

Università degli studi di Udine

Feasibility limits of using low-grade industrial waste heat in symbiotic district heating and cooling networks

Original

Availability: This version is available http://hdl.handle.net/11390/1186575 since 2020-06-24T17:06:20Z

Publisher:

Published DOI:10.1007/s10098-020-01875-2

Terms of use:

The institutional repository of the University of Udine (http://air.uniud.it) is provided by ARIC services. The aim is to enable open access to all the world.

Publisher copyright

(Article begins on next page)

Feasibility limits of using low grade industrial waste heat in symbiotic district heating and cooling networks

3 Maurizio Santin¹, Damiana Chinese^{*1}, Alessandra De Angelis¹, Markus Biberacher²

¹ Dipartimento Politecnico di Ingegneria e Architettura, University of Udine, Via delle Scienze 206, Udine, Italy

² Research Studio iSPACE, Schillerstraße 25, 5020 Salzburg, Austria *damiana.chinese@uniud.it

Abstract. Low grade waste heat is an underutilized resource in process industries, which may consider investing in urban symbiosis projects to make heating and cooling available to proximal urban areas through district energy networks. A long distance between industrial areas and residential users is a barrier to the feasibility of these projects, given the high capital intensity of infrastructure, and alternative uses of waste heat, such as power generation, may be more attractive in spite of electric efficiency. This paper introduces a parametric approach to explore the economic feasibility limits of industrial waste heat based district heating and cooling (DHC) of remote residential buildings in temperate climates. It also proposes a comparative water-energy-carbon nexus analysis of district heating and cooling and of Organic Rankine Cycles for power generation in an Italian and in an Austrian setting. The results show that, for a generic 4MW industrial waste heat flow steadily available at 95°C, district heating and cooling is the best option from an energy-carbon perspective in both countries. Power generation is the best option in terms of water footprint in most scenarios, and is economically preferable to DHC in Italy. Maximum DHC feasibility threshold distances are in line with literature, and may reach up to 30 km for waste heat flows of 30 MW in Austria. However, preferability threshold distances, above which waste heat-to-power outperforms DHC from an economic viewpoint, are shorter, in the order of 20 km in Austria and 10 km in Italy for 30 MW waste heat flows.

Keywords: Industrial Waste Heat Recovery, Water Energy Nexus analysis,
 District Heating and Cooling, ORC, Urban symbiosis

1

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 Highlights

- Comparison of carbon footprints and water footprints of industrial waste heat recovery options
 Parametric footprint calculator for district heating and cooling systems depending on extension
 Economic threshold distances for urban symbiosis via DHC for Italian and Austrian settings
- Waste heat use for power generation with Organic Rankine Cycles improves
 water footprint

10 Introduction

Industrial waste heat, particularly at low temperature, is often an underutilized re source. Its better exploitation is recognized to bring about lower CO₂ emissions, better
 energy efficiency, and generally cleaner production (Mirò et al., 2018).

14 Karner et al. (2015), in particular, highlighted a lack of research concerning the 15 symbiosis of industries and cities, and particularly of figures enabling an economic 16 comparison with other energy production technologies. In fact, there is more evidence on the environmental benefits of urban symbiosis: research in similar projects reports 17 18 savings between 12% (Lu et al, 2020) and 66% (Dou et al., 2018) of carbon equivalent 19 emissions. Moreover, a study (Persson et al., 2014) performed at macroregional 20 (NUTS3) level in Europe highlighted that 46% of the total surplus heat from industries 21 and thermal power plants, which is in the order of 11 EJ/year, could meet 31% of the 22 heating demand of the buildings in the identified macroregions. However, the limited 23 information about the economic feasibility of industrial symbiosis, and by extension of 24 urban symbiosis, particularly at local project scale, is an obvious barrier to their 25 development (Golev et al., 2014).

26 Indeed, the economic feasibility, the energy and the environmental impact of 27 recovering industrial waste heat through new or existing district heating systems have 28 increasingly been explored in research and practice. In this regard, the authors 29 performed a literature review on the Scopus database, based on a research using 30 keywords "industrial waste heat" in conjunction with "district heating" or "district 31 cooling" and "case study". Altogether 41 papers have been retrieved at the time of 32 search (July 2019). Among them, we focused on those reporting numeric data on the 33 industrial waste heat capacities exploited in symbiotic projects and, possibly, on the 34 distance between waste heat sources and users. Fifteen such papers have been found 35 and reviewed, as reported in the supplementary materials to this paper in Table S1, 36 which highlights the types of waste heat sources used, the indicators reported and the -37 eventual - alternative uses of waste heat considered for comparison. This literature 38 review shows that the application of industrial waste heat recovery in connection with 39 district heating has attracted growing attention in Asia (China, South Korea, and Japan) 40 and Italy in the last few years, whereas it has been a focal point in continental Europe 41 (Sweden, Finland, Denmark, the Netherlands, Germany, and Austria) for several years.

For the projects examined, the variety in size and technologies is wide, ranging from
microscale projects of about 0,5-1 GWh/year (Brückner et al., 2014) to metropolitan
projects of several PJ/year (Dou et al., 2018, Kim et al. 2018, Tong et al., 2017, see
Table S1). The extension of networks connecting industrial sources to DH substations
or users also varies from a few hundred meters (Dominkovic et al., 2017) up to some
50 km (Sandvall et al., 2016).

7 It is reasonable to expect that in larger projects higher heat demand makes longer
8 networks financially viable, in spite of higher investment costs, heat losses and
9 pumping energy requirements. Since industrial areas may be quite far from urban
10 centers, the financial viability of making waste heat available for district heating is a
11 fundamental question for prospective investors, particularly for systems which are yet
12 to be constructed.

Fang et al. (2013) recommend 5-10 km as an economically feasible distance between sources and users for industrial waste heat based district heating systems in small towns, and mention 30 km as a limit for large cities or cold climates, but do not provide any specific calculations, nor any correlation with the magnitude of the exploited waste heat flows.

18 Indeed, based on the literature review, a similar elaboration has been apparently 19 attempted only by Dou et al. (2018), who sketch a diagram highlighting a linear 20 dependence between initial investment and heat transport distance, identifying a 21 dilemma for smaller, financially attractive projects with limited environmental 22 performance, and partially by Chinese et al. (2018), who suggest that distances between 23 waste heat sources and first district heated buildings up to 10 km might be feasible for 24 a 1 MW waste heat recovery project under middle European climate conditions. Hence, 25 there is limited evidence in literature of correlations, parametric models or guidelines 26 on how far should heat transport be considered, depending on available flows and 27 considering, as mentioned by Karner et al. (2015), also alternative energy production 28 and waste heat exploitation technologies. Moreover, none of the mentioned 29 contributions considers summer cooling opportunities, which in connection with 30 industrial waste heat recovery were considered, e.g. by Tong et al. (2017) as interesting 31 opportunities for specific case studies.

Case specific feasibility studies exploring economic and environmental aspects of urban symbiosis projects are obviously needed, but they are resource consuming as they require gathering information on industries, territories, available energy supply options and local energy demand. Hence, establishing a correlation between the distance from industrial sources to users and economically viable network capacity would be helpful as a planning guideline before undertaking specific studies, allowing to allocate resources to the most promising ones.

Against this background, this paper aims to explore the economic feasibility and the environmental impact of using low grade industrial waste heat flows for both heating and air conditioning reference residential buildings via district energy networks. In the literature (DOE, 2008), low grade waste heat is often defined as waste heat available at up to 230 °C. In this paper, we focus on the temperature ranges typical of traditional *DH* installations, which have a supply temperature of 75-90 °C (Johansson and Söderström, 2014). The paper attempts to establish a correlation between the maximum economically feasible distance between heat source and users, and the magnitude of
 waste heat potential. In particular, this study will focus on new district heating systems,
 and particularly on small scale projects (up to 30 MW), both because literature suggests
 that they are the most critical in terms of profitability (Lygnerud and Werner, 2018),
 and because new projects are likely to start small.

6 Moreover, the feasibility limits of industrial waste heat based district heating and 7 cooling (IWH DHC) schemes will also be explored in the current paper by comparing their profitability with that of alternative energy recovery options, in particular 8 9 electricity generation. In fact, literature (Johansson and Söderström, 2014) suggests that electricity production is an interesting option for companies with large waste heat 10 flows. In particular, Organic Rankine Cycles (ORC) (see e.g. Gutierrez-Arriaga et al., 11 12 2015) can be cost efficient power generation systems even at a waste heat supply 13 temperature of 95°C, which is the reference value used in this study.

14 It should be observed that, among the studies reviewed above, only Battisti et al. 15 (2016) perform a direct comparison of the economic and environmental impact of DH and power generation as waste heat recovery alternatives. In their case, the distance 16 17 between industrial waste heat sources and the feed-in-point of the DH network is 18 apparently negligible, and so are DH investment costs other than heat exchangers. As 19 a consequence, no information on how the distance between sources and users affects 20 techno-economic performance can be derived. Previous work by Chinese et al. (2018) 21 also attempts a similar comparison, with some information on distance, however for a 22 space heating application (1 MWth reference case).

Building upon previous literature, this paper is exploring the economic and
environmental preferability of waste-heat recovery for district heating and cooling
through a comparative analysis with "as is" situations (no waste heat recovery) and with
power generation via *ORC* as alternative heat recovery options.

The environmental preferability will be evaluated within the "water-energy-carbon 27 28 nexus" framework (Schnoor, 2011), in that indicators for environmental impact will 29 include direct and indirect CO₂ equivalent emissions and freshwater consumption. In 30 fact, interactions and possible trade-offs between water and energy consumption, as 31 well as carbon emissions, are receiving increasing attention in industrial contexts 32 (Varbanov, 2014). Such interactions should be accounted for particularly when heat 33 dissipation occurs, because heat dissipation is the main determinant of industrial water 34 consumption (Förster, 2014), and requires energy consumption as well. However, as 35 shown by the literature review (Table S1, supplementary material), water consumption 36 related factors are hardly included in the indicators commonly calculated for symbiotic 37 district energy projects.

38 The current analysis moves from a real case study of a waste heat flow from biogas 39 engines available at a waste management company in Italy, which is proposed to be 40 recovered to feed a district heating system including summer cooling options 41 (Cucchiaro et al., 2019). The district heating and cooling system will be designed and 42 modelled as a point to point system serving a virtual residential complex. Based on the 43 outcome of this reference model, a parametric study will then be developed in order to 44 obtain correlations between the performance of alternative heat recovery options 45 (district heating and power generation) at different conditions and in different climate

1 regions, and systems size. In particular, a parametric analysis of the same system as if 2 it were located in Italy and in Austria will be performed: this is because this research is 3 part of the cross border Interreg Italy-Austria project "IDEE", which aims to define 4 tools and guidelines for planning cleaner energy system in urban areas, especially by exploiting synergies with industrial areas. Moreover, Italy and Austria have different 5 climatic conditions: in spite of the limited difference in latitude and altitude of the 6 7 reference locations (Maniago, at 46° 9' latitude and 283 m altitude in north eastern 8 Italy, and Salzburg, at 47° 48' and 424 m altitude in Austria), the temperature difference 9 between the two side of the Alps is not negligible (the yearly average temperature is 10 approximately 12 °C in Maniago and approximately 9 °C in Salzburg based on weather data from (EnergyPlus, 2018), taking the airports of Aviano and Salzburg as weather 11 12 data reference). Resource costs are also different in the two countries: in particular, 13 electricity and natural gas prices are lower in Austria, and water prices are lower in 14 Italy (see Table S8 in supplementary materials). Hence, the cross-border comparison of 15 the results for the same waste heat flow will also highlight the impact of such factors 16 on the performance of alternative waste heat recovery options.

17 Methodology

In order to investigate the environmental and economic feasibility limits of recovering
an assigned low grade waste heat flow by feeding it into a district heating network,
rather than either dissipating it or exploiting it for power generation through an ORC,
following steps have been performed:

- 1. Definition of reference functional units, systems boundaries, and scenarios;
- 23 2. Definition and calculation of indicators;
- 24 3. Technical model definition and parametrization.
- 25

22

26 Functional units, system boundaries and scenarios

Figure 1 and Table 1 presents the functional units, the systems boundaries and thescenarios selected.

Because our goal is to compare alternative processing options for low grade wasteheat, the definition of functional units is centered on waste heat flows.

At a generic industrial site, a waste heat flow (represented as green dotted lines in figure 1) of 4 MW_{th} (as in the real case study of concern, Cucchiaro et al., 2019) is assumed to be steadily available in the form of hot water at 95°C. This is the reference waste heat flow assumed as basic functional unit.

In the base scenarios (identified by green rectangles in figure 1, and as *DC BASE* and *CT BASE* scenarios marked in green in Table 1), it is assumed that such waste heat flow is fully dissipated. This can be done with wet cooling system using cooling towers

38 (*CT*), which by exposing water to ambient air determine its partial evaporation, and

- 39 consequently a direct consumption of freshwater (light blue arrow in Figure 1).
- 40 Alternatively, dry cooling systems (DC) can be used to cool down hot water by con-
- 41 duction and convection through an air stream, created by fans. Dry cooling systems do

not imply direct water consumption, but require more electricity than *CT* to operate
fans. Choosing between *DC* and *CT* for heat dissipation is a first dilemma from a waterenergy-carbon nexus perspective, as one has to consider the water consumption
associated with electricity generation (light blue arrow marked as indirect water
consumption in Figure 1). In order to evaluate the impact of the dissipation systems
used, corresponding scenarios are conceived, and marked with *DC* or *CT*, respectively,
as described in Table 1.





Fig. 1. Functional units, scenarios and resource flows.

Table 1. Characterization of scenarios and system boundaries.

Scenario	Description
DC BASE	This <i>BASE</i> scenario has no heat recovery and all the waste heat is dissipated with dry coolers (<i>DC</i>). The system boundaries include full size natural gas boilers used for heating, and mechanical vapour compression chillers with local dry coolers for cooling at the remote building complex.
DC DHC	Heat recovery is allocated to district heating and cooling (<i>DHC</i>), all the residual waste heat is dissipated at the generation points with

	<i>DC.</i> The system boundaries include: heat exchangers at recovery site and in each building, district heating pipes and relevant pumping systems, natural gas peak load boilers installed at remote buildings, base load absorption (<i>ABS</i>) and peak load mechanical vapour compression (<i>MVC</i>) cooling systems at remote buildings.
DC ORC	Heat recovery is allocated to power generation with an Organic Rankine Cycle <i>(ORC)</i> system located at the industrial site. Generated electricity is consumed internally at industry and substitutes electricity from the grid (national energy mix). <i>DC</i> are used for dissipation of residual waste heat and for <i>ORC</i> working fluid condensation. The remote building energy supply is as in the <i>DC BASE</i> scenario.
CT BASE	This <i>BASE</i> scenario has no heat recovery and all the waste heat is dissipated with cooling towers (<i>CT</i>). The system boundaries include full size natural gas boilers used for heating, and mechanical vapour compression chillers with local dry coolers for cooling at the remote building complex.
CT DHC	Heat recovery is allocated to district heating and cooling (<i>DHC</i>), all the residual waste heat is dissipated at the generation points with <i>CT</i> . The system boundaries include: heat exchangers at recovery site and in each building, district heating pipes and relevant pumping systems, natural gas peak load boilers installed at remote buildings, base load absorption (<i>ABS</i>) and peak load mechanical vapour compression (<i>MVC</i>) cooling systems at remote buildings.
CT ORC	Heat recovery is allocated to power generation with an Organic Rankine Cycle <i>(ORC)</i> system located at the industrial site. Generated electricity is consumed internally at industry and substitutes electricity from the grid (national energy mix). <i>CT</i> are used for dissipation of residual waste heat and for <i>ORC</i> working fluid condensation. The remote building energy supply is as in the <i>CT BASE</i> scenario.

1 2

3

4

5

In the *district heating and cooling (DHC)* recovery scenarios, it is assumed that the waste heat flow can be partially recovered to heat and cool a remote residential building complex, which is initially assumed to be located at 5 km from the industrial site as in the original case study (Cucchiaro et al., 2019).

6 To enable comparison, the space heating and cooling systems of the remote building 7 complex are included within functional units in all scenarios. In *BASE* scenarios, space 8 heating is assumed to operate entirely with natural gas boilers. These are fed by exist-9 ing natural gas grids, whose capital costs are assumed to be sunk. Space cooling is 10 performed with mechanical vapor compression chillers, which also require associated 11 waste heat dissipation systems as described in Table 1. For all the components 12 mentioned above, both materials and operation are included within the systems boundaries for footprint assessment, as better clarified in the "Definition and calculation of indicators" section.

3 To evaluate the feasibility limits for district heating and cooling, the remote user site 4 is conceived as a virtual building complex, whose size and operation are selected in a 5 way that enables the most profitable utilization of waste heat. Thus, the viability of DHC is evaluated under the most optimistic conditions, in particular for a high density 6 of heating demand at the remote user. In fact, realistic physical features (shape factors, 7 transmittances) for an averagely insulated reference residential buildings are defined 8 9 for the virtual building complex, denoted as remote building complex in figure 1. Next, 10 the buildings' size and the number of buildings within the complex are varied parametrically in order to adapt its demand pattern to the maximum available waste 11 12 heat flow.

The waste-heat recovery based system evaluated in *DHC* scenarios is identified inFigure 1 by the light red rectangles, and includes:

- a heat exchanger at the industrial site;
- supply and return district heating pipes transporting hot water at 90°C and
 70°C, respectively;
- 18 a suitable pumping system;
- 19 a heat exchange substation at the remote user site;

- an absorption cooler at the remote user site, exploiting district heat to meet localspace cooling demand.

To optimize the profitability of *DHC* systems, it is also assumed that a peak load boiler is part of the remote building space heating system (within the red dotted rectangle in Figure 1). In line with findings by Wang et al (2015), this collocation of peak heat boilers allows a better sizing of pipe diameters and pumping systems, and ultimately a lower electricity consumption for district heating.

Finally, heat recovery for power generation (identified by light blue rectangles in Figure 1 and Table 1) is assumed to exploit the available waste heat flow completely and to produce electricity for internal industrial use. In this case, the waste heat deriving from the condensation stage of the *ORC* is assumed to be dissipated with *DC* or *CT* according to the scenario.

32 Definition and calculation of indicators

In line with Chhipi-Shreshta et al. (2018), the alternative scenarios are evaluated from
 a water-energy carbon nexus viewpoint and as to engineering economics by calculating
 following indicators:

36

15

- **37** Total water footprint
- 38 Carbon footprint
- 39 Primary energy demand
- 40 Life cycle cost.
- 41

42 Total water footprint

The total water footprint (Hoekstra et al., 2011) includes the direct water consumption
and the indirect or embodied water consumption associated with the use of other
resources within the system.

In the present evaluation, in line with Mack-Vergara and John (2017), we do not
account for water pollution impacts (so called grey water), but only for the blue water
footprint, which measures the consumptive use of surface and ground water.

8 The blue water footprint W_f is calculated according to equation 1, where W_d is the 9 direct water consumption within systems, W_{op} is the indirect water footprint during 10 systems operation and W_c is the water footprint related to the equipment construction 11 materials. W_f is measured in m³ of water over the useful lifetime of the overall system 12 N_l , which has been set at 30 years based on data on district heating systems (Welsch et 13 al. 2018).

14

1

15
$$W_f = W_d + W_{op} + W_c =$$

$$16 = k \cdot W_{ev} \cdot N_l + (cw_{el}E_{el} + cw_{fuel}E_{fuel}) \cdot N_l + cw_{mpipes} \cdot f(C_{mpipes}) \cdot L_{pipes} + 17 \sum_{equip} cw_{mequip}C_{mequip}$$
(1)

18

19 Direct water consumption W_d only occurs in *CT* configurations due to evaporation 20 loss, drift and makeup-water requirements (bleed off). Evaporated quantities are 21 calculated according to Eq.2

$$22 \qquad W_{ev} = \frac{Q_{diss}}{\alpha \cdot LVH} \cdot \Delta T \tag{2}$$

23 Where *LVH* is the latent vaporization heat of water (here set at 2200 kJ/kg), Q_{diss} 24 the is the heat load in kW, ΔT is the operating time expressed in seconds/year, and ρ is 25 the water density (set at 996 kg/m³) so that the resulting W_{ev} is expressed in m³/year.

As shown in Eq.1, W_d is obtained by multiplying W_{ev} by coefficient k, which accounts for additional water losses due to bleed off and drift, and is set here at k=2(Reahvac, 2019).

The indirect water footprint due to system operation W_{op} is expressed as a function of the electricity consumed by all equipment, and of the fuels consumed by boilers. As to the impact of electricity consumption, the calculation approach and the data sources reported by Chinese et al. (2017) were used to derive the water consumption coefficient for electricity generation cw_{el} (reported in the supplementary materials to this paper, Table S2) for each country depending on the national electricity mix.

Focusing on the definition of system boundaries, also known as truncation issue (Hoekstra et al., 2011), all the data sources used for estimating the electricity consumption related water footprint cw_{el} (Burkhardt et al., 2011 for solar power, Saidur et al., 2011, and Xin Li et al., 2012, for wind power, IINAS Gemis, 2016, and Mekonnen et al., 2015 for remaining energy sources) and the fuel consumption related water footprint cw_{fuel} (IINAS Gemis, 2016) take a life cycle view, and account for all

1 the freshwater consumption associated with equipment manufacturing (from materials 2 extraction to installation) and with fuel extraction and consumption. Hence, in order to 3 obtain comparable results for local alternatives, i.e. district heating and cooling, and the 4 local generation of electricity through bottoming ORC, the freshwater consumption 5 associated with the upstream cycle of related equipment to be installed locally should 6 be also considered. Indeed, for most equipment the use phase largely prevails as to 7 carbon emissions and to several resource use categories, as attested by many authors 8 (see e.g. Oliver-Solà et al. 2009, and Bartolozzi et al. 2017 for the LCA of district 9 heating, Beccali et al. 2010, and Catrini et al. 2018 for LCA of cooling systems). 10 However, based on available data and on the expected significance of the upstream 11 contribution to the water footprint (Hoekstra et al., 2011), we decided to account for 12 the indirect contribution of the materials for the construction of energy conversion 13 equipment and of district energy pipes in order to allow a more equitable comparison 14 of alternative conversion pathways.

This contribution is expressed by the last two terms of Eq.1: cw_{mpipes} is the material related water consumption coefficient for twin pipes per length unit, C_{mpipes} is the heating capacity of pipes expressed in kW, and L_{pipes} is the length of the district energy network. Similarly, cw_{mequip} is the materials related water consumption coefficient for equipment *equip*. The values of these coefficients, along with the materials inventories, literature, and the approach used to derive them are reported in the supplementary materials to this paper, Tables S3-S5.

- 22
- 23 Carbon Footprint
- 24

27

curoon i ooiprini

The same approach was taken for the evaluation of the carbon footprint, calculatedaccording to Eq.3:

$$28 \quad CO2_f = CO2_d + CO2_{op} + CO2_m = (cCO2_{fuel}E_{fuel} + cCO2_{el}E_{el}) \cdot N_l + (cCO2_{mpipes}C_{mpipes}L_{pipes} + \sum_{equip} cCO2_{mequip}C_{mequip})$$
(3)

30

In this case, the direct emissions $CO2_d$ associated with systems operation arise from fuel combustion in boilers, while indirect carbon emissions during operation $CO2_{op}$ derive from electricity consumption. The embodied carbon equivalent emissions $CO2_m$ associated with equipment and pipe materials represent the last term of Eq.3. Values and methods for calculating coefficients are reported in Tables S2 (fuels and electricity), S4 (equipment) and S5 (pipes) of supplementary materials.

- 38 Primary energy demand
- 39

As in Chhipi-Shreshta et al. (2018), the indicator of primary energy demand (*PED*)
is calculated just for operation and on a yearly basis according to Eq. 4. The coefficients
are reported in the supplementary materials, Table S2.

1 $PED = C_{PED,el}E_{el} + C_{PED,fuel}E_{fuel}$

3 Life cycle cost

The life cycle cost (LCC) is used as a basis for economic assessment of each scenario. It is calculated according to Eq. 5:

8
$$LCC = C_{op}\left(\frac{q^{N_{l-1}}}{q^{N_{l,i}}}\right) + C_{cap,pipes}L_{pipes} + \sum_{equip}C_{cap,equip}\left(1 + \frac{1}{q^{N_{equip}}}\right)$$
(5)

10 where:

2

4 5

6

7

 C_{op} represents the yearly operating expenses for the systems, and includes 11 12 fuel, electricity, and water costs, as well as equipment and pipe maintenance costs as detailed in the supplementary materials to this paper, tables S6 and S7 13 14 $C_{cap,pipes}$ is capital cost of the DH system, based on the function reported in 15 table S8 of the supplementary material; 16 Ccap.equip is the capital cost of generic equipment equip (Supplementary 17 information Table S8). If the lifetime of equipment equip is shorter than N_l , 18 i.e. the useful lifetime of DH, the equipment is assumed to be replaced at year 19 Nequip spending the same capital cost. Any other discounts, capital cost reductions or salvage values are assumed to be negligible. 20 21 *i* is the interest rate, here set at 10%, and q = 1 + i.

22 Technical model and parametrization

Duration curves of heat loads are commonly used to design and optimize district heating systems. In duration curves, the studied time span is divided into a number of periods, each representing a specific state of the system rather than a specific chronological period, and all heat loads are sorted in decreasing order by the values of heat loads instead of the time they appear in the heating season. Such heat load curves are then discretized for computational handling (Sandberg et al., 2012).

29 Several authors (Wang et al., 2015) have built district heat load curves based on the 30 assumption that the heat demand of a building depends linearly on the outdoor air 31 temperature. However, such assumption does not hold for summer cooling. For this 32 reason, EnergyPlus (US Department of Energy, 2019) was used here to dynamically 33 simulate annual heating and cooling demand profiles for the reference residential 34 building under Italian and Austrian (city and reference airport of Salzburg) climatic 35 conditions. Global horizontal irradiance and ambient temperature data in hourly 36 resolutions were taken from the EnergyPlus data set (US Department of Energy, 2019). 37 The reference building is parallelepiped shaped, with 596 m² floor surface area, 18 m 38 height and 9200 m³ net air volume. The building features (including glazing and 39 envelope) are assumed to be the same in Italy and Austria, and are summarized in Table 40 S9 of the supplementary materials, which also presents the peak heating and cooling

(4)

loads. An annual total heating curve is obtained by composing heating and cooling
 loads according to equation 6,

5

12

17

18

4
$$Q_T(V,t) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} Q_{H_j}(V,t) + \frac{Q_{C_j}(V,t)}{COP_a}$$
 (6)

6 where $Q_{H_j}(V, t)$ is the heating load in time span *t* by the *j*-th building, having volume 7 V, $Q_{Cj}(t)$ is its cooling load and COP_a is the coefficient of performance of the local 8 absorption cooling system. The evaluation of systems energy parameters is then 9 performed for the discretized curves represented in Figure 2, featuring four demand 10 levels, i.e. peak, high, medium, and base demand. The discretization maintains original 11 peak loads and total energy demand, and is performed with the following procedure:

- Total heating loads are arranged in descending order;

Hours with loads above 90% of the maximum heat load are allocated to the peak heat time span, between 60% and 90% to the high heat load time span, between 40% and 60% to the medium heat load span and below 40% to the low heat demand span.

- The equivalent heat load is calculated for each time span as the ratio between the between the energy required in that time span, and the time span duration.

19 Because the basic functional unit is the reference waste heat flow recovered from the 20 industrial plant and optimistic conditions are explored, the virtual building complex is 21 designed to include a number of buildings whose total heating demand at high load 22 conditions exactly matches the waste heat load recovered minus heat losses along the 23 pipes. These are calculated as in Wallentén (1991). Assuming an average yearly soil 24 temperature of 12°C at all sites, a soil thermal conductivity of 1,5 W/mK, and the pipe 25 insulation features reported by manufacturers' catalogues (Socologstor, 2002), heat 26 losses are in the order of 28 W/m. The number of buildings in the virtual complex is 27 then determined so that their high level heat demand exactly matches the net available 28 district heat load (see Figure 2), while a local peak load boiler is assumed to meet the 29 peak load demand during the short time span it takes place (just six hours in Italy, and 30 twenty-eight hours in Austria). To ensure an exact match, minor adjustments to the 31 reference building size are performed depending on climate regions, assuming that 32 building shape factors and heat load patterns are conserved. As a result, the building complex features reported in Table S10 of supplementary materials are thus obtained 33 34 for the reference waste heat flow and distance under Italian and Austrian conditions. 35 Having the same insulation features, the buildings' energy demand is in line with 36 energy labels 'D' (Ilete, 2010), corresponding to well performing but old, non-37 renovated buildings. The ground surface area associated to each building is determined 38 according to a building index of 4 m³/m², typical for high density urban areas. The 39 extension of secondary DH pipes within the building complex is assumed to be 40 proportional to the number of buildings based on the ground surface area, and is hence 41 slightly lower in Austria.

42





Fig. 2. Heat load duration curves for Italy and Austria. The enlarged detail (not in scale) shows
the sizing and operation time of peak load equipment.

4

5 To perform a parametric analysis, the procedure described above will be repeated 6 when the reference waste heat load and the distance between the industry and the 7 remote building complex are varied.

8 The net electricity demand E_{el} is evaluated for each scenario considering the 9 contribution of relevant equipment shown in Figure 1 according to Eq.7, which includes 10 the power demand of pumps P_{pumps} , chillers P_{cool} , heat rejection units P_{diss} depending 11 and, in *ORC* scenarios, the credit P_{ORC} for power generated from waste heat. These 12 power flows, expressed in kW, are calculated for each time span t based on the 13 discretized heat load curve, and are multiplied by the time span duration N_h expressed 14 in hours/year.

15
$$E_{el} = \sum_{t} N_h(t) \cdot \left[P_{pumps}(t) + P_{cool}(t) + P_{diss}(t) - P_{ORC}(t) \right]$$
 (7)

16

The energy models used for the quantification of the power demand by mechanical
vapor compression chillers, absorption cooling chillers, dry coolers and cooling towers,
and of the net power generation in the *ORC* scenarios are those described in Chinese et
al. (2017). The equipment efficiency or COP, respectively, are reported in the
supplementary materials to this paper, table S8.
As to the pumps electricity demand, the absorbed power is calculated according to Eq.8
as:

$$25 \qquad P_{pumps} = \frac{\Delta H \cdot G}{1000 \cdot \eta_p} \tag{8}$$

- 1 Where ΔH is the delivery lift in Pa, G is the volume flowrate in m³/s, and η_p is the pump 2 efficiency. At part load, regulation is performed by reducing the flowrate down to 20%
- of the nominal value, and variable frequency pumps are assumed to be used.
- 4 The delivery lift is calculated by Eq. 9, i.e. the Darcy-Weisbach equation:

5
$$\frac{\Delta H}{L} = \lambda \frac{\rho v^2}{2D} (1 + \psi)$$
(9)

6 where $\Delta H/L$ is the pressure drop per unit length, ρ is the water density, v is the water 7 velocity along the pipe, D is the pipe diameter. ψ is an additional resistance ratio 8 accounting for local head losses, here set at 0.2. λ is the frictional coefficient depending 9 on flow conditions. In particular, since even at part load conditions the flow is found to 10 have a Reynolds' number $Re \ge 10^5$, Eq.10, i.e. the Nikuradse's friction correlation, is 11 used:

12
$$\lambda = 0.0032 + \frac{0.211}{Re^{0.237}}$$
 (10)

13 Reference waste heat flow – results and discussion

14 The environmental parameters for the reference waste heat flow under all scenarios are 15 reported in Tables 2-4. The comparative analysis of economic performance is 16 summarized in Table 5.

17 Blue water footprint

18 Table 2 shows the results for water footprint calculations. The equipment contribution 19 to life cycle consumption is very limited: even in DHC scenarios, where the water 20 consumption related to equipment and pipes is almost three times higher than in the 21 base and ORC scenarios, their ratio to the gross balance is hardly significant (below 22 10% in DC scenarios, and below 1% in CT scenarios). The major contribution to water 23 footprint is due to the direct water consumption from heat dissipators in CT scenarios, 24 to the indirect water demand from electricity feeding heat dissipators in DC scenarios, 25 respectively. The net water footprint in all CT scenarios is about one order of magnitude 26 higher than in corresponding DC scenarios. This means that, in terms of water footprint, 27 the reduced electricity consumption by CT compared with DC does not offset the direct 28 water consumption occurring in CT systems. Both in Italy and in Austria, the net water 29 footprint of DHC CT scenarios is lower than in BASE scenarios, with significant water 30 savings (around 25% of the base water footprint). In DC scenarios, however, the water 31 footprint increases when DHC is introduced: it is hence worth examining how this 32 varies with the network extension in the "Parametric analysis - Results and discussion" 33 section.

The alternative use of waste heat for power generation in *ORC* scenarios is, in most cases, the best option in terms of water footprint, because substantial indirect water emissions from national electricity generation are thus avoided. In *DC* scenarios, this even leads to negative balances. In the Italian *CT* scenario, however, *DHC* is the best option in terms of water footprint. Indeed, in *DHC CT* scenarios the reduction in direct
water consumption at cooling towers is smaller in Italy than in Austria, because of the
differences in relevant district heating and cooling demand profiles. However, this
disadvantage for *DHC* in Italy is offset by the smaller indirect water demand related to
electricity consumption, which makes water pumping for *DHC* less resource
consuming, and local power generation through *ORC* less competitive.

7 Carbon footprint

8 In terms of carbon footprint (Table 3) *DHC* is by far the best option compared with
9 both the *BASE* scenario and the *ORC*, which in turn performs better than the *BASE*10 scenarios in all cases. This is more evident in Austria on one hand, because climate
11 leads to higher fuel savings, and on the other hand, because carbon emission credits
12 from power generation are smaller than in Italy: in fact, carbon equivalent emissions
13 per kWh_{el} in Austria are less than half the Italian ones (see supplementary data, Table
14 S2).

15 In line with the literature cited above, the weight of equipment related emissions on the 16 total emissions is small in the BASE scenarios, whereas fuel related emissions account for more than 77% of total values in Italy and for more than 90% of total values in 17 18 Austria, respectively. The difference between the two countries can be attributed to the 19 climate, in particular to the higher share of air conditioning in Italy, and the related 20 electricity consumption. On the other hand, the proportion of equipment and pipe related carbon equivalent emissions is not negligible in DHC scenarios, ranging 21 22 between 12% (DC DHC in Italy) and 28% (CT DHC in Austria) of net emissions.

23 Primary energy demand

24 The results for the primary energy demand, reported in Table 4, are in line with those 25 for carbon equivalent emissions. The reduction in fuel consumption in DHC scenarios are significant. It should be stressed that variations from BASE values of electricity 26 27 related primary energy consumption are minimal reductions in DC and CT ORC 28 scenarios, and increases in DHC scenarios. This means that, for the reference DH 29 network configuration, the additional electricity, mainly used for pumping water in the 30 district energy network, is not offset by the reduced demand for space cooling and for 31 heat dissipation.

			Ita	ly			Austria						
	DC BASE	DC DHC	DC ORC	CT BASE	CT DHC	CT ORC	DC BASE	DC DHC	DC ORC	CT BASE	CT DHC	CT ORC	
Energy conversion equipment	7724	21103	8501	2764	12586	3542	6442	13591	7219	2483	7896	3260	
District heating - pipes	0	6541	0	0	6541	0	0	6479	0	0	6479	0	
Fuels	2914	19	2914	2914	19	2914	3176	14	3176	3176	14	3176	
Direct water consumption	0	0	0	3544532	2478219	3239148	0	0	0	3445946	2317776	3140561	
Indirect consumption from electricity consumption	274371	296468	254431	40012	134147	39124	943557	1065936	866810	78457	479745	75036	
Credits for electricity generation	0	0	-575138	0	0	-575138	0	0	-2213678	0	0	-2213678	
Net life cycle water consumption	285009	324131	-309292	3590222	2631512	2709590	953175	1086020	-1336473	3530062	2811910	1008355	

 Table 2. Blue water consumption, in m³ over 30-year operation.

Table 3. CO2eq emissions in tons over 30-year operation.

		Italy							Austria					
	DC BASE	DC DHC	DC ORC	CT BASE	CT DHC	CT ORC	DC BASE	DC DHC	DC ORC	CT BASE	CT DHC	CT ORC		
Energy conversion equipment	963	1487	1020	334	406	391	807	1008	864	304	285	361		
District heating - pipes	0	1233	0	0	1233	0	0	1222	0	0	1222	0		
Fuel consumption	67167	433	67167	67167	433	67167	73204	334	73204	73204	334	73204		
Electricity consumption	18184	19649	16863	2652	8891	2593	6801	7683	6248	566	3458	541		
Credits electricity generation	0	0	-38118	0	0	-38118	0	0	-15956	0	0	-15956		
Net life cycle CO2eq emissions	86314	22802	46931	70152	10963	32032	80813	10247	64360	74074	5299	58150		

	Italy							Austria					
	DC BASE	DC DHC	DC ORC	CT BASE	CT DHC	CT ORC	DC BASE	DC DHC	DC ORC	CT BASE	CT DHC	CT ORC	
Fuels consumption	23160	149	23160	23160	149	23160	25242	115	25242	25242	115	25242	
Electricity consumption	7612	8225	7059	1110	3722	1085	4156	4695	3818	346	2113	331	
Electricity generation (credits)	0	0	-15956	0	0	-15956	0	0	-9751	0	0	-9751	
Net energy consumption	30772	8374	14263	24270	3871	8289	29398	4811	19309	25588	2228	15822	

 Table 4. Primary energy demand in TOE over 30-year operation.

 Table 5. System life cycle cost in kEURO over 30-year operation.

			Ita	ly					Aus	tria		
Systems LCC over 30 years, in k€	DC BASE	DC DHC	DC ORC	CT BASE	CT DHC	CT ORC	DC BASE	DC DHC	DC ORC	CT BASE	CT DHC	CT ORC
CAPEX equipment	2176	2952	3355	2027	2685	3208	1872	1638	3051	1756	1469	2878
CAPEX pipes	0	3923	0	0	3923	0	0	3885	0	0	3885	0
OPEX fuels	8651	56	8651	8651	56	8651	8939	41	8939	8939	41	8939
OPEX electricity	2359	2549	2188	344	1154	336	1519	1716	1395	126	772	121
OPEX water	0	0	0	1254	877	1146	0	0	0	2408	1620	2195
OPEX maintenance	198	1439	318	336	1472	441	188	1280	309	335	1342	439
SAVINGS electricity	0	0	-4946	0	0	-4946	0	0	-3563	0	0	-3563
LCC overall	13384	10919	9566	12612	10165	8836	12518	8560	10130	13563	9129	11037

1 Life cycle cost

2 Table 5, which summarizes the life cycle costs for all scenarios over 30-year operation,

3 shows that DHC leads to significant savings to the BASE scenarios, in the order of 18%

4 in Italy and of 30% in Austria, both in DC and CT scenarios. The main capital expense

5 (CAPEX) in DHC scenarios is represented by the investment in pipes (components and

6 installation). It leads to substantially higher investments than in *BASE* scenarios, but in

7 both countries it is offset by the reduction in operating expenses (OPEX).

8 However, DHC outperforms ORC in Austria, but not in Italy: here, using low grade

9 waste heat for internal power generation leads to 13% lower life cycle costs than heat

10 recovery for district heating and cooling. This result arises from differences in climate

and fuel expenses, but mainly from the higher costs of electricity in Italy.

12 Parametric analysis – results and discussion

13 The capital expenses for pipes depend on the network extension. Hence, for DHC 14 scenarios it is worth to explore the economic feasibility limits, by determining the 15 minimum network extension which makes DHC more expensive than the BASE 16 scenario, as well as the preferability limits, by establishing thresholds above which the 17 LCC of the ORC alternative is lower than that of DHC. These results are shown in 18 Figure 3a and 3b, respectively.



19 20 21

Fig. 3. LCC and H₂O Threshold distance – km – comparing (a) DH vs Base Case, (b) DH vs ORC.

1 The green lines with triangles (for Italy) and red lines with diamonds (for Austria) 2 represent the threshold distances, above which the life cycle cost of DHC is higher than 3 the alternative, i.e. the BASE scenario with no heat recovery, in the figure left, and the 4 heat recovery for power generation in the figure right, respectively. For example, if a 5 steady flow of e.g. 10 MW of the form described above is currently dissipated with dry coolers at an industrial site at the conditions defined in the methodology, Figure 3a 6 7 shows that a waste heat recovery for DHC purposes to a remote residential building complex is expected to be competitive with existing natural gas heating systems if the 8 9 distance between the site and the user is lower than 14 km in Italy, or lower than 16 km in Austria. However, looking at Figure 3b, we deduce that, if the distance is higher than 10 7 km in Italy or 12 km in Austria, it is economically preferable to exploit the waste heat 11 12 flow for power generation with an ORC system rather than for DHC purposes.

13 Similarly, the dashed blue curves in Figure 3a represent the water footprint 14 equivalence distance between DHC and the BASE scenario for DC. 15

We can observe that:

16	-	As expected, the threshold distance grows with the recovered heat flow,
17		however according to a less than linear pattern (the curves can be well fitted by
18		parables with decreasing slope). Over long distances, diseconomies related to
19		heat losses and head losses prevail, whereas waste heat-to-power solutions
20		benefit more from economies of scale;

- 21 The threshold values are in line with the estimates by Fang et al. (2013), 22 reaching limit distances in the order of 30 km for 30 MW waste heat flows in 23 Austria:
- 24 DHC feasibility curves (3a) for Italy are well (on average about 5 km) below 25 corresponding curves for Austria: this reflects differences in climate (although the overall heating demand is the same, Italy features a significantly higher 26 27 share of absorption cooling, which has higher capital expenses and lower 28 margins), which are only partially compensated by differences in fuel costs (lower electricity and fuel prices in Austria). 29
- 30 ORC threshold curves (3b) for Italy are also below corresponding curves for Austria, and the distance between the curves of the two countries is wider than 31 32 for feasibility threshold curves (3a). In this case, the economic comparison is 33 more intensely affected by electric energy prices, which are significantly lower 34 in Austria than in Italy.
- 35 Water footprint thresholds distances in the DC comparison with the BASE _ 36 scenario (3a) are well below the economic threshold distances: for example, for 37 a waste heat flow of 10 MW, both in Italy and Austria the water footprint of DHC system is higher than that of the BASE scenario if the distance between 38 the industrial source and the user site is higher than 6 km. 39
- 40 Water footprint threshold distances for CT scenarios, primary energy and 41 carbon footprint thresholds could also be analogously analyzed, but they tend to infinite or technically unfeasible values. In other words, waste heat recovery 42 43 based district heating and cooling is linked with better environmental 44 performance as to those indicators for any feasible network extension.

1 2 3	-	Economic threshold distances in CT scenarios (continuous lines in Figure 3) are slightly higher than in DC scenarios (dotted lines in Figure 3) in Austria. In Italy the curves virtually overlap. This is in line with differences in industrial water and electricity prices: in Austria, the former are significantly higher and
5		the second are significantly lower than in Italy which makes <i>CT</i> proportionally
6		more expensive than <i>DC</i> as dissipation systems.
7	In Figu	are 4 a sensitivity analysis is shown, which supports this interpretation. The
8	sensitiv	vity, which is expressed in percentage terms, is performed with reference to the
9	basic fi	unctional unit waste heat flow (4 MW _{th}) and to the Italian conditions. The centers
10	of the f	igures (marked in Figure 4 as 100%) correspond to:
11	-	The reference values for all parameters, along the x-axis;
12	-	The threshold distances above which heat recovery for DHC is economically
13		preferable to the BASE scenario, along the y-axis of figures 4a (DC settings)
14		and 4b (CT settings). As can be observed in Figure 3a, this distance corresponds
15		to 7,0 km for both DC and CT settings.
16	-	The threshold distance above which power generation with ORC is
17		economically preferable to the waste heat use for DHC, along the y-axis of
18		figures 4c (DC settings) and 4d (CT settings). As can be observed in Figure
19		3b, this distance corresponds to about 3,8 km for both <i>DC</i> and <i>CT</i> settings.
20	One fac	ctor at time is varied, and the influence of following parameters is analyzed:
21	•	Natural gas (NG) price;
22	•	Capital expenses (CAPEX) per meter of district heating pipes;
23	•	Industrial price of electricity (EI);
24	•	Industrial price of water, in <i>CT</i> scenarios only;
25	•	Electric efficiency (η) of the ORC based waste-heat-to-power system, in
26		figures 4c and 4d only;
27	•	Heating degree days and cooling degree days of the locations, which is the
28		truncation of daily temperature series at a base temperature according to the
29		ASHRAE Handbook lundamentals (2009). These parameters are recognized as
30 21		an indication of the amount of heating and cooling, respectively, required in a
27 21		respectively. In this case, the data represent the results of simulations for
22		different cities having different climate settings; the center corresponds to the
34		Italian case study in Maniago (reference weather conditions: Aviano airport)
35		while heating degree days at about 130% of the center value correspond to the
36		climate of Salzburg (reference weather conditions: Salzburg airport) and about
37		70% of the center value correspond to the climate conditions in Florence
38		(reference weather conditions: Florence airport).



1 2

3

Fig. 4. Sensitivity analysis on the preferability threshold distance for the reference waste heat flow: *DHC* – *BASE* [*DC* (a), *CT* (b)] and *DHC* – *ORC* [*DC* (c),*CT* (d)]

The results of this sensitivity analysis are generally in line with reasonable expectations: it can be observed that both the threshold distance beyond which *DHC* is unfeasible compared with *BASE* case, and the distance beyond with *DHC* becomes less profitable than *ORC* power generation grow with:

8 - growing natural gas price;

9 - higher heating degree days, i.e. higher space heating demand, whereas a reduction
10 in heating degree days has a proportionally higher negative impact on the economic

- 11 preferability of *DHC* than a reduction in natural gas prices.
- 12 Both threshold distances decrease with:

- 1 higher electricity price;
- 2 higher cooling degree days;
- growing specific capital expenses for *DH* pipelines, where a reduction in
 capital expenses has a proportionally higher positive impact on *DHC*preferability than the negative impact of a specific capital cost increase of the
 same magnitude;
 - growing water velocity (which entails smaller pipes but higher electricity consumption for pumping).
- 8 9 10

7

- The ORC preferability threshold distance also decreases when the energy efficiency of the power generation cycle increases.

11 It may seem counterintuitive that DHC becomes less appealing with growing cooling 12 degree days, i.e. with higher summer cooling demand. However, one should bear in 13 mind that realistic European climate instances have been chosen, and it was not possible 14 to vary just one factor at time: in temperate regions, higher air conditioning demand is 15 normally associated with lower space heating demand in winter. There is no substantial 16 difference between the sensitivity analysis pattern in DC and CT scenarios, and, in the 17 latter (Figure 4d), the variation of the economic preference threshold with water price 18 is negligible.

19 For all parameters analyzed, the slopes of sensitivity diagrams are generally smaller for 20 the DHC -BASE comparison (figures 4a, 4b) than for the DHC - ORC comparison 21 (figures 4c, 4d): the DHC feasibility thresholds determined are thus more robust than 22 the ORC preferability thresholds. This is mainly due to the high proportion of the costs 23 of fuels and of electricity on life cycle costs in the ORC scenario (see Table 5). Looking 24 at Table 5, we also note that the higher sensitivity of the ORC performance highlighted 25 in Figure 4 is in line with the findings of the economic analysis for the reference waste 26 heat flow discussed above: in fact, the preference ranking between the BASE and the 27 DHC scenario remained the same in both countries, in spite of different climatic and 28 energy price conditions, which on the contrary led to opposite performance rankings 29 comparing DHC with ORC scenarios in Italy and Austria, respectively.

30 Conclusions

31 This research has presented a parametric approach to assess the economic and the 32 water-energy-carbon (WEC) nexus performance of symbiotic district heating and 33 cooling of urban areas as an option for low grade waste heat recovery from far away 34 industrial sources. The assessment has been developed on a comparative basis, 35 assessing an "as is" BASE scenario without heat recovery as well as an alternative waste 36 heat utilization scenario entailing waste heat recovery for power generation by means 37 of Organic Rankine Cycle systems. The approach has been applied to realistic case 38 studies in north eastern Italy and in Austria. 39 The findings reveal that district heating and cooling is always the better low grade waste

- 40 heat utilization option in terms of primary energy and of carbon footprint, even
- 41 including the materials related contribution for pipes and equipment, regardless of the

1 distance between the waste heat source and the users. However, head losses, heat losses 2 and capital expenses for pipes limit economically feasible distances according to the 3 patterns presented in the parametric analysis. In particular, specific combinations of 4 electricity and natural gas prices may favor power generation over district heating and 5 cooling, in spite of its lower carbon reduction performance. On the other hand, it has 6 been shown that, in terms of water footprint, power generation is mostly preferable to 7 district heating and cooling as a waste heat recovery option. From a WEC nexus 8 viewpoint, the technologies used for dissipating original and residual waste heat make 9 a difference: district heating and cooling always improves the water footprint 10 performance if cooling towers are used, while network extension limitations should be considered in dry cooling scenarios to ensure that district heating and cooling is a win-11 12 win solution from both an energy-carbon and a water footprint perspective.

13 As every piece of research, this work has limitations, calling for further research on 14 several aspects. Assuming that waste heat flows are steadily available from a company 15 is a strong assumption, and intermittency may impact significantly on systems 16 performance, particularly for power generation: future studies on the sizing and 17 behavior of heat storage system should be planned. Moreover, many different features 18 of the building complex could be imagined, and the discretization patterns, the sizing 19 and regulation of the district heating and cooling systems, which are based on 20 simplifying assumptions, could be changed or further optimized to test the effect of 21 different designs. At any rate, the parametric analysis presented is not meant to replace 22 specific feasibility studies. Rather, it has been developed as a simplified assessment 23 under most optimistic conditions, which can be used by planners and researchers as a 24 guideline to exclude from their analysis of industrial waste heat recovery options the 25 alternatives less likely to be profitable, or more likely to have undesirable implications 26 from a water-energy nexus perspective.

27 Abbreviations

ABS	Absorption chiller
ASHRAE:	American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers
AT:	Austria
CAPEX:	Capital Expenses, Euro
C _{cap,equip} :	Capital cost of generic equipment (equip), Euro
C _{cap,pipes} :	Capital cost of the DH system, Euro/m
<i>cCO</i> 2 _{<i>el</i>} :	Indirect carbon emissions factor for electricity, tCO_{2eq}/kWh
cCO2 _{fuel} :	Indirect carbon emissions factor for fuel, tCO_{2eq}/kWh
cCO2 _{mequip} :	Specific carbon coefficient for equipment, kgCO ₂ /kW
cCO2 _{mpipes} :	Specific carbon coefficient for pipes, $kgCO_2/m$
C _{mequip} :	Power capacity of equipment, kW
C_{mpipes} :	Heating capacity of pipes, kW

Carbon dioxide
Direct carbon emissions (over 30 years), $kgCO_2$
Equivalent Carbon dioxide
Carbon dioxide footprint (over 30 years), $kgCO_2$
Embodied CO_{2eq} emissions associated with equipment and pipe materials, $kgCO_2$
Indirect carbon emissions during operation (over 30 years), $kgCO_2$
Yearly operating cost, Euro/year
Coefficient of Performance, dimensionless
Coefficient of Performance of absorption chiller, dimensionless
Specific heat of water, kJ/kgK
Coefficient of Primary Energy Demand for electricity, TOE/kWh
Coefficient of Primary Energy Demand for fuel, TOE/kWh
Cooling Towers
Water consumption coefficient for electricity generation, m^3/kWh
Fuel consumption coefficient for electricity generation, m^3/kWh
Specific water coefficient based on material for equipment, m^3H_2O/kW
Specific water coefficient based on material for pipes, $m^3 H_2 O/m$
Pipe diameter, mm
Dry Cooling systems
District Heating
District Heating and Cooling
Domestic Hot Water
Net electricity demand, kWh
Net fuel demand, kWh
Electricity
Equipment
volume flowrate, m^3/s
Interest rate, %
Italy
Industrial Waste Heat
Coefficient for water losses, dimensionless
Frictional coefficient depending on flow conditions, dimensionless
Life Cycle Cost, Euro
Latent vaporization heat, kJ/kg
length of the district energy network, m
Mechanical Vapor Compression chiller
Year of replacement, years

NG:	Natural Gas
N_h :	time span duration based on duration curves, hours/year
N_l :	Useful lifetime, years
OPEX:	Operating Expenses, Euro/year
ORC:	Organic Rankine Cycles
P _{cool} :	Power demand (electric) of chillers (MVC), kW
P _{diss} :	Power demand (electric) of heat rejection units, kW
PED:	Primary Energy Demand, TOE
P _{ORC} :	Power derived (electric) from ORC credit, kW
P _{pumps} :	Power demand (electric) of pumps, kW
<i>q</i> :	q = i + 1, dimensionless
Q :	Heat load supplied, kW
Q_{Cj} :	Cooling load of <i>j</i> -th building, kW
Q_{diss} :	Heat load to be dissipated, kW
Q_{Hj} :	Heating load of <i>j-th</i> building, kW
Q_T :	Annual total heating, kW
ρ:	Water density, kg/m^3
Re:	Reynolds' number, dimensionless
t:	Time span, hour
V:	Volume, <i>m</i> ³
<i>v</i> :	Water velocity along the pipe, m/s
W_c :	Water footprint equipment construction, m^3
W_d :	Direct water consumption (over 30 years), m^3
WEC:	Water-Energy-Carbon
W_{ev} :	Evaporated water (CT), $m^3/year$
W_f :	Blue water footprint (over 30 years), m^3
W_{op} :	Indirect water footprint during system operation (30 years), m^3
<i>ΔH</i> :	Delivery lift, Pa
$\Delta H/L$:	Pressure drop per unit length, Pa/m
ΔT :	Operating time, seconds/year
Δ θ :	Temperature difference between the flow entering and return, °C or K
η_p :	Pump efficiency, dimensionless
λ:	Frictional coefficient depending on flow conditions, dimensionless

- ρ : Water density, kg/m^3
- ψ : Additional resistance ration accounting for local head losses, *dimensionless*

1 Conflicts of interest

2 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

3 Fundings

- 4 This research was funded by the European Regional Development Fund Interreg V-A
- 5 Italia Österreich 2014-2020 Axis 1.1 project IDEE ITAT1007 CUP
 6 G22F16000860007

7 **References**

- ASHRAE Handbook (2009) Fundamentals: SI Edition, American Society of Heating,
 Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers
- Bartolozzi, I., Rizzi, F., & Frey, M. (2017). Are district heating systems and renewable energy
 sources always an environmental win-win solution? A life cycle assessment case study in
 Tuscany, Italy. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 80, 408-420.
- Battisti L, Cozzini M, Macii D (2016) Industrial waste heat recovery strategies in urban
 contexts: A performance comparison IEEE 2nd International Smart Cities Conference:
 Improving the Citizens Quality of Life, ISC2 2016 Proceedings, art. no. 7580785, DOI:
 10.1109/ISC2.2016.7580785
- Beccali M, Cellura M, Ardente F, Longo S, Nocke B, Finocchiaro P, Kleijer A, Hildbrand C,
 Bony J, Citherlet S, (2010) Life Cycle Assessment of Solar Cooling Systems. IEA SHC Task
 Solar Air Conditioning and Refrigeration.
 https://iris.unipa.it/retrieve/handle/10447/64309/42644/IEA-Task38Report D3 final%20%281%29.pdf
- Brückner S, Schäfers H, Peters I, Lävemann E (2014) Using industrial and commercial waste
 heat for residential heat supply: A case study from Hamburg, Germany. Sustain Cities Soc
 13:139-142.
- Burkhardt III CJJ, Heath GA, Turchi CS (2011) Life cycle assessment of a parabolic trough
 concentrating solar power plant and the impacts of key design alternatives. Envir Sci Tech.
 45: 2457–2464
- Catrini P, Cellura M, Guarino F, Panno D, Piacentino A, (2018) An integrated approach based
 on Life Cycle Assessment and Thermoeconomics: Application to a water-cooled chiller for
 an air conditioning plant. Energy 160:72-86.
- Chertow M.R.(2000), Industrial Symbiosis: Literature and Taxonomy, Annual Review of
 Energy and the Environment, 25(1):313-337
- Chhipi-Shrestha G, Kaur M, Hewage K et al (2018) Optimizing residential density based on
 water-energy-carbon nexus using UTilités Additives (UTA) method. Clean Techn Environ
- **35** Policy 20: 855-870.

1 Chinese D, Santin M, De Angelis A, Saro O, Biberacher M (2018) What to do with industrial 2 waste heat considering a water-energy nexus perspective. Eceee Industrial Summer Study 3 Proceedings, June, pp. 217-229. 4 Chinese D, Santin M, Saro O (2017) Water-energy and GHG nexus assessment of alternative 5 heat recovery options in industry: A case study on electric steelmaking in Europe. Energy 6 141: 2670-2687. 7 Cucchiaro M, Chinese D, Santin M (2019) Promoting industrial waste heat exploitation in 8 district heating systems through a GIS-based planning approach, Proceedings of the XXIV 9 Summer School Francesco Turco, Brescia, Italy, September 11-13, 2019. ISSN 2283-8996 10 Dominković DF, Bačeković I, Sveinbjörnsson D, Pedersen AS, Krajačić G (2017) On the way 11 towards smart energy supply in cities: The impact of interconnecting geographically 12 distributed district heating grids on the energy system. Energy 137:941-960. 13 Dong L, Fujita T, Dai M, Geng Y, Ren J, Fujii M, Wang Y, Ohnishi S (2016) Towards 14 preventative eco-industrial development: An industrial and urban symbiosis case in one 15 typical industrial city in China. J Clean Prod 114:387-400. 16 Dou Y, Togawa T, Dong L, Fujii M, Ohnishi S, Tanikawa H, Fujita T (2018) Innovative 17 planning and evaluation system for district heating using waste heat considering spatial 18 configuration: A case in Fukushima, Japan. Resour Conserv Recy, 128:406-416. 19 Energy Plus Climate Database (2018) https://energyplus.net/ Accessed 19 December 2019 20 Fang H, Xia J, Zhu K, Su Y, Jiang Y (2013) Industrial waste heat utilization for low 21 temperature district heating. Energ Policy 62:236-246. 22 Förster J (2014) Water use in industry, Cooling for electricity production dominates, 23 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-statistics-in-focus/-/KS-SF-14-014, Accessed 24 24 March 2020 25 Gutiérrez-Arriaga CG, Abdelhady F, Bamufleh HS et al (2015) Industrial waste heat recovery 26 and cogeneration involving organic Rankine cycles. Clean Techn Environ Policy 17:767-779. 27 Hoekstra AY, Chapagain AK, Aldaya MM, Mekonnen MM (2011) The water footprint 28 assessment manual: Setting the global standard, Earthscan, London, UK 29 IINAS - Gemis 4.93 (2016) http://www.iinas.org/gemis.html 30 ILETE, Initiative for Low Energy Training in Europe (2010), Labelling and Certification 31 Guide, https://ec.europa.eu/energy/intelligent/projects/sites/iee-32 projects/files/projects/documents/ilete labelling and certification guide en.pdf 33 Johansson MT, Söderström M (2014) Electricity generation from low-temperature industrial 34 excess heat—an opportunity for the steel industry. Energ Effic 7(2):203-215. 35 Karner K, Theissing M, Kienberger T (2016) Energy efficiency for industries through 36 synergies with urban areas. J Clean Prod 119:167-177. 37 Kim HW, Dong L, Choi AES, Fujii M, Fujita T, Park HS (2018) Co-benefit potential of 38 industrial and urban symbiosis using waste heat from industrial park in Ulsan, Korea. Resour 39 Conserv Recy 135: 225-234.

Lygnerud K, Werner S (2018) Risk assessment of industrial excess heat recovery in district 1 2 heating systems. Energy 151:430-441. 3 Mack-Vergara YL, John VM (2017) Life cycle water inventory in concrete production-A 4 review. Resourc Conserv Recy 122:227-250. 5 Mekonnen MM, Gerbens-Leenes PW, Hoekstra AY (2016), Future electricity: The challenge of reducing both carbon and water footprint. Sci Total Environ 569-570. 6 7 Miró L, McKenna R, Jäger T, Cabeza LF (2018) Estimating the industrial waste heat recovery 8 potential based on CO2 emissions in the European non-metallic mineral industry. Energ Effic 9 11(2): 427-443. 10 Mohd Nawi WNR, Wan Alwi SR, Manan Z et al (2016) A systematic technique for costeffective CO2 emission reduction in process plants. Clean Techn Environ Policy 18: 1769. 11 12 Oliver-Solà J, Gabarrell X, Rieradevall J, (2009) Environmental impacts of the infrastructure 13 for district heating in urban neighbourhoods. Energy Policy 37(11):4711-4719. 14 Reahvac (2019), Cooling Tower Make-up Water Flow Calculation 15 http://www.reahvac.com/tools/cooling-tower-make-water-flow-calculation/ 16 Saidur BR, Rahim NA, Islam MR, Solangi KH (2011) Environmental impact of wind energy. 17 Renew Sust Energ Rev 15(5):2423-2430. 18 Sandberg J, Larsson M, Wang C, Dahl J, Lundgren J (2012) A new optimal solution space 19 based method for increased resolution in energy system optimisation. Appl Energ 92:583-592. 20 Sandvall AF, Ahlgren EO, Ekvall T (2016) System profitability of excess heat utilisation - A 21 case-based modelling analysis. Energy 97:424-434. 22 Schnoor JL (2011) Water-energy nexus. Environ Sci Technol 45(12):5065. doi: 23 10.1021/es2016632. 24 Socologstor S.r.l. (2002) Technical catalogue 2002 C.T. 01/02 - preinsulated systems for civil 25 and industrial installation. Printed version. 26 Tong K, Fang A, Yu H, Li Y, Shi L, Wang Y, Wang S, Ramaswami A (2017) Estimating the 27 potential for industrial waste heat reutilization in urban district energy systems: Method 28 development and implementation in two Chinese provinces. Environ Res Let 12 (12). 29 US Department of Energy (2019) Energy Plus Version 9.2 Documentation, Engineering Reference, https://energyplus.net/documentation 30 31 Van Berkel R, Fujita T, Hashimoto S, Fujii M (2009) Quantitative Assessment of Urban and 32 Industrial Symbiosis in Kawasaki, Japan. Environ Sci Technol 43(5):1271-1281. 33 Varbanov PS (2014) Energy and water interactions: implications for industry. Curr Opin 34 Chem Eng 5:15-21. 35 Viklund, SB, Johansson MT (2014) Technologies for utilization of industrial excess heat: 36 potentials for energy recovery and CO2 emission reduction. Energ Convers Manage 77:369-37 379. 38 Wallentén P, Steady-state heat loss from insulated pipes, Lunds Tekniska 39 Högskola, Byggnadsfysik LTH (1991), https://lucris.lub.lu.se/ws/files/4836934/8146384.pdf

Wang H, Lahdelma R, Wang X et al (2015) Analysis of the location for peak heating in CHP
 based combined district heating systems. Appl Therm Eng 87:402-411.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2015.05.017.

- 4 Xin Li A, Feng K, Ling Siu Y, Hubacek K (2012) Energy-water nexus of wind power in
- 5 China: The balancing act between CO2 emissions and water consumption. Energ Policy6 45:440-448.