and 4),708showing their singular mass and the cumulated dismantled one. The plot include the minimum709value to be reached for 85% RR rate using the ISO22628 approach (corresponding to at least 16.6710kg of dismantled plastic) and the effect of the application of a 95% effective dismantling rate.

711

The RRR rate remains constant in each scenario, equal to 98%, and thus satisfying the limit of 95% required by the 2000/53/EC Directive. An explanation is needed for such result. As already observed describing ISO22628 methodology, the RRR value is based on the material *potentially* recoverable, so that any organic material not considered in  $m_D$  and  $m_{Tr}$  is in any case included in  $m_{Te}$ ; the sum of the three is constant. The same applies to metal materials; those parts not included in  $m_D$  are in any case included in  $m_M$ . Since  $m_P$  is unambiguously determined by the prescription, the final result is that RRR value does not depend on the treatment applied.

Such result are in line with those achieved by the products subjected to Directive 2000/53/EC and demonstrates that the vehicle can already satisfy 3R requirements provided for M1 and N1 classes. The analysis of all the vehicle components showed that even if Recyclability is not a legally binding target for this vehicle, the good prescriptions usually applied in automotive production to encourage recycling are respected, and in particular:

- most components are marked with the symbol or the acronym of the constituting material, that is
   fundamental to recognize and trace recyclable ones
- the number of polymeric families used in the vehicle are quite low, and most parts are made using
   PP and ABS, that can be recycled

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

728 parts potentially containing hazardous materials can be separated quite easily, mainly being 729 represented by the electronic components and electric accumulators.

730 The analysis, however, still suggests that the application of further Design for EoL criteria is necessary to 731 increase the opportunities for recycling. Even if no criticalities emerged, a few improvement opportunities 732 arised. In particular:

- 733 a certain separation effort is necessary to dismantle from the bodywork panels those additional ٠ 734 parts which are built using different polymers, e.g. the elastomer protectors linked to the PP 735 footboard
- 736 despite of the fact that most part are directly accessible for disassembly, a few components with ٠ 737 relevant mass are not recommended for dismantling due the complexity of the operation. That is 738 the case of helmet and luggage vane which is collocated under the seat; thus, even if its 739 constituting material is recyclable, this part was excluded for disassembly, since it is not 740 compatible with the time restrictions related to normal ATFs activities
- 741 the number of different polymers and of their coatings used in the vehicle should be further ٠ 742 reduced; the vehicle, however, already shows a remarkable homogeneity
- 743 the participation to the IDIS platform, originally developed by the automotive industry to meet the • 744 legal obligations of the 2000/53/EC Directive; IDIS can be used to suggest to the operators the 745 treatments to be performed on the basis of manufacturers know-how; this is mainly aimed to:
- 746 747
- o ensure that all the hazardous components are removed on the pretreatment phase, e.g. highlighting the presence of fluid in the shock adsorbers
- 748 749
- identify the components, particularly the plastic ones, which have be to be dismantled to 0 achieve the RR target with reasonable labor.

750 The collection of fluid from shock absorbers is time consuming and is often neglected from ATFs. Such 751 practice, even if related to insufficient treatment rather than to manufacturer choice, should be 752 discouraged, e.g. through proper component marking. However, sealed shock absorbers are used also on 753 vehicle already subjected to 2000/53/EC, so that the three wheeler is, again, in line with those vehicle 754 currently subjected to mandatory 3R targets.

755

756 The application of the UNIFE method leads to significantly lower RR rates. Considering that a market for 757 secondary raw materials coming from plastic scraps are quite consolidated only for a few polymers (e.g. 758 the painted PP constituting the bodywork can be treated together with bumpers coming from M1 and N1 759 vehicles), at the current moment the scenario 3 (which suggests the dismantling of PP and ABS parts) is 760 likely to be the most feasible. In this case, the effective value estimated by the UNIFE method is slightly 761 above the 85% limit, thus showing the feasibility of the achievement of the RR target even considering technological limitations. It should be noted, however, the relevant role of PST for ASR recycling: the 762 763 modification of the MRF from 14% to 0% (a realistic scenario for current shredding facilities), in fact, 764 implies that 85% target can be reached only in case of accurate dismantling.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

765

766 Regarding the final RRR rate, the value assessed by the UNIFE method is significantly lower than the ISO22628 one and in general below the 95% target. The difference is due to the unfavourable MRF and 767 ERF factors (14% and 19%, respectively) used for those parts which are not dismantled from the vehicle 768 769 and are supposed to be recovered through ASR treatment. In case that more efficient PST techniques will 770 be introduced, a value of 95% could be achievable; in the proposed example, an ERF of 50% could lead to 771 an RRR value in line with the target considering the unit approximation (i.e., 94.9% is 95%). However, it 772 cannot be said, on the basis of the present work, if the ERF has to be limited due to technological factors 773 (i.e., new technologies could reach the needed 50% factor) or due to unavoidable limitations (i.e., the limit 774 is related to the characteristics of the materials and 50% ERF is physically unfeasible). To respond to such 775 question, a shredding trial of the three wheeler together with other L-class vehicles (similar three 776 wheelers, two wheelers, scooters etc.) and a tailored ASR characterization would be needed.

11 should be noted that the ELV-L under study, even if not currently subjected to the whole requirements of 2000/53/EC Directive, is designed in a way which enables the achievement of promising RR and RRR rates, so that according to the current automotive reference standard ISO22628 the target for 2015 can be fully satisfied. The consequence is that the mixing of the scraps coming from ELV-L with the ones coming from M1 and N1 ELVs does not modify significantly the overall recycling results, for which the M1 and N1 ELVs are certified.

## 783 **5 - Conclusions**

Market forecasts regarding urban mobility alternatives suggest that an increasing relevance of L-class vehicles in the European circulating fleet is possible. Main cause for such interest is based on the need for new personal and urban mobility solutions in the context of European and worldwide cities. However, the European ELV Directive does not set 3R objectives for most L-category vehicles. Not surprisingly, recycling programs are consolidated on those countries where L-vehicles are sold in relevant numbers, especially in Asian area.

790 The present study aims at estimate the EoL performances of one L-vehicle and has been conducted on 791 the Piaggio MP3 125 Hybrid. It has been chosen due to the fact that it represents a niche market segment 792 with a relevant potential for increase in the next years; the vehicle technology is also innovative and it is 793 a candidate as personal urban mobility solution in the context of vehicle electrification. The analysis has 794 been developed not only according to regulation-related standards, but also taking into account actual 795 EoL issues. As a first assumption, former experiences have been used to define a proper EoL treatment 796 for ELV-L category, the process being structured similarly to the one applied on full-size M1 and N1 797 vehicles. Two methods for the assessment of 3R performances have been chosen and compared, the first 798 one being the ISO22628 standard, suitable for automotive products, and the second one being the UNIFE 799 method. This latter is supposed to be used on the basis of voluntary agreements by railway manufacturers; 800 it introduces effective Recyclability/Recoverability factors (MRF and ERF). Various hypotheses have been 801 proposed, leading to four main dismantling scenarios.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

The vehicle has been dismantled, obtaining a detailed inventory. The first results of the study is a full material breakdown which highlights the predominance of metallic materials, the value being above 70%, similarly to other regulated automotive products. The study showed that the vehicle is capable of satisfactory EoL performances. Precautions such as material marking permits the correct identification of all the components during dismantling and, in general, limited criticalities have been noted.

The analysis of the vehicle, according to the unavoidable arbitrariness of the existing methodologies, highlights that it can fully comply with the dictates of the Directive and with the type approval necessities if analyzed using ISO22628. In particular, the extensive use of PP suggests a possible market interest for the plastic scraps; in addition, the dismantling of the bodywork is also sufficient to achieve the 85% RR result, and higher values are obtained in case of favorable scenario.

812 Since the performances of the recycling system in each Country are evaluated on the basis of final scraps 813 and ASR products, the adoption of a method which uses loss factors based on experience enhances the 814 quality of preliminary calculation of RR and RRR rates. According to such observation, the use of the 815 UNIFE methodology highlights that, even if it is still possible to achieve a satisfactory RR rate, the actual 816 Recyclability differs from the theoretically calculated one, discrepancy being about 2% for typical 817 scenarios. The analysis suggests that the ATFs should dismantle both PP and ABS parts (the most used 818 plastics in the vehicle) in order to achieve an effective 85% RR rate. The UNIFE RR rate is further reduced 819 adopting additional, restrictive hypotheses. In such case, the target of 85% can be reached only in case 820 that considerable effort is spent for the accurate dismantling on the vehicle. However, average values are 821 not far from the threshold, since RR rate below 82% are obtained only in case of improper treatment by 822 ATFs (worst case scenario).

Regarding the RRR rates, the discrepancy between ISO22628 and UNIFE estimations is wider in comparison with RR rate. According to the first method, RRR rate overpasses 98% in every scenario, since the method itself is not able to estimate the sensitiveness of the results on the treatment variation. The UNIFE estimation, on the contrary, defines an upper limit that reduce the realistic, achievable value on the edge of 95%. The difference between ISO22628 and UNIFE RRR rate ranges from 3% to 15%, depending on the considered scenario.

829 It is not possible, in the present study, to determine if such limit can be overpassed improving the 830 technology of the treatment or if it is unfeasible in any case. Such observation confirms that further work 831 is necessary to verify MRF and ERF values and to improve the confidence on preliminary RR and RRR 832 calculations. In particular, batteries and inverters are critical components for HEVs; further study is 833 necessary to assess their Recyclability with dedicated factors rather than using average ones for electrical 834 parts. MRF and ERF specific for context of application should be investigated through applied research, 835 since such parameters are related not only to the component material but also to the technological level 836 of demanufacturing operations.

From a manufacturer' point of view, the study demonstrates that the vehicle under study – structured as a plastic bodywork over metallic frame and adopting an hybrid powertrain - is able to achieve EoL performances which are comparable to conventional M1 and N1 vehicles if ISO22628 method is used. Good practices such as material marking and prevalent use of certain polymers are already adopted for the considered case study. Future work should examine the EoL performances of a range of L-class

vehicles to confirm that the category, on average, is able to satisfy the requirements of Directive
2000/53/EC; on field trial for the production and examination of ASR should be performed. Since the
ISO22628 leaves to the Manufacturer the responsibility to identify the available recycling technologies,
the use of the UNIFE method or of similar ones represents a valuable information source, but it implies
lower 3R results.

847 From an Authority point of view, two evidence arise: the limitations of the assessment method and the 848 occurrence of physical 3R limitations, that is an open topic in literature. If UNIFE method is used, it is 849 confirmed that current RR and RRR targets are approaching physical limitations. This point has many 850 significant implications for future policy planning, main one being that the definition of eventual new EoL 851 thresholds could be ineffective from a practical point of view if up-to-date assessment methods are not 852 provided. The generic indications of the ISO22628, in fact, lead to a lack of sensitiveness in terms of the 853 estimation of 3R results, an issue that is not depending on the class of the ELV. It is therefore possible 854 that the 3R assessments using ISO22628 are based on the masses addressed to recycling and recovery 855 rather than on those effectively valorized or discarded. The study estimates the potential discrepancy 856 between theoretical assessment and practice and confirms that improved methods based on factors are 857 able to catch the sensitiveness to the quality of the treatment.

858

## **Acknowledgments**

This work has been partially developed within the MUSS (Urban and infra-urban sustainable and safe mobility) project, within the Industria 2015 - Bill for the competitiveness and revamping of the industrial policy, funded by the Ministry of Economic Development, Italy (2006/09/22 - ongoing). The authors gratefully acknowledge Piaggio & C. Spa of Pontedera (PI, Italy) for providing material and technical support, and the ACEM Motorcycle Industry Association in the person of Rita Sterckx and Adedoyin Adedipe for providing up-to-date data regarding motorcycle market in Europe.

866

## **References**

- ACEM, 2015a. End-of-life Directive The Motorcycle Industry in Europe [WWW Document]. URL
- http://www.acem.eu/index.php/policy-access/environment/end-of-live-directive (accessed
  2.25.15).
- ACEM, 2015b. Powered two wheeler registrations in EU and EFTA countries 2014 statistical release
- 872 [WWW Document]. URL http://www.acem.eu/images/publiq/2015/2014-registrations873 statistics.pdf (accessed 3.3.15).
- ACEM, 2015c. Top 20 Motorcycle models sales in Europe in 2014. Personal communication.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

- Barker, M., Drew, B., Darling, J., Edge, K.A., Owen, G.W., 2009. Steady-state steering of a tilting three-875 876 wheeled vehicle. Veh. Syst. Dyn. 48, 815-830. doi:10.1080/00423110903147474
- 877 Bertoluzzo, M., Buja, G., Cossalter, V., Doria, A., Mazzaro, D., 2008. Getting around in electric vehicles. 878 IEEE Ind. Electron. Mag. 2, 10-18. doi:10.1109/MIE.2008.928606
- 879 Berzi, L., Delogu, M., Giorgetti, A., Pierini, M., 2013. On-field investigation and process modelling of End-880 of-Life Vehicles treatment in the context of Italian craft-type Authorized Treatment Facilities. 881 Waste Manag. 33, 892–906. doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2012.12.004
- 882 Boughton, B., Horvath, A., 2006. Environmental assessment of shredder residue management. Resour. 883 Conserv. Recycl. 47, 1–25. doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2005.09.002
- Cahill, E.C., Taylor, B., Sperling, D., 2013. Low-Mass Urban Microcars for the Emerging Vehicle Markets 884 885 of Megacities. Transp. Res. Rec. J. Transp. Res. Board 2394, 30-37. doi:10.3141/2394-04
- 886 Camañes, V., Elduque, D., Javierre, C., Fernández, Á., 2014. The Influence of Different Recycling 887 Scenarios on the Mechanical Design of an LED Weatherproof Light Fitting. Materials 7, 5769-888 5788. doi:10.3390/ma7085769
- 889 Cheng, Y.W., Cheng, J.H., Wu, C.L., Lin, C.H., 2012. Operational characteristics and performance 890 evaluation of the ELV recycling industry in Taiwan. Resour. Conserv. Recycl. 65, 29–35. 891 doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2012.05.001
- 892 Coates, G., Rahimifard, S., 2007. Assessing the economics of pre-fragmentation material recovery within 893 the UK. Resour. Conserv. Recycl. 52, 286-302. doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2007.04.001
- 894 Corso, M., Muffatto, M., Verganti, R., 1999. Reusability and multi-product development policies: a 895 comparison of approaches in the automotive, motorcycle and earthmoving machinery industries. 896 Robot. Comput.-Integr. Manuf. 15, 155–165. doi:10.1016/S0736-5845(99)00010-1
- 897 Cossu, R., Fiore, S., Lai, T., Luciano, A., Mancini, G., Ruffino, B., Viotti, P., Zanetti, M.C., 2014. Review of 898 Italian experience on automotive shredder residue characterization and management. Waste 899 Manag., Industrial Waste 34, 1752-1762. doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2013.11.014
- 900 Delogu, M., Del Pero, F., Romoli, F., Pierini, M., 2015. Life cycle assessment of a plastic air intake 901 manifold. Int. J. Life Cycle Assess. 20, 1429-1443. doi:10.1007/s11367-015-0946-z
- 902 Del Pero, F., Delogu, M., Pierini, M., Bonaffini, D., 2015. Life Cycle Assessment of a heavy metro train. J. 903 Clean. Prod. 87, 787-799. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.10.023
- 904 Diener, D.L., Tillman, A.-M., 2015. Component end-of-life management: Exploring opportunities and 905 related benefits of remanufacturing and functional recycling. Resour. Conserv. Recycl. 102, 80-906 93. doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2015.06.006
- 907 Edelmann, J., Plöchl, M., Lugner, P., 2011. Modelling and analysis of the dynamics of a tilting threewheeled vehicle. Multibody Syst. Dyn. 26, 469-487. doi:10.1007/s11044-011-9258-7 908
- EPA-TW, 2015. Recycling Fund Management Board [WWW Document]. URL http://jama-909 910 english.jp/release/release/2004/040705.html (accessed 1.26.15).
- 911 EPD Consortium, 2009. Product Category Rules (PCR) for Preparing an EPD for Rail Vehicles Version
- 912 2.11 [WWW Document]. URL http://www.environdec.com/en/PCR/Detail/?Pcr=5846
- 913 Eurostat, 2014a. Environmental Data Centre [WWW Document]. URL
- 914 http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/waste (accessed 3.3.15).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

Eurostat, 2014b. Transport database [WWW Document]. URL 915 916 http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/transport/data/database (accessed 3.3.15). 917 Fang, H.C., Ong, S.K., Nee, A.Y.C., 2014. Product Remanufacturability Assessment based on Design 918 Information. Procedia CIRP, 21st CIRP Conference on Life Cycle Engineering 15, 195–200. 919 doi:10.1016/j.procir.2014.06.050 920 Fan, K.-S., Lin, C.-H., Chang, T.-C., 2005. Management and Performance of Taiwan's Waste Recycling Fund. J. Air Waste Manag. Assoc. 55, 574–582. doi:10.1080/10473289.2005.10464647 921 922 Festini, A., Tonoli, A., Zenerino, E., 2011. Urban and Extra Urban Vehicles: Re-Thinking the Vehicle 923 Design, in: Chiaberge, M. (Ed.), New Trends and Developments in Automotive System 924 Engineering. InTech. 925 Froelich, D., Haoues, N., Leroy, Y., Renard, H., 2007a. Development of a new methodology to integrate 926 ELV treatment limits into requirements for metal automotive part design. Miner. Eng., Selected 927 papers from Material, Minerals & Metal Ecology '06, Cape Town, South Africa, November 2006 928 20, 891-901. doi:10.1016/j.mineng.2007.04.019 929 Froelich, D., Maris, E., Haoues, N., Chemineau, L., Renard, H., Abraham, F., Lassartesses, R., 2007b. State of the art of plastic sorting and recycling: Feedback to vehicle design. Miner. Eng., 930 931 Selected papers from Material, Minerals & Metal Ecology '06, Cape Town, South Africa, 932 November 2006 20, 902–912. doi:10.1016/j.mineng.2007.04.020 933 Fuse, M., Kashima, S., 2008. Evaluation method of automobile recycling systems for Asia considering 934 international material cycles: application to Japan and Thailand. J. Mater. Cycles Waste Manag. 935 10, 153-164. doi:10.1007/s10163-008-0201-9 936 Giannouli, M., de Haan, P., Keller, M., Samaras, Z., 2007. Waste from road transport: development of a 937 model to predict waste from end-of-life and operation phases of road vehicles in Europe. J. 938 Clean. Prod. 15, 1169-1182. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2006.05.031 939 Go, T.F., Wahab, D.A., Rahman, M.N.A., Ramli, R., Azhari, C.H., 2011. Disassemblability of end-of-life 940 vehicle: a critical review of evaluation methods. J. Clean. Prod. 19, 1536–1546. 941 doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2011.05.003 942 Graedel, T.E., Allwood, J., Birat, J.-P., Buchert, M., Hagelüken, C., Reck, B.K., Sibley, S.F., Sonnemann, G., 943 2011. What Do We Know About Metal Recycling Rates? J. Ind. Ecol. 15, 355–366. 944 doi:10.1111/j.1530-9290.2011.00342.x 945 Grujicic, M., Sellappan, V., He, T., Seyr, N., Obieglo, A., Erdmann, M., Holzleitner, J., 2008. Total Life 946 Cycle-Based Materials Selection for Polymer Metal Hybrid Body-in-White Automotive 947 Components. J. Mater. Eng. Perform. 18, 111-128. doi:10.1007/s11665-008-9279-4 948 Hatayama, H., Daigo, I., Matsuno, Y., Adachi, Y., 2012. Evolution of aluminum recycling initiated by the 949 introduction of next-generation vehicles and scrap sorting technology. Resour. Conserv. Recycl. 950 66, 8-14. doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2012.06.006 951 Hawkins, T.R., Singh, B., Majeau-Bettez, G., Strømman, A.H., 2012. Comparative Environmental Life 952 Cycle Assessment of Conventional and Electric Vehicles. J. Ind. Ecol. no-no. doi:10.1111/j.1530-953 9290.2012.00532.x

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

- HD, 2012. Harley Davidson Sustainability Strategy Report [WWW Document]. URL http://www.harley davidson.com/content/dam/h-
- 956 d/documents/company/sustainability/en\_US/Sustainability\_Report\_2012.pdf
- Hiratsuka, J., Sato, N., Yoshida, H., 2013. Current status and future perspectives in end-of-life vehicle
   recycling in Japan. J. Mater. Cycles Waste Manag. 16, 21–30. doi:10.1007/s10163-013-0168-z
- Honda motors, 2011. Environmental annual report [WWW Document]. URL
  http://world.honda.com/environment/report/download/pdf/2011\_report\_E\_full.pdf (accessed
  2.23.15).
- Hutchinson, T., Burgess, S., Herrmann, G., 2014. Current hybrid-electric powertrain architectures:
   Applying empirical design data to life cycle assessment and whole-life cost analysis. Appl.
   Energy 119, 314–329. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2014.01.009
- 965 IDIS, 2015. International Dismantling Information System [WWW Document]. URL
   966 http://www.idis2.com/ (accessed 2.25.15).
- 967 ISO, 2002. ISO22628:2002 Road vehicles Recyclability and recoverability Calculation method.
- 968 ISO, 1990. ISO 1176:1990 Road vehicles -- Masses -- Vocabulary and codes.
- JAMA, 2008. Report on Environmental Protection Efforts Promoting Sustainability in Road Transport in
   Japan [WWW Document]. URL http://www.jama.ca/pubs/2009/env\_prot\_report/index.asp
   (accessed 2.25.15).
- Kidane, S., Rajamani, R., Alexander, L., Starr, P., Donath, M., 2007. Experimental Investigation of a
  Narrow Leaning Vehicle Tilt Stability Control System, in: American Control Conference, 2007.
  ACC '07. Presented at the American Control Conference, 2007. ACC '07, pp. 1612–1617.

975 doi:10.1109/ACC.2007.4282625

- Klinglmair, M., Sala, S., Brandão, M., 2013. Assessing resource depletion in LCA: a review of methods
  and methodological issues. Int. J. Life Cycle Assess. 19, 580–592. doi:10.1007/s11367-013-0650978
- Kuo, T.C., Hsu, C.W., Ku, K.C., Chen, P.-S., Lin, C.H., 2012. A collaborative model for controlling the
  green supply network in the motorcycle industry. Adv. Eng. Inform. doi:10.1016/j.aei.2012.09.001
- Lee, C.-H., 1997. Management of scrap car recycling. Resour. Conserv. Recycl. 20, 207–217.
   doi:10.1016/S0921-3449(97)00018-9
- Li, J., Barwood, M., Rahimifard, S., 2014. An automated approach for disassembly and recycling of
  Electric Vehicle components, in: Electric Vehicle Conference (IEVC), 2014 IEEE International.
  Presented at the Electric Vehicle Conference (IEVC), 2014 IEEE International, pp. 1–6.
  doi:10.1109/IEVC.2014.7056158
- Mancini, G., Tamma, R., Viotti, P., 2010. Thermal process of fluff: Preliminary tests on a full-scale
   treatment plant. Waste Manag. 30, 1670–1682. doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2010.01.037
- Maris, E., Froelich, D., 2013. Critical Analysis of Existing Recyclability Assessment Methods for New
   Products in Order to Define a Reference Method, in: REWAS 2013. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., pp.
   202–216.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

- Mathieux, F., Froelich, D., Moszkowicz, P., 2008. ReSICLED: a new recovery-conscious design method
   for complex products based on a multicriteria assessment of the recoverability. J. Clean. Prod.
   16, 277–298. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2006.07.026
- Mathieux, F., Recchioni, M., Ardente, F., 2014. Measuring the Time for Extracting Components in End-of life Products: Needs for a Standardized Method and Aspects to be Considered. Procedia CIRP,
   21st CIRP Conference on Life Cycle Engineering 15, 245–250. doi:10.1016/j.procir.2014.06.033
- Mayyas, A., Qattawi, A., Omar, M., Shan, D., 2012. Design for sustainability in automotive industry: A
  comprehensive review. Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev. 16, 1845–1862.
  doi:10.1016/j.rser.2012.01.012
- Merkisz-Guranowska, A., Merkisz, J., Jacyna, M., Pyza, D., Stawecka, H., 2014. Rail vehicles recycling, in:
   Computers in Railways XIV. Presented at the Urban Transport 2015, WIT Press, València, Spain,
   pp. 425–436. doi:10.2495/CR140351
- Millet, D., Yvars, P.-A., Tonnelier, P., 2012. A method for identifying the worst recycling case: Application
  on a range of vehicles in the automotive sector. Resour. Conserv. Recycl. 68, 1–13.
  doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2012.07.002
- Mizuno, T., Kunii, E., Fukushige, S., Umeda, Y., 2012. Recyclability Evaluation of LCD TVs Based on End of-Life Scenarios, in: Dornfeld, D.A., Linke, B.S. (Eds.), Leveraging Technology for a Sustainable
   World. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 179–183.
- Naomoto, U., C, D., Toshio, Y., C, D., Yoshihiko, T., C, D., 2004. Motorcycle Disposal and Recycling in
   Asia and Brazil. IATSS Rev Int Assoc Traffic Saf Sci 29, 229–237.
- Ohno, H., Matsubae, K., Nakajima, K., Kondo, Y., Nakamura, S., Nagasaka, T., 2015. Toward the efficient
   recycling of alloying elements from end of life vehicle steel scrap. Resour. Conserv. Recycl. 100,
   11–20. doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2015.04.001
- Passarini, F., Ciacci, L., Santini, A., Vassura, I., Morselli, L., 2013. Aluminium flows in vehicles: enhancing
   the recovery at end-of-life. J. Mater. Cycles Waste Manag. 16, 39–45. doi:10.1007/s10163-013 0175-0
- Passarini, F., Ciacci, L., Santini, A., Vassura, I., Morselli, L., 2012. Auto shredder residue LCA:
   implications of ASR composition evolution. J. Clean. Prod. 23, 28–36.
- 1020 doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2011.10.028
- Phornprapha, J., Fukuda, A., Arimura, M., 2010. Optimization of reverse logistics network for End-Of Life/Second Hand motorcycle in Thailand. Infrastruct. Plan. Manag., Journal of Japan Society of
   Civil Engineers 27, 4, 683–692.
- 1024 Piaggio&C, 2012. Corporate Social Responsibility Report [WWW Document]. URL
- 1025 http://www.piaggiogroup.com/sites/all/files/piaggiogroup/doc/CSR\_2012\_eng\_26Marzo.pdf
- Reuter, M.A., van Schaik, A., Ignatenko, O., de Haan, G.J., 2006. Fundamental limits for the recycling of
   end-of-life vehicles. Miner. Eng., Selected papers from Processing and Disposal of Minerals
   Industry Wastes '05 19, 433–449. doi:10.1016/j.mineng.2005.08.014
- 1029 Richa, K., Babbitt, C.W., Gaustad, G., Wang, X., 2014. A future perspective on lithium-ion battery waste
  1030 flows from electric vehicles. Resour. Conserv. Recycl. 83, 63–76.
- 1031 doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2013.11.008

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

- 1032 Rofiqul Islam, M., Haniu, H., Rafiqul Alam Beg, M., 2008. Liquid fuels and chemicals from pyrolysis of 1033 motorcycle tire waste: Product yields, compositions and related properties. Fuel 87, 3112-3122. 1034 doi:10.1016/j.fuel.2008.04.036
- Ruffino, B., Fiore, S., Zanetti, M.C., 2014. Strategies for the enhancement of automobile shredder 1035 residues (ASRs) recycling: Results and cost assessment. Waste Manag. 34, 148–155. 1036 1037 doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2013.09.025
- 1038 Saboori, B., Sapri, M., bin Baba, M., 2014. Economic growth, energy consumption and CO2 emissions in 1039 OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development)'s transport sector: A fully 1040 modified bi-directional relationship approach. Energy 66, 150-161.
- 1041 doi:10.1016/j.energy.2013.12.048
- 1042 Sakai, S., Noma, Y., Kida, A., 2007. End-of-life vehicle recycling and automobile shredder residue 1043 management in Japan. J. Mater. Cycles Waste Manag. 9, 151-158. doi:10.1007/s10163-007-1044 0180-2
- 1045 Santini, A., Herrmann, C., Passarini, F., Vassura, I., Luger, T., Morselli, L., 2010. Assessment of 1046 Ecodesign potential in reaching new recycling targets. Resour. Conserv. Recycl. 54, 1128–1134. 1047 doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2010.03.006
- 1048 Schiavone, F., Pierini, M., Eckert, V., 2008. Strategy-based approach to eco-design: application to an 1049 automotive component. Int. J. Veh. Des. 46, 156-171. doi:10.1504/IJVD.2008.01718
- 1050 Schmid, A., Naguin, P., Gourdon, R., 2013. Incidence of the level of deconstruction on material reuse, 1051 recycling and recovery from end-of life vehicles: an industrial-scale experimental study. Resour. 1052 Conserv. Recycl. 72, 118-126. doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2013.01.007
- 1053 Schmidt, W.-P., Dahlqvist, E., Finkbeiner, M., Krinke, S., Lazzari, S., Oschmann, D., Pichon, S., Thiel, C., 1054 2004. Life cycle assessment of lightweight and end-of-life scenarios for generic compact class 1055 passenger vehicles. Int. J. Life Cycle Assess. 9, 405–416. doi:10.1007/BF02979084
- 1056 Simboli, A., Taddeo, R., Morgante, A., 2014. Analysing the development of Industrial Symbiosis in a 1057 motorcycle local industrial network: The role of contextual factors. J. Clean. Prod. 66, 372-383. 1058 doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.11.045
- 1059 Simboli, A., Taddeo, R., Morgante, A., Rosica, P., 2011. Product end-of-life in the motorcycle industry. 1060 Defining scenarios. Presented at the LCM 2011 - Towards Life Cycle Sustainability 1061 Management, Berlin.
- 1062 Taylor, R., Ray, R., Chapman, C., 2013. Advanced thermal treatment of auto shredder residue and refuse 1063 derived fuel. Fuel 106, 401–409. doi:10.1016/j.fuel.2012.11.071
- 1064 Tian, J., Chen, M., 2014. Sustainable design for automotive products: Dismantling and recycling of end-1065 of-life vehicles. Waste Manag. 34, 458-467. doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2013.11.005
- 1066 UNIFE, 2013. UNI-LCA-001:00 - Recyclability and Recoverability Calculation Method - Railway Rolling 1067 Stock [WWW Document]. URL
- 1068 http://www.unife.org/component/attachments/?task=download&id=326 (accessed 2.23.15).
- 1069 Vermeulen, I., Block, C., Van Caneghem, J., Dewulf, W., Sikdar, S.K., Vandecasteele, C., 2012.
- 1070 Sustainability assessment of industrial waste treatment processes: The case of automotive 1071 shredder residue. Resour. Conserv. Recycl. 69, 17-28. doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2012.08.010

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

- 1072 Vermeulen, I., Van Caneghem, J., Block, C., Baeyens, J., Vandecasteele, C., 2011. Automotive shredder 1073 residue (ASR): Reviewing its production from end-of-life vehicles (ELVs) and its recycling, 1074 energy or chemicals' valorisation. J. Hazard. Mater. 190, 8-27. doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2011.02.088
- 1075 Will, F., Davdison, J.N., Couchman, P., Bednall, D., 2011. Tomorrow's Car - For Today's People: Can
- 1076 Tilting Three Wheeled Vehicles be a Solution for the Problems of Today and the Future? (SAE 1077 Technical Paper No. 2011-28-0001). SAE International, Warrendale, PA.
- Witik, R.A., Payet, J., Michaud, V., Ludwig, C., Månson, J.-A.E., 2011. Assessing the life cycle costs and 1078 1079 environmental performance of lightweight materials in automobile applications. Compos. Part 1080 Appl. Sci. Manuf. 42, 1694–1709. doi:10.1016/j.compositesa.2011.07.024