



UNIVERSITÀ
DEGLI STUDI
FIRENZE

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:

The webpage <https://hdl.handle.net/2158/1023796> of the repository was last updated on 2021-03-30T22:27:01Z

Published version:

DOI: 10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.01.013

Terms of use:

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.

La data sopra indicata si riferisce all'ultimo aggiornamento della scheda del Repository FloRe - The above-mentioned date refers to the last update of the record in the Institutional Repository FloRe

(Article begins on next page)

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

5 Lorenzo Berzi¹, Massimo Delogu, Marco Pierini, Filippo Romoli.

6 Department of Industrial Engineering - University of Florence, Via di S. Marta, 3, 50139 Firenze – Italy.

7 Abstract

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

¹ Corresponding author. Tel. + 39 055 2758698. Email address: lorenzo.berzi@unifi.it.

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 discrepancies 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.

43 Acronyms

44	3R	3R rates - used in the article to indicate RR and RRR rates together
45	ASR	Automotive Shredder Residue
46	ATF	Authorized Treatment 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

64	MRF	Material Recycling Factor
65	PCB	PolyChlorinated Biphenyl (pollutants, e.g. fluids)
66	PCB	Printed Circuit Boards (components)
67	PCR	Product Category Rules
68	PST	Post Shredder Technologies
69	PTW	Powered Two Wheeler
70	RR	Reuse and Recycling
71	RRR	Reuse, Recycling and Recovery
72	WEEE	Waste Electrical and Electronics Equipment
73		
74	Plastic material acronyms	please refer to ISO 1043:1998, Plastics - Symbols and abbreviated terms

75

76 **1 - Introduction**

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
89 a significant environmental impact at worldwide level. Assuming GHG emissions as main indicator, the
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

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.

137 The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 describes the relevance of the topic and offers a brief
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
140 boundary conditions of the activity. Section 4 illustrates the application on the selected case study and
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.**

144 2 - End of Life L-vehicles

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

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.

155 2.1 - Relevance of the problem

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

158 2015a) state that the problem is not critical due to a number of reasons; two relevant ones are the
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
168 to recent data for the EU28 countries (ACEM, 2015c). The final results confirm the predominance of other
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
176 of waste produced, but also from other drivers such as the sensitiveness of the customers; this
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 (Rofiquil Islam et al., 2008).

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,
206 which implies that they are subjected to a mandatory recycling target; the system is based on a payback
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

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
 238 vehicle has been used for a Recyclability analysis, aiming to find a reference value for the almost new
 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) n.°	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 **Table 2 – Estimation of total waste flow related to L-vehicles. Due to lack of data for some**
 249 **countries, the numbers do not refer to the whole EU-28 market (ACEM, 2015b; Eurostat, 2014a).**


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

253 2.2 - Vehicle End of Life treatment

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
 256 three main steps: depollution, dismantling and shredding, this latter being followed by material separation.
 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

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
 261 subsequent treatments. The shredding of the vehicle is performed to comminute the body and all the
 262 remaining parts in small fragments, which can be segregated and successfully recycled. In general, almost
 263 all the metal content is separated with widespread available technologies, while the other materials (e.g.
 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
 268 (Boughton and Horvath, 2006; Cossu et al., 2014; Vermeulen et al., 2011). Most suitable process often
 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 synthesized
 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.



278

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

280 The evidence coming from the on field investigation is that the material flows coming from M1, N1, L and
281 heavy vehicles are frequently mixed together; such activity is not in contrast with the regulation, but can
282 cause inaccuracy in terms of the calculation of final rates. The presence of other type of waste (e.g. urban
283 waste residuals, WEEE) is one of the reasons that can cause contamination of automotive waste, such as
284 PCB pollutants presence (Mancini et al., 2010). Regarding ELV-L, they are subjected to a treatment
285 procedure that is conceptually similar to the one applied to any other ELV; however, since binding RR and
286 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
289 their constituting material is usually suggested to the operators through the IDIS (IDIS, 2015), whose
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).

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

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

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

- 312 • The ISO 22628:2002 standard for road vehicles

- 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
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.

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.

383

3 - Method for vehicle dismantling and

384

3R rates assessment

385

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.

386

387

388

389

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:

390

391

392

a) pretreatment

393

b) dismantling

394

c) separation of metals

395

d) processing of non-metallic residue

396

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.

397

398

399

3.1 - Material breakdown phase

400

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).

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

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%
6	Modified	Organic	Natural	6	Thermosets	100%	0%	0%
	Materials (MONM)							

7	Others (Compounds, Electric, etc.)	7	Thermosets (GF filled)	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-metal	Mixed non-metal materials in ASR	14%	19%	67%

408 **Table 4 – Material categories for both considered methods and material factors to be used for**
 409 **UNIFE calculations. Considering those parts that are not dismantled, MRF and ERF for ASR have**
 410 **to 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
 413 vehicle of all the potentially harmful substances. When the substance cannot be extracted, whole parts
 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
 417 a typical example. All the removed elements usually need other treatment processes such as
 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
- 422 • all vehicle fluids
 - 423 ○ engine oil, fuels, coolant, service fluids
- 424 • gas tanks (LPG, CNG), if present
- 425 • oil filters
- 426 • tyres
- 427 • 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
 430 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.

432 The sum of the masses of the components, materials and fluids removed at this stage is considered to be
 433 reusable or recyclable; according to ISO22628, the abbreviation is conventionally m_p . According to UNIFE

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

436 **3.3 - Dismantling phase**

437 According to both the ISO 22628 and the Directive 2000/53/EC, the manufacturer has to identify the
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
441 easiness of dismantling, which depends on the accessibility of the part, on the type of fastening used and
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.

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

- 453 • Catalysts
- 454 • Metal components containing copper, aluminum and magnesium if these metals are not
455 segregated in the shredding process
- 456 • Glass
- 457 • Tyres and large plastic components (bumpers, dashboard, fluid containers, etc) *if these materials*
458 *are segregated in the shredding process in such a way that they can be effectively recycled as*
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
462 indicates its removal during the pretreatment phase; in practice this is always done due to the high
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
466 mass to be recycled, so that the occurrence of metal parts dismantling does not influence the calculation
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.

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.

471 The last elements of the list include organic materials; in this case, the occurrence of dismantling is critical
472 for recycling. Considering the large number of existing families (elastomer, thermoplastic and thermoset
473 polymers), only a few of them are suitable for recycling. In addition, polymers can be effectively recycled
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_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.

485 **3.4 - Metals separation**

486 After the disassembly phase, all the ferrous and non-ferrous metals that were not removed in the previous
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_D . 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.

494 **3.5 - Non-metals residues treatment**

495 All the materials remaining from previous steps are subjected to shredding together with the metal part
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}
- 500 • use for energy recovery: the mass potentially usable for this purpose is indicated by the symbol
501 m_{Te} .

502

503 The determination of m_{Tr} 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
505 MONM are considered *potentially* usable for the recovery of energy. Within the present activity such
506 materials are supposed to be always subjected to thermal recovery if not included in m_D or m_{Tr} . As a
507 consequence, the sum of m_D , m_{Tr} and m_{Te} is constant and the choices determining m_D and m_{Tr} are not
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_{Tr} and m_{Te} ; these
512 are calculated as 14% and 19% (MRF and ERF, respectively) of the mass of non-metal materials not
513 included in m_D . Due to the use of such factors, within the UNIFE method the RRR rate is expected to vary
514 and to be dependent on the assumptions regarding dismantling effort.

515 **3.6 - Recyclability and Recoverability rates**

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_{cyc} and R_{cov} coefficients. Different definitions are
518 possible for the initial mass of the vehicle m_v ; in this application it is constituted by the total shipping
519 mass of the vehicle as defined by ISO1176 - Standard on road vehicles masses (ISO, 1990). The mass m_v
520 includes the masses of lubricants, service fluids, fuel (it is assumed that the reservoir is filled at least 90%
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.

ISO22628	UNIFE method
$R_{cyc} = \frac{m_p + m_D + m_M + m_{Tr}}{m_V} * 100$	$R_{cyc} = \frac{\sum m_i * MRF_i}{m_V} * 100$
$R_{cov} = \frac{m_p + m_D + m_M + m_{Tr} + m_{Te}}{m_V} * 100$	$R_{cov} = \frac{\sum m_i * MRF_i + \sum m_i * ERF_i}{m_V} * 100$ <p>Where m_i corresponds to the partial masses coming from main steps ($m_p, m_D, m_M, m_{Tr}, m_{Te}$)</p>

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
 541 other recyclable parts are excluded, if not strictly necessary to achieve the binding threshold. During
 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.
 547 Assuming the point of view of the Authority, the analysis estimates what is going to happen in terms of
 548 waste production in case of inappropriate or incomplete treatment of the vehicle in the ATFs. This can
 549 occur due to the heterogeneity of such plants, which are mostly using craft-type dismantling methods.

550 4 - Application on the three wheeler case 551 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

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
 556 expressed according to the two different classification proposed by ISO22628 and UNIFE standards. Then,
 557 a typical treatment sequence – including pretreatment and dismantling – is formulated. On the subsequent
 558 step, four scenarios have been identified considering different dismantling effort and the context of the
 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.**

566 4.1 - Vehicle description

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.
 569 The layout of the vehicle is typical of scooters: the engine is rear and integrated with the swingarm, the

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 gasoline-
574 electric hybrid unit. After the removal of harmful substances, the three wheeler has been disassembled
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
583 by rubber parts (tires, pipes, transmission belt, seals, etc.) and followed by 4% of fluids (fuel, coolant,
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.




597

598

Figure 4 – Vehicle “Piaggio MP3 125 Hybrid” mass composition according to ISO22628.

599



600


601

Figure 5 – Vehicle mass composition according to UNIFE categories. Only most representative categories are shown (8 out of 16), while the remaining (thermosets, glass, MONM etc.) are included in “others”.

602

603

604




605

606

607

608

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



609

610

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

611

4.2 - Dismantling scenarios

612

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.

614

615

The 4 scenarios have been hypothesized as follows:

616

617

618

619

- 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

- 620
- 621 ▪ scenario n° 2: the dismantling of PP-based components has been considered in addition to the
622 treatment provided in the scenario n° 1. PP-based materials are the most used plastics in the
623 vehicle, accounting for 34.3 kg (12.3% of total vehicle mass); the availability of recycling
624 technologies for PP is proven (Froelich et al., 2007b). The removal of the parts, according to the
625 structure of the vehicle, also implies the disassembly of some additional parts (mainly metal-
626 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*".
 - 627 ▪ scenario n° 3: the treatment includes the dismantling of plastic parts made with the two most
628 used thermoplastic polymers, namely PP and ABS, in addition to the treatment provided in
629 scenario n° 1. ABS parts account for 6.3 kg (2.3% of total vehicle mass); this second material has
630 been chosen because it is mostly localized on the exterior body of the vehicle, thus being
631 accessible. It is named "*PP & ABS scenario*".
 - 632 ▪ scenario n° 4: in this last case, it has been considered the dismantling of all the components
633 made with other thermoplastic polymers or recyclable ones in addition to the treatment provided
634 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.

640 Table 7 includes the components made of polymeric materials that have not been disassembled in the
641 scenario 2 and 3. This components are included in the dismantling list for the scenario 4. The PP and ABS
642 components to be removed, as expected in the scenario 2 and 3, are described in the graphical summary
643 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
650 19%, and an enhanced one, that is 50%; such value is used in order to evaluate which improvement should
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.

653 Reasonable assumptions are also necessary for those parts made of more than one material which are
654 closely bonded; for these, it was assumed that the organic part is thermally recoverable and that the
655 remaining part is recyclable as metal. The ratio between organic and inorganic was obtained by weighting
656 (see Table 8). It should be noted that wire harness is about 2.5% of total vehicle mass, that is quite
657 remarkable; a relevant contribution comes from the hybrid powertrain system. According to ISO22628, the

This document is the accepted version of the article "Evaluation of the End of Life performance of a hybrid scooter with the application of Recyclability and Recoverability assessment methods", to be used for sharing through Author Institution repository.


Final published version is available at:

<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.
660

661

PP or ABS components	Mass [kg]
Lower helmet compartment	4.260
Rear cover helmet compartment	1.140
RH passenger grab handle	0.322
LH passenger grab handle	0.315
Closure backrest support	0.288
Rear luggage closure	0.178
Central part front wheels compartment	0.135
Electric fan bracket	0.101
RH switch support	0.087
LH switch support	0.084
Radiator fan	0.047
RH side front suspension cover	0.029
LH side front suspension cover	0.029
Closure passage wiring helmet comp.	0.028
Licence plate light	0.017
Bracket wiring helmet comp.	0.010



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

665

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

666 **Table 7 – List of components not disassembled, and thus considered only for energy recovery (m_{T_e}**
 667 **mass contribution) in the EOL scenario 2 and 3. Small parts (below 0.25kg) are not reported.**

668

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%


669 **Table 8 – Components constituted by closely bonded materials and therefore not easy to separate.**
 670 **Such data have been used to estimate m_{Tr} and m_M contributions for the ISO22628 calculation.**

671 4.3 - Results

672 The calculation of the RR and RRR rates for each of the four vehicle End of Life scenarios and for the
 673 different boundary conditions described in the previous paragraph generates the results summarized in
 674 Table 9 and Figure 8. The outcomes of both calculation methods are included, the UNIFE one being more
 675 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%


677 **Table 9 – Final RR and RRR rates achieved in the different scenarios according to the described**
 678 **boundary conditions. Case 1: ISO22628 calculation on the four scenarios. Case 2: UNIFE**
 679 **calculation on the four scenarios. Case 3: UNIFE calculation, on the hypothesis of 50% ERF for**
 680 **ASR. Case 4: UNIFE calculation, on the hypothesis of 0% MRF for ASR. Case 5 to 8: same**
 681 **hypotheses of case 1 to 4, additional hypothesis being 95% dismantling rate for non-metal parts**
 682 **(e.g. due to destructive dismantling).**



683


684 **Figure 8 – RR rate in the four analyzed EoL scenarios, according with the different methodologies**
685 **applied. Boundary 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 **Figure 9 – Sankey diagram illustrating EoL material flow for the case study – method adopted:**
695 **ISO22628, scenario PP+ABS dismantling. Masses corresponds to the symbols introduced in**
696 **Table 5.**
697

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.



706

707

708

709

710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

719

720

721

722

723

Figure 10 – List of all ABS and PP components suitable for dismantling (scenario 2, 3 and 4), showing their singular mass and the cumulated dismantled one. The plot include the minimum value to be reached for 85% RR rate using the ISO22628 approach (corresponding to at least 16.6 kg of dismantled plastic) and the effect of the application of a 95% effective dismantling rate.

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:

724

725

726

727

- 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

- 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
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
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
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 ○ ensure that all the hazardous components are removed on the pretreatment phase, e.g.
747 highlighting the presence of fluid in the shock adsorbers
 - 748 ○ identify the components, particularly the plastic ones, which have be to be dismantled to
749 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
762 technological limitations. It should be noted, however, the relevant role of PST for ASR recycling: the
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.

765

766 Regarding the final RRR rate, the value assessed by the UNIFE method is significantly lower than the
767 ISO22628 one and in general below the 95% target. The difference is due to the unfavourable MRF and
768 ERF factors (14% and 19%, respectively) used for those parts which are not dismantled from the vehicle
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.
777 It should be noted that the ELV-L under study, even if not currently subjected to the whole requirements
778 of 2000/53/EC Directive, is designed in a way which enables the achievement of promising RR and RRR
779 rates, so that according to the current automotive reference standard ISO22628 the target for 2015 can
780 be fully satisfied. The consequence is that the mixing of the scraps coming from ELV-L with the ones
781 coming from M1 and N1 ELVs does not modify significantly the overall recycling results, for which the M1
782 and N1 ELVs are certified.

783

5 - Conclusions

784 Market forecasts regarding urban mobility alternatives suggest that an increasing relevance of L-class
785 vehicles in the European circulating fleet is possible. Main cause for such interest is based on the need
786 for new personal and urban mobility solutions in the context of European and worldwide cities. However,
787 the European ELV Directive does not set 3R objectives for most L-category vehicles. Not surprisingly,
788 recycling programs are consolidated on those countries where L-vehicles are sold in relevant numbers,
789 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.

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

807 The analysis of the vehicle, according to the unavoidable arbitrariness of the existing methodologies,
808 highlights that it can fully comply with the dictates of the Directive and with the type approval necessities
809 if analyzed using ISO22628. In particular, the extensive use of PP suggests a possible market interest for
810 the plastic scraps; in addition, the dismantling of the bodywork is also sufficient to achieve the 85% RR
811 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).

823 Regarding the RRR rates, the discrepancy between ISO22628 and UNIFE estimations is wider in
824 comparison with RR rate. According to the first method, RRR rate overpasses 98% in every scenario, since
825 the method itself is not able to estimate the sensitiveness of the results on the treatment variation. The
826 UNIFE estimation, on the contrary, defines an upper limit that reduce the realistic, achievable value on
827 the edge of 95%. The difference between ISO22628 and UNIFE RRR rate ranges from 3% to 15%,
828 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.

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

842 vehicles to confirm that the category, on average, is able to satisfy the requirements of Directive
843 2000/53/EC; on field trial for the production and examination of ASR should be performed. Since the
844 ISO22628 leaves to the Manufacturer the responsibility to identify the available recycling technologies,
845 the use of the UNIFE method or of similar ones represents a valuable information source, but it implies
846 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

859 **Acknowledgments**

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

866

867 **References**

- 868 ACEM, 2015a. End-of-life Directive - The Motorcycle Industry in Europe [WWW Document]. URL
869 <http://www.acem.eu/index.php/policy-access/environment/end-of-live-directive> (accessed
870 2.25.15).
- 871 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-registrations-](http://www.acem.eu/images/publiq/2015/2014-registrations-statistics.pdf)
873 [statistics.pdf](http://www.acem.eu/images/publiq/2015/2014-registrations-statistics.pdf) (accessed 3.3.15).
- 874 ACEM, 2015c. Top 20 Motorcycle models sales in Europe in 2014. Personal communication.

- 875 Barker, M., Drew, B., Darling, J., Edge, K.A., Owen, G.W., 2009. Steady-state steering of a tilting three-
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
- 884 Cahill, E.C., Taylor, B., Sperling, D., 2013. Low-Mass Urban Microcars for the Emerging Vehicle Markets
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 three-
908 wheeled vehicle. *Multibody Syst. Dyn.* 26, 469–487. doi:10.1007/s11044-011-9258-7
- 909 EPA-TW, 2015. Recycling Fund Management Board [WWW Document]. URL [http://jama-](http://jama-english.jp/release/release/2004/040705.html)
910 [english.jp/release/release/2004/040705.html](http://jama-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).

- 915 Eurostat, 2014b. Transport database [WWW Document]. URL
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
921 Fund. *J. Air Waste Manag. Assoc.* 55, 574–582. doi:10.1080/10473289.2005.10464647
- 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.
930 State of the art of plastic sorting and recycling: Feedback to vehicle design. *Miner. Eng.,
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

- 954 HD, 2012. Harley Davidson Sustainability Strategy Report [WWW Document]. URL [http://www.harley-](http://www.harley-davidson.com/content/dam/h-d/documents/company/sustainability/en_US/Sustainability_Report_2012.pdf)
955 [davidson.com/content/dam/h-](http://www.harley-davidson.com/content/dam/h-d/documents/company/sustainability/en_US/Sustainability_Report_2012.pdf)
956 [d/documents/company/sustainability/en_US/Sustainability_Report_2012.pdf](http://www.harley-davidson.com/content/dam/h-d/documents/company/sustainability/en_US/Sustainability_Report_2012.pdf)
- 957 Hiratsuka, J., Sato, N., Yoshida, H., 2013. Current status and future perspectives in end-of-life vehicle
958 recycling in Japan. *J. Mater. Cycles Waste Manag.* 16, 21–30. doi:10.1007/s10163-013-0168-z
- 959 Honda motors, 2011. Environmental annual report [WWW Document]. URL
960 http://world.honda.com/environment/report/download/pdf/2011_report_E_full.pdf (accessed
961 2.23.15).
- 962 Hutchinson, T., Burgess, S., Herrmann, G., 2014. Current hybrid-electric powertrain architectures:
963 Applying empirical design data to life cycle assessment and whole-life cost analysis. *Appl.*
964 *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.
- 969 JAMA, 2008. Report on Environmental Protection Efforts - Promoting Sustainability in Road Transport in
970 Japan [WWW Document]. URL http://www.jama.ca/pubs/2009/env_prot_report/index.asp
971 (accessed 2.25.15).
- 972 Kidane, S., Rajamani, R., Alexander, L., Starr, P., Donath, M., 2007. Experimental Investigation of a
973 Narrow Leaning Vehicle Tilt Stability Control System, in: American Control Conference, 2007.
974 ACC '07. Presented at the American Control Conference, 2007. ACC '07, pp. 1612–1617.
975 doi:10.1109/ACC.2007.4282625
- 976 Klinglmaier, M., Sala, S., Brandão, M., 2013. Assessing resource depletion in LCA: a review of methods
977 and methodological issues. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* 19, 580–592. doi:10.1007/s11367-013-0650-
978 9
- 979 Kuo, T.C., Hsu, C.W., Ku, K.C., Chen, P.-S., Lin, C.H., 2012. A collaborative model for controlling the
980 green supply network in the motorcycle industry. *Adv. Eng. Inform.* doi:10.1016/j.aei.2012.09.001
- 981 Lee, C.-H., 1997. Management of scrap car recycling. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* 20, 207–217.
982 doi:10.1016/S0921-3449(97)00018-9
- 983 Li, J., Barwood, M., Rahimifard, S., 2014. An automated approach for disassembly and recycling of
984 Electric Vehicle components, in: Electric Vehicle Conference (IEVC), 2014 IEEE International.
985 Presented at the Electric Vehicle Conference (IEVC), 2014 IEEE International, pp. 1–6.
986 doi:10.1109/IEVC.2014.7056158
- 987 Mancini, G., Tamma, R., Viotti, P., 2010. Thermal process of fluff: Preliminary tests on a full-scale
988 treatment plant. *Waste Manag.* 30, 1670–1682. doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2010.01.037
- 989 Maris, E., Froelich, D., 2013. Critical Analysis of Existing Recyclability Assessment Methods for New
990 Products in Order to Define a Reference Method, in: REWAS 2013. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., pp.
991 202–216.

- 992 Mathieux, F., Froelich, D., Moszkowicz, P., 2008. ReSICLED: a new recovery-conscious design method
993 for complex products based on a multicriteria assessment of the recoverability. *J. Clean. Prod.*
994 16, 277–298. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2006.07.026
- 995 Mathieux, F., Recchioni, M., Ardente, F., 2014. Measuring the Time for Extracting Components in End-of-
996 life Products: Needs for a Standardized Method and Aspects to be Considered. *Procedia CIRP*,
997 21st CIRP Conference on Life Cycle Engineering 15, 245–250. doi:10.1016/j.procir.2014.06.033
- 998 Mayyas, A., Qattawi, A., Omar, M., Shan, D., 2012. Design for sustainability in automotive industry: A
999 comprehensive review. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* 16, 1845–1862.
1000 doi:10.1016/j.rser.2012.01.012
- 1001 Merkisz-Guranowska, A., Merkisz, J., Jacyna, M., Pyza, D., Stawecka, H., 2014. Rail vehicles recycling, in:
1002 *Computers in Railways XIV*. Presented at the Urban Transport 2015, WIT Press, València, Spain,
1003 pp. 425–436. doi:10.2495/CR140351
- 1004 Millet, D., Yvars, P.-A., Tonnelier, P., 2012. A method for identifying the worst recycling case: Application
1005 on a range of vehicles in the automotive sector. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* 68, 1–13.
1006 doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2012.07.002
- 1007 Mizuno, T., Kunii, E., Fukushige, S., Umeda, Y., 2012. Recyclability Evaluation of LCD TVs Based on End-
1008 of-Life Scenarios, in: Dornfeld, D.A., Linke, B.S. (Eds.), *Leveraging Technology for a Sustainable*
1009 *World*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 179–183.
- 1010 Naomoto, U., C, D., Toshio, Y., C, D., Yoshihiko, T., C, D., 2004. Motorcycle Disposal and Recycling in
1011 Asia and Brazil. *IATSS Rev Int Assoc Traffic Saf Sci* 29, 229–237.
- 1012 Ohno, H., Matsubae, K., Nakajima, K., Kondo, Y., Nakamura, S., Nagasaka, T., 2015. Toward the efficient
1013 recycling of alloying elements from end of life vehicle steel scrap. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* 100,
1014 11–20. doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2015.04.001
- 1015 Passarini, F., Ciacci, L., Santini, A., Vassura, I., Morselli, L., 2013. Aluminium flows in vehicles: enhancing
1016 the recovery at end-of-life. *J. Mater. Cycles Waste Manag.* 16, 39–45. doi:10.1007/s10163-013-
1017 0175-0
- 1018 Passarini, F., Ciacci, L., Santini, A., Vassura, I., Morselli, L., 2012. Auto shredder residue LCA:
1019 implications of ASR composition evolution. *J. Clean. Prod.* 23, 28–36.
1020 doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2011.10.028
- 1021 Phornprapha, J., Fukuda, A., Arimura, M., 2010. Optimization of reverse logistics network for End-Of-
1022 Life/Second Hand motorcycle in Thailand. *Infrastruct. Plan. Manag., Journal of Japan Society of*
1023 *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
- 1026 Reuter, M.A., van Schaik, A., Ignatenko, O., de Haan, G.J., 2006. Fundamental limits for the recycling of
1027 end-of-life vehicles. *Miner. Eng., Selected papers from Processing and Disposal of Minerals*
1028 *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

- 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
- 1035 Ruffino, B., Fiore, S., Zanetti, M.C., 2014. Strategies for the enhancement of automobile shredder
1036 residues (ASRs) recycling: Results and cost assessment. *Waste Manag.* 34, 148–155.
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., Naquin, 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

This document is the accepted version of the article "Evaluation of the End of Life performance of a hybrid scooter with the application of Recyclability and Recoverability assessment methods", to be used for sharing through Author Institution repository.

Final published version is available at:

<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.
- 1078 Witik, R.A., Payet, J., Michaud, V., Ludwig, C., Månson, J.-A.E., 2011. Assessing the life cycle costs and
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

1081