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## 1. INTRODUCTION

This document presents the comparative study of greenhouse gases (GHG) emissions derived from the raw material production, manufacturing and transportation of the steel and the our smart carbon cylinder (from now on called SCC cylinder) for pressurized gases, such as hydrogen, helium, nitrogen, oxygen, argon and its mixes, etc.

Nowadays there is a global commitment to fight against climate change, which means a double challenge:

- Mitigation through the development of policies, technologies and measures that allow.
- On the one hand, to limit and reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases.
- On the other hand, to improve the capacity of gas absorption by the terrain.
- Adaptation, that is, anticipating the adverse effects of climate change and taking the appropriate measures to avoid or minimize the damage they may cause, adapting to the consequences that may come.

> The Carbon Footprint could be defined as an indicator that allows us to numerically value the amount of greenhouse gas emissions attributable to any human activity.

Overcoming this double challenge requires a new approach to the manufacturing procedures: our present model leads to either fragile systems or with a significant climatic and environmental impact. This effort towards a new productive model will open up new opportunities, such as the development of systems with low inputs or a wider use of renewable energies, which will support a new low-carbon economy.

So the Carbon Footprint could be defined as an indicator that allows us to numerically value the amount of greenhouse gas emissions attributable to any human activity. It is expressed in mass (grams, kilograms, tons...) of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ equivalent. The $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ equivalent is considered as a unit that allows us to use a single reference to refer to all greenhouse gases through its Global Warming Potential. The global warming potential of a gas (GWP) reflects its relative capacity to increase the greenhouse effect compared to that of Carbon Dioxide.

## 2. GOALS AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

## OBJECTIVES OF ANALYSIS

Calculate the GHG emissions of the process of extraction of the required raw material for the manufacture of both steel and SCC cylinders.

Calculate the GHG emissions in the manufacturing process of both steel and SCC cylinders.

Calculate the GHG emissions throughout the life cycle of both steel and SCC cylinders.

Explain why the use of SCC cylinders is truly a positive contribution to the objectives of energyefficiency and climate protection.

## 3. WHAT IS THE CARBON FOOTPRINT?

The carbon footprint is the addition of all $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions directly or indirectly caused by humans on the environment. It is measured from the extraction of raw materials to our daily habits, such as what means of transport we use or what energy consumption we make.


## 4. FACTORS TO CONSIDER

## THE FACTORS TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT FOR THIS CALCULATION ARE:

THE RAW MATERIALS THAT GENERATE $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ EMISSIONS INTO THE ATMOSPHERE DURING THEIR EXTRACTION

THE TRANSFORMATION OF THESE RAW MATERIALS TO OBTAIN THE FINAL PRODUCT

## TRANSPORTATION

## RECYCLING

### 4.1 EXTRACTION OF RAW MATERIALS

Following you will find a table of emissions of $\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{Kg}$ in the extraction of raw materials needed to manufacture WP 300 bars steel and and smart carbon cylinders.

| MATERIALS | CARBON FOOTPRINT |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 Kg of ROUGH ALUMINUM | $1.7 \mathrm{Kg} \mathrm{of} \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |
| 1 Kg of CARBON FIBRE | 12.5 Kg of CO$_{2}$ |
| 1 Kg of POLYURETHANE | 3 Kg of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |
| 1 Kg of EPOXY RESIN | $6.7 \mathrm{Kg} \mathrm{of} \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |
| 1 Kg of UNPROTECTED POLYPROPYLENE | $1.34 \mathrm{Kg} \mathrm{of} \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |
| 1 Kg of ROUGH STEEL | $2 \mathrm{Kg} \mathrm{of} \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |

The raw material needed to manufacture a 50-liter steel cylinder weighing 68.5 Kg , as well as its carbon footprint, is:

| MATERIALS | Kg MATERIALS | CARBON FOOTPRINT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ROUGH STEEL | 68.5 | 137 Kg of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |
| TOTAL | 68.5 | $137{\mathrm{Kg} \text { of } \mathbf{C O}_{2}}^{8}$ |

The raw materials needed to manufacture a 50-liter carbon fibre cylinder weighing 25 Kg are:

| MATERIALS | Kg MATERIALS | CARBON FOOTPRINT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ROUGH ALUMINIUM | 11.4 | 19.38 Kg of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |
| CARBON FIBRE | 9.9 | 123.75 Kg of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |
| POLYUTETHANE | 2 | 6.00 Kg of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |
| EPOXY RESIN | 4.2 | 28.14 Kg of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |
| POLYPROPYLENE | 2.5 | 3.35 Kg of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |
| TOTAL | 30 | 180.62 Kg of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |

### 4.2 MANUFACTURING PROCESS

After accounting for the carbon footprint required to obtain the raw materials for the manufacture of these cylinders, we must also take into account the treatment and moulding of the raw material for the manufacturing of each cylinder. To test these processes we need to find the calorific value of each industrial process.

The data to consider are: Kg of the product, melting temperature and specific heat of the material. With these data we can obtain the calorific power needed to mould the material.

To obtain the calorific power needed, we need to use a fuel such as propane. We have estimated that in the process we are going to have a $40 \%$ loss (reduction of calorific power) in the propane.

## Required data from all raw materials:

|  | MELTING TEMP. | KILOGRAMS | SPECIFIC HEAT J/KGㅇC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALUMINIUM | 660 | 11.4 | 897 |
| CARBON FIBRE | 1500 | 9.9 | 711 |
| POLYPROPYLENE | 220 | 2.5 | 1880 |
| STEEL | 1500 | 68.5 | 2000 |
|  | PROPANE | CALORIFIC POWER | CARBON FOOTPRINT |
|  | 1 Kg | $11082 \mathrm{Kcal} / \mathrm{Kg}$ | $2.94 \mathrm{Kg} / \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |

In the following table, we show the calorific value necessary for the treatment of both types of cylinders:

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { B50 } \\ \text { CYLINDERS } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\mathrm{Mx} \mathrm{Cex} \mathrm{(T2-T1)}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCC CYLINDER | KILOGRAMS | SPECIFIC HEAT | ROOM TEMP. | MELTING TEMP. | Q (JOULES) | Q (Kcal) |
| ALUMINIUM | 11.4 | 897 | 25 | 660 | 6493383 | 1551.95 |
| CARBON FIBRE | 9.9 | 711 | 25 | 1500 | 10382377 | 2481.44 |
| POLYPROPYLENE | 2.5 | 1880 | 25 | 220 | 916500 | 219.05 |
| TOTAL SCC |  |  |  |  |  | 4252.44 |
| STEEL CYLINDER | KILOGRAMS | SPECIFIC HEAT | ROOM TEMP. | MELTING TEMP. | Q (JOULES) | Q (Kcal) |
| TOTAL STEEL | 68.5 | 2000 | 25 | 1500 | 202075000 | 48297.08 |

## Summary table of the calorific value required

| B50 CYLINDER660 | Q (Kcal) |
| :---: | :---: |
| SCC CYLINDER 45 LITERS | 4252.44 |
| STEEL CYLINDER 50 LITERS | 48297.08 |

A $40 \%$ energy loss of the propane in the manufacturing process has been assessed. In the following table we may observe the Kg of propane needed in both types of cylinder to obtain the calorific value and therefore its carbon footprint.

The carbon footprint of 1 Kg of Propane Gas has an emission factor of $2.94 \mathrm{Kg} \mathrm{CO}_{2}$

|  | MxCex (T2-T1) |  | PROPANE Kg | PROPANE | EMISSION Kg CO 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Q (JOULES) | Q (Kcal) | 100\% | 140\% | $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |
| ALUMINUM | 6493383 | 1551.95 | 0.14 | 0.196 | 0.576 |
| CARBON FIBRE | 10382377 | 2481.44 | 0.223 | 0.312 | 0.917 |
| POLYPROPYLENE | 916500 | 219.05 | 0.019 | 0.026 | 0.076 |
| TOTAL ALUMINUM |  | 4252.44 | 0.382 | 0.534 | 1.569 |
|  | MxCex | -2-T1) | PROPANE Kg | PROPANE | EMISSION KG CO2 |
|  | Q (JOULES) | Q (Kcal) | 100\% | 140\% | $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |
| TOTAL STEEL | 202075000 | 48297.08 | 4.358 | 6.101 | 17.93 |

Summary of the carbon footprint. Extraction raw material + manufacturing of cylinders:

| SCC CYLINDER |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| MATERIALS | Kg CO 2 |
| EXTRACTION RAW MATERIALS | 180.62 |
| MANUFACTURING OF SCC MATERIALS | 1.56 |
| TOTAL | $182.18 \mathrm{Kg} \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |
| STEEL CYLINDER |  |
| MATERIALS | KG CO 2 |
| STEEL | 137 |
| STEEL MANUFACTURING | 17.93 |
| TOTAL | $154.93 \mathrm{Kg} \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |

With these results it can be stated that the manufacture of a SCC cylinder produces $\mathbf{1 7 . 5 8 \%} \mathbf{m o r e} \mathbf{C O}_{\mathbf{2}}$ than the manufacture of a steel cylinder.

### 4.3 TRANSPORTATION

Let us check the savings in transportation using a 300 bars SCC cylinder 45 liter versus a steel cylinder 50 liter.

## We take into account the following data:

- The $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions considering an average value for transportation of goods by road is 50 gr . of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ per Km and Ton of weight.
- We will consider a distance of 150 Km for our calculation.

| PRODUCT | STELL CYLINDER 50 LITER | SMART CARBON CYLINDER 45 LITER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 20.6 KG of oxygen | 18.54 KG of oxygen |
|  | 15.45 KG of nitrogen | 13.90 KG of nitrogen |

## CASE $1:$

We will start by comparing the $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ footprint in the round trip of a single cylinder, in both cases.
Single Cylinder (14 Tn. Freight Truck) Delivery of a full cylinder with oxygen + collection of an empty one back to the plant.

## SINGLE STEEL CYLINDER

Outbound trip full cylinder $=68.5 \mathrm{Kg}+20.6 \mathrm{Kg}=89.10 \mathrm{Kg} / / 150 \mathrm{Km} \times 0.089 \mathrm{Tm} \times 50 \mathrm{gr} .=668.25 \mathrm{gr}$.
$\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ Inbound trip empty cylinder $=68.5 \mathrm{Kg} / / 150 \mathrm{Km} \times 0.068 \mathrm{Tm} \times 50 \mathrm{gr} .=513.75 \mathrm{gr} . \mathrm{CO}_{2}$
Total 1182 gr. of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}=1.082 \mathrm{Kg}$ of $\mathrm{CO} 2 / /$ Ratio $\mathrm{CO}_{2} \times \mathrm{Kg}$ of gas delivered $1082 / 20.6 \mathrm{Kg}=57.37 \mathrm{gr} . \mathrm{CO}_{2}$

## SINGLE SCC CYLINDER

Outbound trip full cylinder $=30+18.54 \mathrm{Kg}=48.54 \mathrm{Kg} / / 150 \mathrm{Km} \times 0.048 \mathrm{Tm} \times 50 \mathrm{gr} .=364.05 \mathrm{gr} . \mathrm{CO}_{2}$
Inbound trip empty cylinder $=30 \mathrm{Kg} / / 150 \mathrm{Km} \times 0.03 \mathrm{Tm} \times 50 \mathrm{gr} .=225 \mathrm{gr} . \mathrm{CO}_{2}$
Total 589.5 gr . of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}=0.5895 \mathrm{Kg}$ of $\mathrm{CO}_{2} / /$ Ratio $\mathrm{CO}_{2} \times \mathrm{Kg}$ of gas delivered $589.50 / 18.54 \mathrm{Kg}=31.77 \mathrm{gr}$. $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$

## CONCLUSION:

USING SCC CYLINDERS FOR GAS TRANSPORTATION REDUCES CO 2 EMISSIONS BY A 44.62\% COMPARED TO THE STEEL CYLINDER.

| B50 CYLINDER | REDUCES CO |
| :---: | :---: |
| OXYGEN | $-44.62 \%$ |
| NITROGEN | $-46.12 \%$ |
| ARGON | $-43.28 \%$ |

### 4.3 TRANSPORTATION

## CASE 2:

Delivering a single cylinder is not frequent, so we will consider a more usual example: the delivery of a whole freight truck.
Freight Truck 24 tons of payload (dimensions $13.40 \times 2.50 \mathrm{~m}$.)

## USING STEEL CYLINDERS:

240 cylinders with cages, each cylinder contains 20.6 Kg of oxygen
240 cylinders $\times 89.10 \mathrm{Kg}+20$ cages $\times 130 \mathrm{Kg}=23984 \mathrm{Kg}$
240 cylinders $\times 68.5 \mathrm{Kg}+20$ cages $\times 130 \mathrm{Kg}=19040 \mathrm{Kg}$
Total 43024 Kg to deliver 4944 Kg of product

Outbound trip full cylinder $=150 \mathrm{Km} \times 23.98 \mathrm{Tn} \times 50 \mathrm{gr} .=179850 \mathrm{gr} . \mathrm{CO}_{2}$
Inbound trip empty cylinder $=150 \mathrm{Km} \times 19.04 \mathrm{Tn} \times 50 \mathrm{gr} .=142800 \mathrm{gr} . \mathrm{CO}_{2}$
Total 322650 gr. of $\mathrm{CO}_{2} / /$ Ratio $\mathrm{CO}_{2} \times \mathrm{Kg}$ of product 322650 gr. $/ 4944 \mathrm{Kg}=6526$ gr. $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$
USING SCC CYLINDERS:
465 cylinders, 31 pallets of 15 cylinders each, each cylinder carries 18.54 Kg of oxygen
465 cylinders $\times 48.54 \mathrm{Kg}+31$ pallet $\times 25 \mathrm{Kg}=23346 \mathrm{Kg}$
495 cylinders $\times 30 \mathrm{Kg}+31$ pallet $\times 25 \mathrm{Kg}=14725 \mathrm{Kg}$
Total 38071 Kg to deliver 8621 Kg of product

Outbound trip full cylinder $=150 \mathrm{Km} \times 23.34 \mathrm{Tn} \times 50 \mathrm{gr} .=175050 \mathrm{gr} . \mathrm{CO}_{2}$
Inbound trip empty cylinder $=150 \mathrm{Km} \times 14.72 \mathrm{Tn} \times 50 \mathrm{gr} .=110400 \mathrm{gr} . \mathrm{CO}_{2}$
Total: 285450 gr. of $\mathrm{CO}_{2} / /$ Ratio $\mathrm{CO}_{2} \times \mathrm{Kg}$ of product 285400 gr ./ $8621 \mathrm{Kg}=33.111 \mathrm{gr}$. $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$

## CONCLUSION:

USING SCC CYLINDERS FOR GAS TRANSPORTATION REDUCES CO 2 EMISSIONS BY A 49.26\% COMPARED TO THE STEEL CYLINDER.

| CYLINDER 40/50 LITER | REDUCES CO |
| :---: | :---: |
| OXYGEN | $-49.26 \%$ |
| NITROGEN | $-50.69 \%$ |
| ARGON | $-47.94 \%$ |

## LAYOUT OF CYLINDERS IN A 24 TN FREIGHT TRUCK

Weight is important, but let us consider dimensions and space too.
A freight truck of 24 tons, dimensions of the cargo space: $13.4 \times 2.50$ meters.

## USING STEEL CYLINDERS:

Transportation of these cylinders requires metal cages with dimensions of $850 \times 1080 \mathrm{~mm}$, each cage has a capacity of 12 cylinders. Each cage with the 12 cylinders filled with gas weighs 1199 Kg . Considering that the maximum weight allowed by the freight truck is 24 Tons, only 20 cages ( 23980 Kg ) can be carried. Also, we must keep in mind the space, keeping the necessary distances in the freight truck cargo space, we may fit 2 rows of 15 cages in each, for a maximum of 30 cages ( 35970 Kg ). Due to this reason, the truck can only carry 20 cages ( 240 cylinders).

## USING SCC CYLINDERS:

Standard $800 \times 1200$ euro pallets are used, 15 cylinders fit in each pallet. Keeping the necessary distances, 33 pallets ( 465 SCC cylinders) fit in each cargo space. Each pallet with 15 filled cylinders weighs 753.10 Kg , that is, 31 filled pallets weigh 23346 Kg .
Although space allows us to fit 33 pallets, the weight limit of 24 tons permits us to charge just 31 pallets.


### 4.4 RECYCLING



We must keep in mind that more than $95 \%$ of all SCC materials can be recycled.
Aluminum is a totally recyclable material that does not lose its properties, moreover, recycling aluminum saves $95 \%$ of the energy needed to produce new aluminum.
Polypropylene is $100 \%$ recyclable which makes it a versatile material in reprocessing, allowing us to obtain products that fulfill an equivalent functional promise to the initial application or giving them a greater impact destination.

## 5. REDUCTION OF THE CARBON FOOTPRINT WITH THE SCC CYLINDER

## HOW MUCH CO CAN A TREE ABSORB?

It can be stated that figures vary between 10 Kg and 30 Kg of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ per year. For calculation purposes, it is recommended to take 15 Kg of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ as a reference.

## SCC cylinder service life: 30 years

One 50-litres SCC cylinder has an average rotation of 4 times to the year, meaning it is filled, delivered and collected 4 times a year.

## 10 In the manufacturing process there is a saving of:

Steel Cylinder $=154.93 \mathrm{Kg}$ of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$
BIC Cylinder $=182.18 \mathrm{Kg}$ of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$
The difference is -27.25 Kg of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ per cylinder.

## $\mathbf{2}^{\circ}$ In the transportation of a SCC cylinder:

Considering a service life of 30 years and a rotation of 4 times a year, 120 round trips are made in the life of each cylinder. On each round trip there is a saving of 0.429 Kg of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ per cylinder
So for 120 trips, the economy is: 0.429 Kg of $\mathrm{CO} 2 \times 120=51.48 \mathrm{Kg}$ of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$

## CONCLUSION:

TOTAL SAVING OF $\mathrm{CO}_{2}=51.84 \mathrm{KG}-27.25 \mathrm{KG}=24.23 \mathrm{KG} \mathrm{OF} \mathrm{CO}_{2}$. AS IF WE HAD SEEDED 1.6 TREES.


Using SCC cylinders implies a reduction of the carbon footprint equivalent to the seeding of more than one tree all over the life of each BIC cylinder.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

After the present study and the analysis of the results, we can state that, although in the manufacturing process of the SCC the data are similar to those of the steel cylinder, there is a significant reduction of $56 \%$ in the carbon footprint in the transportation process, that grows up to $60 \%$ when considering the full load of a 24 Tn freight truck.

The reason for this economy are:

- Its lower weight, almost three times lighter than steel cylinders.
- Its hexagonal shape, which allows using pallets instead of cages, so we have more space to carry almost twice as many cylinders in a 24 Tn freight truck.

We may come to the conclusion that the "carbon balance" for smart carbon cylinders (SCC) shows that its use implies a reduction of the carbon footprint equivalent to the seeding of more than one tree all over the life of each SCC cylinder.
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