

1 **Analysis of the environmental impacts of alkali-activated concrete**
2 **produced with waste glass-derived silicate activator – a LCA study.**

3 Isabella Bianco^a, Branwen Ap Dafydd Tomos^b, Raffaele Vinai^{b, *}

4 ^a Department of Environment, Land and Infrastructure Engineering (DIATI), Politecnico di Torino, Corso Duca
5 degli Abruzzi 24, 10129 Turin - Italy,

6 ^b College of Engineering, Mathematics and Physical Sciences, University of Exeter, North Park Road, Exeter EX4
7 4QF - United Kingdom

8 * Corresponding author: r.vinai@exeter.ac.uk

9

10 **ABSTRACT**

11 Concrete is responsible for a significant share of global GHG emissions, which can be
12 mainly ascribed to the production of clinker. Alkali-activated concretes have been
13 investigated in literature as a possible alternative, but the sustainability still appears reduced
14 by the high embodied energy of chemicals typically used for the activation step. This paper
15 investigates concrete belonging to strength classes 35, 50 and 70 MPa and produced with a
16 silicate activator derived from waste glass (AABR). Through a Life Cycle Assessment (LCA),
17 the investigation aims to compare the AABR to Ordinary Portland Cement (OPC) concrete
18 and alkali-activated concrete produced with commercially available chemicals (AABC). The
19 effects produced by the variations of some key parameters (impact allocation of precursors,
20 energy mix, amount of activator in the concrete, distance of procurement of raw materials)
21 over the total impact of the AABR are also investigated. Results show that the adoption of
22 alkali-activated concretes instead of OPC concrete allows a significant reduction in
23 environmental categories of global warming (averagely 64% reduction for AABC and 70% for
24 AABR), acidification potential (averagely 23% for AABC and 35% for AABR), and terrestrial
25 eutrophication (averagely 53% for AABC and 60% for AABR). In addition, the study
26 evidenced that the use of waste glass-based activator allows a significant reduction in every
27 environmental category when compared to the use of commercially available chemicals.

28

29 **Keywords:** alkali-activated concrete, OPC concrete, waste glass activator, LCA, impacts
30 comparison

31

32 **1. INTRODUCTION**

33 **1.1. Background**

34 Concrete is the most utilised building material in the world (Scrivener et al., 2018). Most
35 recent figures on Portland cement production in 2018 suggest a yearly global production of
36 4.1 billion tonnes (Cembureau, 2019), 80% of which is produced in developing countries.

37 Due to the combined effect of limestone decalcination and fuel utilised for heating the kiln up
38 to 1450 °C, Portland cement (PC) production is responsible for about 5 – 7% of the world's
39 carbon dioxide emissions (Meireles et al., 2019, Costa and Ribeiro, 2020, Kotsay and
40 Jaskulski, 2020, Nwankwo et al., 2020).

41 In order to achieve the target to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial
42 levels set by the Paris Agreement, signatory countries committed to undertake ambitious
43 efforts in reducing greenhouse gas emissions (Rogelj et al., 2016). Fulfilling the CO₂
44 emission reduction targets will require the construction sector to undergo significant
45 changes.

46 Most common building materials such as steel, glass, bricks or concrete have relatively high
47 embodied energies. Embodied energy of concrete has been calculated between 0.6 and 2
48 MJ/kg, whereas embodied energy of steel, brick and glass have been calculated equal to 25,
49 2-5, and 15-25 MJ/kg respectively (Hammond and Jones, 2008, Dixit, 2016). When recycling
50 is taken into account, embodied energy of steel can be reduced to about 9 MJ/kg (Hammond
51 and Jones, 2008), and a similar value was calculated for recycled glass (Morini et al., 2019).

52 Despite the embodied energy per unit mass of steel, bricks or glass can look higher than the
53 one of concrete in a cradle-to-gate analysis (Lehne and Preston, 2018), it is important
54 recalling that direct comparisons should be carried out only for equivalent function (or
55 performance) and utilisation scenarios. The mass of concrete used in construction outweighs
56 by far any other material, and thus concrete has significant environmental impacts in terms

57 of carbon emissions, as extensively discussed in the scientific literature and brought to the
58 attention of the general public by recent UK media coverages (The Guardian 2019). The
59 problem lies in the production of clinker (i.e. the main constituent of Portland cement), and
60 therefore, through the substitution of clinker with other, less energy intensive materials, the
61 goal of having a versatile, strong and durable material with low carbon emissions can be
62 achieved. Among the candidates for clinker substitution, magnesium oxides derived from
63 magnesium silicates (MOMS) and alkali-activated binders (AAB) were considered the most
64 promising substitutes, leading to a reduction of over 85% of the emissions (Lehne and
65 Preston, 2018).

66 Due to the carbonation reactions involved in MOMS binder, a 100% emission reduction
67 could be achieved. However, constraints in terms of supply (due to cost or resource
68 availability) have been evidenced (Shi et al., 2019). Furthermore, the reactivity of ultramafic
69 rock-derived MgO still needs to be fully investigated, as for the time being most of the
70 previous research used magnesium oxide from the decarbonation of magnesium carbonate,
71 which is neither carbon neutral nor sustainable (Scrivener et al., 2018).

72 AAB (sometimes also referred to as 'geopolymers', although the term should be used only
73 for low calcium binding systems) technology exploits the reaction between aluminosilicate
74 materials (called precursors) and alkali chemicals (called activators) to produce a solid,
75 dense binding matrix. Precursors can be sourced among waste/by-product streams to
76 produce concrete with good mechanical properties and good durability against physical and
77 chemical attacks (Shi et al., 2019). Despite a wide range of activators has been investigated
78 to date, the most common activation method still consists of the combined use of alkali
79 hydroxide (sodium or potassium hydroxide) and alkali silicate (sodium or potassium silicate)
80 solutions (Provis, 2018). The alkali hydroxide is required for increasing the pH of the pore
81 solution and thus triggering the dissolution of Si and Al species, whilst the alkali silicate is
82 used for providing free and active silicate to the system, thus fostering the nucleation of the
83 inorganic aluminosilicate polymeric 3D chain.

84 The use of high embodied energy chemicals for the activation step has an impact on the
85 cost of the alkali-activated concrete production, as well as on the environmental performance
86 of the end products. In order to mitigate this problem, research worldwide has been
87 investigating the production of alternative activators that could be obtained with low-energy
88 processes or that can be sourced from waste or by-product streams. However, strong
89 debate has been ongoing in the scientific community whether or not AAB can significantly
90 decrease the carbon emission of the construction industry.

91 Vinai and Soutsos proposed a method for the production of sodium silicate powder by
92 recycling glass waste (Vinai and Soutsos, 2019). Alkali-activated concretes were
93 manufactured by activating blends of fly ash and ground granulated blast furnace slag
94 (GGBS) with a Na_2SiO_3 powder obtained by thermally treating waste glass powder and
95 sodium hydroxide. Concretes with strength ranging from 35 MPa to 70 MPa were
96 investigated, and a preliminary cost analysis suggested that these were 30% to 35%
97 cheaper than those produced with commercially available chemicals, and 4% to 16%
98 cheaper than PC concrete (Vinai and Soutsos, 2019). The method was independently
99 replicated and assessed in another research that confirmed the effectiveness of the process
100 in producing suitable sodium metasilicate for alkali activation (Samarakoon et al., 2020)

101 **1.2. Contribution and potential impact of this study**

102 This paper analyses the environmental impact of alkali-activated concrete manufactured
103 using waste glass-derived sodium silicate as the activator (AABR) and compares it with
104 Ordinary Portland Cement (OPC) concrete and alkali-activated concrete produced with
105 commercially available chemicals (AABC). The full life cycle analysis recommended for the
106 Environmental Product Declaration in relevant Standard (BS EN 15804, 2012), as well as
107 the assessment of environmental performance of buildings described in relevant Standard
108 (BS EN 15978, 2011), fall outside the scope of this paper. However, the methodology
109 followed in this study made use of LCA technique for providing a quantitative comparison
110 among different activators that can be used for producing AAB, and for benchmarking the
111 results against OPC concrete production (i.e. the *status quo*).

112 To the best of Authors knowledge, this is the first advanced LCA study on waste glass-
113 derived solid sodium silicate activator, as the only other available study on the environmental
114 impact of this activator was carried out by Samakaroon et al. (2020) and was limited to the
115 emission analysis in the context of a wider study. The significance of this paper lies in the
116 provision of objective and detailed data that are expected to help researchers and industry
117 stakeholders to have a more complete picture on AAB concrete and to boost
118 environmentally responsible actions. Furthermore, these results can foster further research
119 in the study of secondary sources for the production of activators, which can – and must –
120 have a primary importance in the scaling-up of AAB concrete technology. This study
121 demonstrated that the emissions related to the activator could be cut by more than 30% by
122 using waste-derived solid sodium silicate instead of commercially available sodium silicate
123 and sodium hydroxide solutions, thus reinforcing the position of AAB as strong candidates
124 for curbing greenhouse gases emissions from the construction industry.

125

126 **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

127 The discussion on the carbon emissions of alkali-activated binders started in early 1990's.
128 Comparing the emissions of Portland cement production with the possible emissions of
129 geopolymers, Davidovits claimed a possible reduction in CO₂ emission by 80% - 90%
130 (Davidovits, 1993). These results boosted the worldwide interest in alkali-activated materials
131 as potential substitute for Portland cement in concrete application, following global
132 environmental concerns raised by events such as the United Nations Conference on
133 Environment and Development (UNCED), also known as the Rio de Janeiro Earth Summit in
134 1992. Fawell et al. (1999) published a paper discussing the life cycle inventories for the
135 production of sodium silicates (Fawer et al., 1999), and data from this work fostered
136 subsequent LCA analysis of alkali-activated concrete.

137 Habert et al. (2011) described the LCA-based environmental assessment carried out on
138 alkali-activated materials, suggesting that, due to the production of sodium silicate and
139 considering allocations of emissions from industrial processes involved in the production of

140 fly ash or GGBS, geopolymer concrete had an impact on global warming similar to Portland
141 cement-based concrete (Habert et al., 2011). Results from Turner and Collins (2013) aligned
142 with these outcomes, indicating that the CO₂ footprint of geopolymer concrete was
143 approximately 9% less than comparable Portland cement-based concrete (Turner and
144 Collins, 2013) when all the production stages were taken into account. These findings were
145 heavily criticised by Davidovits (2015), objecting that data for the mix proportions and from
146 the silicate production were not reliable and the analyses grossly overestimated the actual
147 emissions from geopolymer concrete production (Davidovits, 2015).

148 It became therefore apparent that the assessment of the actual environmental performances
149 of alkali-activated materials were heavily influenced by local conditions, and no result could
150 claim general validity. McLellan et al. (2011) developed a LCA analysis of geopolymer
151 concrete by considering Australian feedstock, and suggested a possible reduction of
152 greenhouse gas emissions in the range of 44 – 64% (McLellan et al., 2011). Yang et al.
153 (2013) investigated the production of alkali-activated concrete referring to Korean lifecycle
154 inventory (LCI) database, suggesting that alkali-activated concrete would allow a possible
155 CO₂ emission reduction between 55 and 75%, but warning on the crucial effect of type,
156 concentration, and dosage of activators (Yang et al., 2013).

157 Heath et al. (2014) focussed on the production of geopolymer concrete from meta-clay
158 precursors, observing that this can have a lower global warming potential (GWP) than
159 Portland cement-based binders. However, it was recognised that large reductions in GWP
160 are unlikely without the substitution of commercially available soluble silicates, as sodium
161 silicate used for activation is responsible for the greatest emission contribution and thus it
162 should be targeted for reducing GWP of alkali-activated materials (Heath et al., 2014).

163 In a further study on the environmental impact of alkali-activated cements, Habert and
164 Ouellet-Plamondon (2016) revised their results looking into the environmental profiles of
165 different precursors and activators, raising important issues regarding the allocation of
166 impact to by-products such as fly ash and GGBS. Outcomes suggested that slag-based AAB
167 can reduce the GWP by a factor of four, but all the other environmental impacts investigated

168 by a LCA study gave worst results than OPC-based materials (Habert and Ouellet-
169 Plamondon, 2016). The GWP impact of a thermally treated mix of albite and sodium
170 hydroxide proposed in the literature (Feng et al., 2012) was also examined. The contribution
171 of such obtained 'one part geopolymer' cement was less than 5% of the GWP of 100% OPC
172 cement, and when economic allocations on slag and fly ash were also considered, an 80%
173 reduction in GWP was achieved (Habert and Ouellet-Plamondon, 2016).

174 Further research focussed on the production of alternative, waste-derived silicate activators
175 and their environmental effects. Passuello et al. (2017) investigated AAB manufactured
176 using calcined kaolin sludge activated with a waste-derived silicate solution obtained through
177 the dissolution of rice husk ash (RHA) in aqueous NaOH as previously proposed by others
178 (Bouzón et al., 2014). Outcomes indicated that AAB activated with waste-derived sodium
179 silicate allowed a 75% reduction of GWP and beneficial effects on acidification potential
180 (AP), eutrophication potential (EP) and photochemical oxidation (POCP), whereas it showed
181 impact higher than OPC in other LCA categories (Passuello et al., 2017). Tong et al. (2018)
182 proposed a hydrothermal method for the production of sodium silicate solution by dissolving
183 rice husk ash (RHA) in sodium hydroxide solution under the following conditions: NaOH
184 solution concentration 3 M, heating temperature 80 °C, process duration 3 hours. Authors
185 claimed that the waste-derived sodium silicate was able to provide suitable activation for
186 alkali-activated binders, with a reduction of 55% in activator costs, and delivering
187 environmental benefit according to SUB-RAW approach proposed in the literature (Tong et
188 al., 2018).

189 The implications of energy mix and process for production of NaOH were discussed in a
190 recent paper investigating the local conditions in Ecuador (Salas et al., 2018). With a low-
191 carbon energy mix based on solar power and hydropower, as well as through the production
192 of NaCl (for obtaining NaOH) from seawater evaporation, a 64% GWP reduction when
193 comparing AAB with OPC concretes can be achieved. Other considerations on local
194 conditions such as material availability and impacts related to transportation operations can
195 be found in the literature (Sandanayake et al., 2018).

196 Maddalena et al. (2018) investigated a range of novel binders for insulation purposes,
197 including NaOH-activated metakaolin-based alkali-activated materials, and carried out an
198 extensive LCA study focussing on the local conditions and raw material availability in the UK.
199 They concluded that novel binders can have a carbon footprint up to 23-55% lower than
200 Portland cement (Maddalena et al., 2018). Robayo-Salazar et al. (2018) came to similar
201 conclusions comparing the carbon emissions of a AAB concrete obtained from a blend of
202 natural volcanic pozzolan and slag activated with sodium silicate and sodium hydroxide and
203 OPC. Their results suggested that AAB concrete in the Colombian context showed GWP
204 44.7% lower than the one calculated for OPC with same mechanical properties (Robayo-
205 Salazar et al., 2018).

206 According to Scrivener et al., AAB can play a role in the reduction of global CO₂ emissions
207 only if the CO₂ footprint of activators such as sodium silicate can be at least halved
208 (Scrivener et al., 2018).

209 Summarising, available scientific literature showed that:

- 210 i. Environmental benefits from substituting OPC with AAB in concrete need to be
211 considered under local conditions.
- 212 ii. Activators and in particular alkali silicates are the main contributors to environmental
213 impacts of AAB and thus only their substitution with less harmful activators can
214 deliver significant benefits.
- 215 iii. LCA is the best tool for capturing the whole picture, as some impacts are often
216 overlooked, being the main focus on GWP.
- 217 iv. Waste-derived activators and thermally treated solid materials can reduce the
218 emissions significantly in comparison to OPC concretes.

219 In the following sections, an LCA study that investigated the environmental impacts of an
220 AAB concrete produced using a novel solid activator developed by thermal treatment of
221 waste glass powder is presented. Obtained LCA indicators are compared to those of OPC
222 concrete and AAB concrete produced with commercially available chemicals having

223 equivalent fresh properties and strength class. Main outcomes from the investigation and
 224 their limitations are discussed.

225 **Table 1.** Summary of the findings from literature review.

Reference	Material	Precursors	Activators	Environmental analysis	CO ₂ emission reduction compared to OPC
Davidovits, 1993	Concrete	Calcined clays, slag	Alkali silicates	Stoichiometric assessment of active oxides production	80% - 90%
Habert et al. 2011	Concrete	Fly Ash, slags, or metakaolin.	NaOH, sodium silicate	LCA	Small or no reduction when allocation was considered
Turner and Collins, 2013	Concrete	Fly ash	NaOH, sodium silicate	LCA	9%
McLellan et al., 2011	Paste	Fly ash, silica fume, gibbsite	NaOH, sodium silicate	Sum of emissions from production and transportation	44% - 64%
Yang et al., 2013	Concrete	Fly ash, slag, metakaolin	Ca(OH) ₂ Sodium silicate NaOH	CO ₂ contribution from raw materials, transportation, mixing and curing	55% - 75%
Heath et al., 2014	Concrete	Meta-clays	Alkali hydroxides Alkali silicates	LCA	40%
Habert and Ouellet-Plamondon, 2016	Concrete	Fly ash, slag	Alkali hydroxides, alkali silicate	LCA	75%
Feng et al., 2012	Concrete	Thermally treated albite (from literature)	NaOH	LCA	95%
Passuello et al., 2017	Paste	Calcined kaolin sludge	waste-based sodium silicate	LCA	75%
Tong et al., 2018	Concrete	Fly ash, slag	Waste-based sodium silicate	SUB-RAW	n.a.
Salas et al., 2018	Concrete	Natural zeolite	Sea water-derived NaCl for the production of NaOH and low carbon energy mix	LCA	64%
Maddalena et al., 2018	Binder	Metakaolin	NaOH	LCA	23% - 55%
Robayo-Salazar et al., 2018	Concrete	Natural volcanic soil	NaOH, sodium silicate	GWP, GTP	44.7%

226

227 **3. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

228 **3.1. Production process of Ordinary Portland Cement-based concrete and Alkali**
229 **Activated Binder-based concrete**

230 One of the reasons why concrete is the most popular building material lies in the possibility
231 of obtaining almost any desired properties in fresh and hardened state by adjusting the mix
232 proportions and select suitable constituents. This adds a significant complexity in properly
233 evaluating and comparing the environmental impacts arising from different concretes. As
234 there is not a universal and accepted mix proportioning method for OPC concrete, and even
235 less consensus exists for AAB concrete, there is a strong debate in the research community
236 on how a comparison between different concretes can be fair and objective. The mix
237 proportion influences the physical and mechanical properties of concrete, as well as its
238 environmental impact. The choice of the mixes to be compared is therefore essential in
239 ensuring sound results and avoiding misleading interpretations. In this study, mix
240 proportions from published papers (Rafeet et al., 2017, Vinai and Soutsos, 2019), focussing
241 on the production of concrete with three specified nominal strengths (35, 50 and 70 MPa
242 respectively) and desired fresh properties, were used. Hereafter a brief recall on the mixes
243 and the assumptions and limitations of these data is provided. Full details can be found in
244 the original publications.

245 - *Concrete specifications*: three concrete mixes with consistency class S2 were investigated,
246 targeting (a) a typical ready mix concrete, with cube compressive strength of 35 MPa; (b) a
247 typical structural concrete with cube compressive strength 50 MPa; (c) a high strength mix
248 for precast concrete applications, with cube compressive strength of 70 MPa (Rafeet et al.,
249 2017).

250 - *OPC concrete mixes*: mix proportions suitable for the production of concrete having the
251 desired properties were developed using the BRE method (Marsh et al., 1997) by Rafeet et
252 al. (2017). Authors claimed that mixes were obtained without considering the use of
253 admixtures such as superplasticizers, which would have reduced the water content and

254 therefore the cement content. This might lead to some overestimation of the impact of the 70
255 MPa strength concrete.

256 - *AAB concrete produced with commercially available chemicals (AABC)*: mix proportions
257 were developed using the method proposed by Rafeet et al. (2017). Concretes were
258 produced with blends of fly ash and GGBS (the higher the GGBS content, the stronger the
259 concrete was), namely 80%-20%, 70%-30%, and 30%-70% fly ash-GGBS blends for 35, 50
260 and 70 MPa concrete respectively. Binders were activated with NaOH and sodium silicate
261 solutions, the former purchased in prills then dissolved in water, the latter procured from
262 Fisher Scientific and having chemical composition 25.5% SiO₂, 12.8% Na₂O, 61.7% water.
263 Dosage of chemicals was controlled by two parameters, namely the alkali modulus AM (i.e.
264 the mass ratio Na₂O/SiO₂) and the alkali dosage M+ (i.e. the mass ratio Na₂O/binder).
265 Declared values were AM = 1.25 and M+ = 7.5% (Rafeet et al., 2017).

266 - *AAB concrete produced with waste-derived activator (AABR)*: the three mixes were
267 proposed by Vinai and Soutsos (2019), where the use of commercially available chemical
268 solutions for the activation was replaced by the inclusion in the mix of a solid powder of
269 sodium metasilicate (Na₂SiO₃) obtained by processing waste glass powder and NaOH (mass
270 ratio 11:10 glass powder:NaOH) in oven at temperature ranging from 150°C to 330°C.
271 Authors demonstrated the suitability of the waste-derived sodium metasilicate in activating
272 blends of fly ash-GGBS mortars using M+ = 7.5% and AM = 1 as chemical dosages (this
273 latter due to the chemical nature of the sodium metasilicate). They then provided mix
274 proportions derived from Rafeet et al. (2017) by substituting the amount of chemicals (NaOH
275 and sodium silicate solution) with a suitable amount of novel activating powder, which
276 resulted being about 18.8% of the binder mass (Vinai and Soutsos, 2019). The Authors did
277 not provide an experimental validation of the proposed mixes, and thus the assessment of
278 the required quantity of activating powder should cover a range rather than as a fixed value.
279 For this reason, in this paper a sensitivity analysis was carried out on the powder content, in
280 the range 15% - 25% of the binder mass.

281 The processes for the production of OPC, AABC and AABR concretes are not dissimilar. For
282 OPC concrete, aggregate (i.e. sand and gravel) is mixed with OPC powder, and then water
283 is added (sometimes aggregate fraction is pre-mixed with a certain amount of water in order
284 to ensure its saturation). For AABC concrete, aggregate and binder blend (i.e. fly ash and
285 GGBS) are mixed, the liquid fraction (i.e. sodium silicate solution, NaOH and water) is
286 prepared and then added in the mixer. For AABR concrete, aggregate, binder blend and
287 activating powder are mixed, then water is added. The same layout of equipment for the
288 production of concrete can be assumed in the three cases. No special need for curing was
289 assumed in the analysis.

290

291 **3.2. Goal and scope of concrete LCA**

292 The goal of this study is to evaluate if the AAB concrete with activators from recycled waste
293 glass (AABR concrete) could represent a valid solution to mitigate the environmental impacts
294 of concrete. Specifically, AABR concrete is compared to OPC and to AAB concrete with
295 activators from commercial sources (AABC concrete). To enable an objective comparison,
296 the related assessments have the same system boundaries (see Figure 1), which
297 comprehend the raw material extraction and processing, the processing of secondary
298 material input, the transport to the manufacturer. No cut-off rule is applied for the calculation
299 since the entire production chain of each raw and secondary materials is included in the
300 study. In line with previous studies on concrete, the functional unit of the study is 1 m³ of
301 concrete with a specified compressive strength (concrete with 35, 50 and 70 MPa cube
302 compressive strength have been evaluated). Only functionally equivalent concretes have
303 been compared, i.e. concretes from the same strength class having thus same functional
304 unit and same function, production, operation and use scenarios. It has been assumed that
305 concrete mixes from different binding systems would have the same durability. The detailed
306 analysis of concrete durability is outside the scope of this paper, although there is general
307 consensus that AAB concrete can have better durability than OPC concrete under harsh
308 environmental conditions, thus the obtained results should be conservative in respect of

309 OPC concrete and not misleadingly in favour of AAB concrete in this regard. Primary data
310 have been preferably used for the inventory. When primary data were not available, good
311 quality secondary data from Ecoinvent 3.4 Cut-off database have been employed, with
312 particular attention to the technological, time and geographical representativeness.

313 As underlined by the previous literature, results can be highly affected by the approach used
314 to deal with waste and by-products. This LCA study has been developed with a cut-off
315 approach (Wernet et al., 2016) and considers GGBS and fly ash as allocable by-products,
316 since they currently have a market value. Specifically, fly ash is a by-product from the coal
317 combustion in thermal power stations and GGBS is a by-product from blast furnaces
318 producing iron. Therefore these materials bear some burdens from their production, which
319 are allocated on an economic basis against the reference flow. The physical allocation has
320 been avoided because of the different unit of measure between fly ash (kg) and energy (MJ)
321 and because of the relatively high mass of GGBS against iron, as discussed by Chen et al.
322 (2010).


323 The glass powder used for producing the activator in AABR concrete can be derived from
324 two different processes, both of them considered in the LCA of this study. Firstly it is
325 considered the glass powder comes as an unintended residue from the glass recycling
326 process. In this case, the glass powder enters the concrete production process as a burden-
327 free flow. Secondly, it is considered the case of production from the grinding of waste glass.
328 In this case, in line with the study of Passuello et al. (2017), the glass powder only bears
329 impacts due to its beneficiation.

330 Inventory and impact calculations have been supported by SimaPro 8 software. The
331 software allows the user to select the method for impact assessment among more than 30
332 methods proposed by international bodies or literature (PRé, 2020). The method chosen in
333 this study for the impact assessment was the International Reference Life Cycle Data
334 System (ILCD) Midpoint+ (version 1.0.9), developed under the coordination of the European
335 Commission and backed by most LCA practitioners. The ILCD method harmonises the
336 existing practices in line with ISO 14040 and 14044:2006. A broad documentation has been

337 developed by the European Commission Joint Research Centre - Institute for Environment
338 and Sustainability, providing guidance for the application of the method and the choice of
339 characterisation factors. These have been detailed in handbook (European Commission,
340 2011) and technical note (European Commission, 2012), where the quality of the indicators
341 and the relevant literature backing their calculation have been thoroughly discussed.
342 Interested readers are referred to these publications for the details. This paper shows the
343 impact results for the categories of global warming potential (GWP), acidification potential
344 (AP), Terrestrial Eutrophication (TE), Freshwater ecotoxicity (FE), Particulate matter (PM),
345 Mineral, fossil & renewable resource depletion (RD). All these categories are recommended
346 with quality levels between I and III in the ILCD supporting information (European
347 Commission, 2012), and have been chosen because of their relevance for the construction
348 sector, and/or because they are in line with literature studies.

349 Contribution analyses have also been developed for the two AAB products to understand
350 which processes of the supply chain have the major influence to the different impact
351 categories and to identify if there is still room for improvement. Finally, the AABR production
352 chain has been further investigated through a sensitivity analysis on some key variables that
353 are significantly uncertain. The robustness of the results has been verified and discussed
354 through the introduction of flexible parameters on the economic allocation factors, the energy
355 mix used for the processes of glass powder production, the raw materials ratios and the
356 transport distances. Eventually, some simplifications have been included in the analysis
357 when the complexity and the uncertainty of some parameters determining the scenarios
358 would have introduced excessive variability in the results, making a general comparison
359 ineffective and meaningless. Section 4.4 details the limitations of this study.

360



361

362 **Figure 1.** Flow charts of the analysed mix designs of concrete.

363

364 3.3. Life cycle inventory

365 This section gives details on the Life Cycle Inventory of the different types of concrete that
 366 have been investigated. This allows the reader to clearly understand and replicate the LCA
 367 model, eventually modify some parameters and calculate the environmental impacts.

368 Nine different concrete combinations have been considered: OPC, AABC and AABR
 369 concretes, each one having nominal compressive strengths of 35, 50 and 70MPa.

370 Table 2 summarises the components and quantities for each of the 9 cases. Quantities of
 371 input flows are based on previous studies (Vinai and Soutsos, 2019) and adapted to conform
 372 to the nature and chemistry of LCA database entries.

373 Specifically, OPC concrete is composed by Portland cement, water and aggregates. For the
 374 Portland cement, a dataset of Ecoinvent 3.4 database has been used. This dataset was
 375 chosen as it represents the average situation in Europe, it is focussed on the main current
 376 technologies and it is modelled with reference to the year 2017. Transportation of Portland
 377 cement from the cement factory to the mixing plant was not included in the analysis, please
 378 refer to section 4.4 for further discussion on possible limitations due to this parameter.

379

380

381 **Table 2.** Mix design of the 9 analysed types of concrete, data for 1 m³ of concrete.

	35MPa			50MPa			70MPa		
	AABC	AABR	OPC	AABC	AABR	OPC	AABC	AABR	OPC
Portland Cement (kg)	-	-	355	-	-	440	-	-	550
Fly Ash (kg)	283.2	283.2	-	258.3	258.3	-	99	99	-
GGBS (kg)	70.8	70.8	-	110.7	110.7	-	231	231	-
Sodium Silicate Solid (kg)	27.7	-	-	28.8	-	-	25.8	-	-
Activating Powder (kg)	-	66.6	-	-	69.4	-	-	62.1	-
Sodium Hydroxide (kg)	26.0	-	-	27.1	-	-	24.2	-	-
Water (kg)	157.3	158.8	220	155.6	157	220	169.1	170.8	220
Aggregate (kg)	1897.5	1897.5	1832	1897.5	1897.5	1750	1925	1925	1668
Total (kg)	2462.4	2476.9	2407	2478.0	2492.9	2410	2474.1	2487.9	2438

382

383 The AABC concrete does not contain any Portland cement and the binder is composed by
384 fly ash, ground-granulated blast-furnace slag (GGBS), sodium hydroxide and sodium
385 silicate. Particular attention was paid on the choice of the proxy dataset for the activators, as
386 these are responsible for the highest share of embodied energy, global warming potential
387 and other environmental impact. As previously described, the dosage of chemicals in the
388 reference literature is controlled by the alkali modulus AM (mass ratio Na₂O/SiO₂) and the
389 alkali dosage M+ (mass ratio Na₂O/binder). The values of AM = 1.25 and M+ = 7.5% in the
390 concrete mixes were claimed to be achieved through the inclusion of a blend of sodium
391 silicate and sodium hydroxide solutions. In order to ensure that the quantities of chemicals
392 were correctly computed in the LCA model, the compositions of the sodium silicate and
393 sodium hydroxide recorded in the Ecoinvent database were checked and equivalent masses
394 of chemicals were calculated. From the value of alkali dosage M+ and the mass of binder
395 obtained from the targeted literature, it was possible to calculate the required Na₂O. The

396 following calculations pertain to the 35 MPa AABC mix, but data for other mixes can be
397 calculated in analogy:

398 $\text{Mass of binder} = \text{mass of Fly Ash} + \text{mass of GGBS} = 283.2 + 70.8 = 354 \text{ kg}$ (1)

399 $\text{Mass of Na}_2\text{O} = (\text{mass of binder}) \times (M+) = 354 \times 0.075 = 26.5 \text{ kg}$ (2)

400 $\text{Mass of SiO}_2 = (\text{mass of Na}_2\text{O}) / (AM) = 26.5 / 1.25 = 21.2 \text{ kg}$ (3)

401 According to the information provided by Ecoinvent database version 3, chemical products
402 are always expressed in 100% active substance, whereas the descriptions hint to the most
403 common forms in which the chemicals are used (Ecoinvent, 2013). In the case of sodium
404 silicate solution, the description is “Sodium silicate, without water, in 37% solution state”. In
405 such dataset there is an input of “sodium silicate production, solid”, which in turn is
406 composed by 0.772 kg silica sand and 0.4 kg soda ash (for 1 kg of sodium silicate).

407 According to the chemical composition of silica sand (100% SiO₂) and soda ash (Na₂CO₃),
408 the resulting sodium silicate would be composed by about 77% SiO₂ and 23% Na₂O.

409 Therefore, in order to incorporate in the concrete mix 21.2 kg of SiO₂ calculated in (3), the
410 equivalent mass of sodium silicate having such composition that needs to be added is:

411 $\text{Mass of sodium silicate} = 21.2 / 0.77 = 27.7 \text{ kg.}$ (4)

412 A share of this mass of sodium silicate is represented by Na₂O:

413 $\text{Mass of Na}_2\text{O} = (\text{mass of sodium silicate}) \times 0.23 = 6.4 \text{ kg.}$ (5)

414 In order to achieve the desired 26.5 kg of Na₂O calculated in (2), some 20.1 kg of extra
415 Na₂O needs to be added from NaOH. The database entry for NaOH is “Sodium hydroxide,
416 without water, in 50% solution state”, whereas it actually refers to the impacts of 100% solid
417 sodium hydroxide. Knowing that Na₂O represents 77.5% of NaOH, the quantity of NaOH
418 requested for achieving the target amount of Na₂O is:

419 $\text{Mass of NaOH} = (\text{mass of Na}_2\text{O}) / 0.775 = 20.1 / 0.775 = 26 \text{ kg.}$ (6)

420 The quantities of sodium silicate and sodium hydroxide calculated in (4) and (6) were
421 therefore used in AABC mix proportions in order to ensure that the required quantities of
422 SiO₂ and Na₂O for the activation matched the quantities provided by Vinai and Soutsos
423 (2019). The amount of water in the mixes was then adjusted by calculating the water from

424 the sodium silicate solution used in the mix from the literature and adding it into the total
425 water.

426 As far as the fly ash is concerned, in line with previous literature (Seto, 2017, Babbitt, 2005),
427 it has been assumed that the production of 1 MWh of electricity from hard coal fuelled plants
428 produces 29.8 kg of fly ash as by-product. A market price equal to 0.1173 €/kWh has been
429 used for the electricity for the economic allocation of impacts, since that is the EU-27
430 average price for non-household consumers recorded in the second half of 2019, according
431 to Eurostat (2019). The fly ash price has been estimated from a market analysis carried out
432 using prices published on the Alibaba web platform by different retailers. The average value
433 (used for the default allocation) is 0.024 €/kg, while minimum (0.009 €/kg) and maximum
434 (0.055 €/kg) values have been adopted in the sensitivity analysis. A similar procedure was
435 used to obtain values for the economic allocation between the pig iron and the by-product of
436 iron slag (precursor of GGBS). Specifically, the market price of pig iron has been calculated
437 as the average price of pig iron exports from Brazil, Russia and Ukraine (331 \$/t)
438 (Steelonthenet.com, 2020), while the iron slag average, minimum and maximum values have
439 been obtained from Curry (2020) and from a web research of retailers. The adopted values
440 are respectively 27.5 \$/t, 10 \$/t and 60 \$/t. Transportation of fly ash and GGBS was included
441 in the analysis by considering a distance of 100 km from the available raw materials and the
442 mixing plant. Please refer to section 4.4 for further discussion on possible limitations due to
443 this parameter.

444 The production process of the AABR concrete involves manufacturing an activating powder
445 from recycled glass and sodium hydroxide. This powder is then used to in the concrete
446 mixes. As discussed in section 3.2, glass powder can come both as a residue from the glass
447 recycling (case 1) and from a grinding process of glass waste (case 2). In both cases, in
448 order to produce 1 kg of activating powder it can be estimated an energy consumption equal
449 to 0.072 MJ (in the form of electricity), based on an oven with power consumption of 10kW,
450 running for 2 hours to produce 1000 kg of powder. The mass ratio of glass dust to sodium
451 hydroxide has been fixed equal to 11:10, according to the literature (Vinai and Soutsos,

452 2019). The water added has been estimated equal to 0.1 kg per kg of powder, while
 453 transportation of glass waste has been assumed equal to 100 km on a truck, please refer to
 454 section 4.4 for further discussion on possible limitations due to this parameter. Table 3
 455 summarises the inputs for the production of 1 kg of activating powder in the two cases.

456

457 **Table 3.** Inputs for the production of 1 kg of activating powder

	Input quantities - CASE 1	Input quantities - CASE 2
Glass powder from glass recycling process (burden-free)	0.52 kg	/
Transport of waste glass powder	100 km	/
Glass waste (burden-free)	/	0.52 kg
Transport of waste glass	/	100 km
Electricity (to grind waste glass)	/	0.0072 MJ
Electricity for oven	0.072 MJ	
Sodium hydroxide	0.48 kg	
Water	0.1 kg	

458

459

460 The AABR concrete inventory includes the activation powder, as well as GGBS, fly ash,
 461 water and aggregates.

462 Table 4 lists the proxy datasets used for each element. Datasets were chosen from

463 Ecoinvent 3.4 database and are considered representative of the materials used in the case
 464 study here discussed.

465

466

467

468

469

470 **Table 4.** Correspondence between flows and datasets in Ecoinvent 3.4

Input	Proxy dataset
Portland Cement	Cement, Portland {Europe without Switzerland} market for Cut-off, S
Fly Ash	Built from “Heat, district or industrial, other than natural gas {Europe without Switzerland} heat production, at hard coal industrial furnace 1-10MW Cut-off, U” (allocated)
GGBS	Built from “Pig iron {GLO} production Cut-off, S” (allocated) + Ground granulated blast furnace slag {GLO} production Cut-off, U
Sodium Silicate Solution	Sodium silicate, without water, in 37% solution state {RER} sodium silicate production, furnace liquor, product in 37% solution state Cut-off, S
Sodium Hydroxide	Sodium hydroxide, without water, in 50% solution state {GLO} market for Cut-off, S
Water	Tap water {GLO} market group for Cut-off, S
Aggregate	Gravel, crushed {CH} market for gravel, crushed Cut-off, S
Electricity	Electricity, medium voltage {RER} market for Cut-off, S
Transport	Transport, freight, lorry 16-32 metric ton, EURO6 {RER} transport, freight, lorry 16-32 metric ton, EURO6 Cut-off, S

471

472 Some variables have also been introduced in the LCA model to enable the development of
 473 sensitivity analyses. Table 5 summarises the variables and the related values that have
 474 been set for the analysis. In particular, for the evaluation of the effect of the electricity mix
 475 used to produce the activating powder on its environmental impacts (parameter named
 476 “Electr_activ_powder”), it has been chosen to perform the sensitivity analysis using the
 477 average European grid mix as a benchmark, the Swedish mix for a low carbon option
 478 (having a high share of renewables) and the Polish mix for a carbon intensive option (having
 479 a high share of energy from coal). The ratio of the activating powder in the AABR mix design
 480 (variable named “activating_powder_quantity”) has been varied from 15% to 25% because it
 481 is a mixing parameter that has not been optimised yet and, as a consequence, future
 482 variation of the quantity of this constituent in the concrete mix could be possible. As
 483 previously discussed, the economic allocations of fly ash and iron slag (parameters named
 484 “alloc_flyash” and “alloc_slag”) consider the variation in market prices of the two by-

485 products. Finally, the parameter “distance” has been introduced to evaluate how a local or
 486 national provision of binder raw materials might affect the results.

487

488 **Table 5.** Parameters for the sensitivity analysis of impact results.

Name of variable	Description	Base case (default value)	Scenarios	
Electr_activ_powder	Electricity mix used to produce 1 kg of activating power	market group for electricity, medium voltage Europe without Switzerland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • market for electricity, medium voltage PL • market for electricity, medium voltage SE 	
activating_powder_quantity	Quantity of activating powder (% of the binder mass) in the mix design of AABR concrete	18.8%	MIN: 15%	MAX: 25%
alloc_flyash	Economic allocation for the outputs of electricity and fly ash from hard coal furnace	99.4% electricity; 0.6% fly ash	MIN: 99.8% electricity; 0.2% fly ash	MAX: 98.6% electricity; 1.4% fly ash
alloc_slag	Economic allocation for the outputs of pig iron and iron slag (precursor of GGBS)	97.6% pig iron; 2.4% iron slag	MIN: 99.1% pig iron; 0.9% iron slag	MAX: 94.9% pig iron; 5.1% iron slag
distance	Distance for the transportation of binder raw materials (fly ash, GGBS, sodium hydroxide, sodium silicate, glass powder)	100 km	500 km	

489

490

491

492

493

494

495 **4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

496 **4.1. Life cycle impact assessment and interpretation**

497 Main results obtained through the LCA analysis are detailed in this section. Environmental
498 impacts of OPC, AABC and AABR concretes within the same strength class are compared
499 for the impact categories of GWP, AP, TE, FE, PM and RD, as indicated in section 3.2.
500 Results for AABR concrete were obtained under the case 1 scenario (activating powder
501 produced from residues of glass recycling), which can be considered relevant also for case 2
502 (activating powder produced from a grinding process of glass waste), since outputs differ
503 only by 0.1% for all impact categories. Table 6 shows the absolute values of the obtained
504 potential impacts, while Figure 2 provides a graphical representation of relative results,
505 where the 100% is set for the highest value reached for each impact category in each
506 strength class. As it can be noticed, the potential impact on climate change of OPC concrete
507 is significantly higher (about three times) than both alkali-activated concretes for each
508 strength class. AABR concrete results showed the lowest GWP impact, while AABC
509 concrete is averagely 16% more impactful. OPC concrete shows the highest potential
510 impacts also for the TE and the AP categories. On the other hand, values for indicators FE
511 and RD were comparable between OPC and AABC, although results for OPC were slightly
512 lower. In particular, the main contributor in the RD impact category for all the investigated
513 concrete mixes was the consumption of gravel, followed by the consumption of Portland
514 cement (for OPC), sodium silicate (for AABC and AABR), and, to a lesser extent, sodium
515 hydroxide (for AABC). As far as the PM indicator is concerned, lowest impacts are obtained
516 by OPC, but it has to be underlined that, in absolute terms, the impact is rather low for all the
517 analysed materials. Results on PM normalised per person according to the EC-JRC Global
518 method, see for example (Crenna et al., 2019), show therefore that 1 m³ of all the analysed
519 types of concrete are in the range 0.01 to 0.02.
520 When comparing AABR to AABC, it was noticed that impact indicators were always lower for
521 the former.

522 **Table 6.** Potential impacts of OPC, AABC and AABR concretes for the strength classes of
 523 35, 50 and 70 MPa.




Impact category	Unit	35 MPa			50 MPa			70 MPa		
		OPC	AABC	AABR	OPC	AABC	AABR	OPC	AABC	AABR
Climate change	kg CO ₂ eq	333	123	100	409	142	118	507	181	160
Particulate matter	kg PM _{2.5} eq	0.055	0.095	0.076	0.0655	0.105	0.087	0.079	0.122	0.105
Acidification	molc H ⁺ eq	0.845	0.705	0.542	1.020	0.777	0.608	1.250	0.875	0.724
Terrestrial eutrophication	molc N eq	2.660	1.400	1.090	3.190	1.510	1.190	3.890	1.640	1.360
Freshwater ecotoxicity	CTUe	579	965	672	682	1040	738	817	1100	827
Mineral, fossil & ren resource depletion	kg Sb eq	0.0075	0.0112	0.0084	0.0078	0.0116	0.0086	0.0083	0.0116	0.0089

524

525 Analysing the results obtained for OPC concrete, it can be observed that Portland cement
 526 bears the highest share of impacts: its contribution varies from 96% to 99% for all the impact
 527 categories, except for RD, for which it accounts for 79%. The contribution analysis of AABC
 528 and AABR concretes are shown in Figures 3 and 4 respectively. As it can be noticed, GGBS,
 529 sodium silicate and sodium hydroxide are the main contributors in almost all impact
 530 categories for AABC concrete, while fly ash accounts averagely for 6% of impacts and gravel
 531 gives significant contributions only for RD (48%) and TE (24%) indicators. On the other
 532 hand, the activating powder is the most significant contributors in the analysis of the AABR
 533 concrete, accounting for most of the impact in all the analysed categories, apart from RD.
 534 Specifically, 96% to 98% of the impacts from the activating powder are due to the sodium
 535 hydroxide used in the activator production process. An important share of impacts is borne
 536 by GGBS as well, whilst fly ash averagely accounts for 8% of impacts.


537

538




539

540 **Figure 2.** Relative environmental impacts of OPC, AABR and AABC concretes for the
 541 strength class of (a) 35 MPa, (b) 50 MPa, and (c) 70 MPa.



542

543 **Figure 3.** Impact contribution analysis of 50 MPa AABC concrete.



544

545 **Figure 4.** Impact contribution analysis of 50 MPa AABR concrete.


546

547 **4.2. Sensitivity analysis**

548 As discussed in section 3.2, some variables have been introduced in the LCA model to

549 develop a sensitivity analysis on the impact results. Specifically, it was felt relevant to

550 understand how assumptions on economic allocations of fly ash and iron slag, as well as
 551 transport distance of binder elements, could affect the results for AABC and AABR
 552 concretes. For the fly ash, minimum (0.009 €/kg) and maximum (0.055 €/kg) market prices
 553 have been used for the analysis. Similarly, the price of iron slag (precursor of GGBS) has
 554 been varied from 10 \$/t (minimum value) to 60 \$/t (maximum value). Transport distance has
 555 been increased to 500 km for fly ash, GGBS, sodium hydroxide and glass powder to take
 556 into account an average transportation that would be necessary for national provision of
 557 materials in typical European countries. The ranges of parameters that were adopted in the
 558 sensitivity analysis are shown in Table 5. Figure 5 shows how the total impact on climate
 559 change of 50 MPa AABC and AABR concretes varies when varying these parameters. As it
 560 can be noticed, the variation of fly ash allocation values does not affect significantly the
 561 results (-3%/+7%). Assumptions on slag allocation resulted in slightly higher variation (-
 562 7%/+14%), while the highest effect can be observed for the increase in transport distance
 563 (+20%).
 564




565

566 **Figure 5.** Sensitivity analysis on climate change results for 50 MPa AABC and AABR
 567 concretes. The parameters that have been made vary are the fly ash allocation, the slag
 568 allocation and the transport distance for binder elements.

569 A further sensitivity analysis has been developed for the AABR concrete to assess the
570 effects of the quantity of activating powder (ratio of activating powder in the mix design, i.e.
571 activating powder mass per m³ of concrete) and of the energy used for producing it on the
572 selected environmental impact indicators.

573 Figure 6 shows the percentage comparison between the default mix design (18.8% of
574 activating powder) and mix designs having respectively the minimum (15%) and maximum
575 (25%) share of activating powder. As it can be noticed, the variation is similar for all the
576 analysed impact categories, averagely ranging between -9% (for a minimum ratio of
577 activating powder) and +14% (for the maximum ratio of activating powder). It is worth noting
578 that even in the worst scenario, impacts of AABR result significantly lower than impacts of
579 AABC for all the analysed categories (these latter shown as solid lines in Figure 6).

580 The change in energy mix for producing the activating powder did not significantly affect
581 impact results, which averagely decrease of 1% with the energy mix of Sweden (i.e. high
582 share of renewable energy sources) and increase of 1% with the energy mix of Poland (i.e.
583 high share of coal-based energy). The reason of this high stability is related to the relatively
584 small amount of electricity required for the production of activating powder.



585

586 **Figure 6.** Percentage change of impacts in relation to the ratio of activating powder in 50
 587 MPa AABR mix design. For each impact category, the line represents the impact of 50 MPa
 588 AABC concrete.

589

590 4.3. Discussion

591 The main objective of this study was to assess quantitatively the environmental impact of a
 592 waste-based activator for AAB production. There is large consensus in the literature on the
 593 use of LCA as a tool for objective and quantitative assessment of the life cycle impact of
 594 products, production methods or global processes. Nonetheless, the discussion on LCA of
 595 alkali activated binders is very much debated as the number of possible variables in the
 596 system is high and different assumptions would lead to significantly diverging results. The
 597 main complication in comparing different results lies on the wide variety of mixing
 598 approaches (use of chemicals as solid or in solution, quantification of the added chemicals
 599 as solid ratios, liquid to solid ratios, molarity of the solution and so on) and the difficulties in
 600 ensuring that datasets from LCA database conveniently reflect the actual mix proportions,

601 particularly as far as activators are concerned. Furthermore, there is not such a thing as a
 602 “typical concrete” to be used for comparison purposes, due to the large variability of
 603 technical requirements and thus of concrete compositions, and therefore a meaningful
 604 comparison ‘alike for alike’ from literature data is very difficult. This research aimed at: (a)
 605 providing an assessment of environmental impacts of different classes of concrete; (b)
 606 providing a fair and sound comparison between a waste-based activator and commercially
 607 available chemicals; (c) determining the effects of variations of some key parameters over
 608 the total impact of the AABR.

609 Results from this study were compared to published outcomes from the literature, in order to
 610 benchmark the expected values and to confirm the robustness of the methodology that was
 611 followed. Data collected from significant available publications are shown in Table 7 and
 612 plotted in Figure 7 against results obtained from this study. It can be appreciated that
 613 obtained results sits well in this dataset, confirming the robustness of the methodology.

614

615 **Table 7.** CO₂ emissions per cubic meter of concretes, data from literature


Source	Strength class (MPa)	CO ₂ -eq (kg/m ³)		
		OPC	AABC	AABR
(Habert et al., 2011)	52.5	306	168	-
(Turner and Collins, 2013)	40	354	320	-
(Yang et al., 2013)	24	323	110	-
	40	509	122	-
	70	568	256	-
(Salas et al., 2018)	15	302	110	-
(Samarakoon et al., 2020)	40	-	-	191
	65	-	284	-
This study	35	333	123	100
	50	409	142	118
	70	507	181	160

616

617 The assessment of the environmental impacts of different classes of concrete confirmed
 618 current trends in LCA studies on concrete. Alkali activated concretes can significantly reduce
 619 most of the impacts identified from the analysis. Climate change indicator can be reduced by
 620 63%-65% with the adoption of AABC, and in the range of 68%-71% when using waste-

621 derived activators. The acidification indicator is similarly reduced by 17%-30%, whereas the
 622 use of waste glass-based activator allows reductions of 29%-40% of this parameter.

623



624

625 **Figure 7.** Equivalent carbon emissions per cubic metre of concrete versus compressive
 626 strength. Circled (dashed line): results from this study.

627

628 Another significant reduction was achieved in terms of terrestrial eutrophication, for which
 629 the adoption of AABC concrete could allow a reduction of 47%-58%, whereas reductions in
 630 excess of 57%-63% were obtained with use of the waste glass-based activator.

631 A less sharp outcome was obtained for indicators such as particulate matter, freshwater
 632 ecotoxicity and resource depletion. The freshwater ecotoxicity indicator worsen significantly
 633 with the adoption of AAB, essentially due to the use of activators. Similar results were found
 634 in the literature (Passuello et al., 2017, Di Maria et al., 2018). The particulate matter indicator
 635 showed higher values for AAB, due to both the use of GGBS and the use of chemicals for
 636 activation, although in absolute terms did not raise particular concern. The natural resource

637 depletion indicator also increased for AAB, which was ascribed to metal depletion in the
638 literature (Matheu et al., 2015). However, with the adoption of AABC the increase is
639 relatively low (7% to 12%), while it is slightly higher for AABC (40% to 49%).

640 It can be noticed that impacts of the three concretes classes always increase at the
641 increasing of the strength class, due to the need to increase the binder content (for OPC) on
642 one hand or the GGBS content (for AAB) on the other hand.

643 The analysis allowed comparison between commercially available chemicals for activation to
644 a waste glass-derived activator, and the study demonstrated that the use of this latter
645 consistently improved the environmental performances of the concrete. Whilst the use of
646 commercially available activators accounts for about 50% on the total climate change
647 indicator, adoption of waste-based activator reduces this burden by 10%. The consequence
648 is that the CO₂ eq. emissions directly allocated to the activators are reduced on average by
649 30%-32% when using the glass-waste derived activator, which is near to the 50% cut
650 claimed by other scholars (Scrivener et al., 2018) for alkali-activated binders to play a
651 significant role in reducing the global warming potential of built environment. It was therefore
652 demonstrated that the development of alternative, waste-derived activators is a key strategy
653 in tacking the environmental impact of concrete in construction. The results can be
654 considered precautionary, as the avoided impacts of non-optimal management of glass
655 cullet waste were not included in the analysis.

656 Eventually, a sensitivity analysis allowed to investigate the impacts of selected key
657 parameters on the environmental performances of AAB concretes. The most significant
658 impacts were observed from assumptions on the GGBS impact allocation, similarly to other
659 works (Habert et al., 2011), and from the transportation distance of raw materials, this latter
660 being the most significant parameter, with increases in the range of 20% of climate change
661 indicator. Similar results were also found in the literature (Peys et al., 2018, Petrillo et al.,
662 2016). The energy mix of electricity and the assumptions on fly ash allocation resulted in
663 minor impacts.

664 The optimisation of the quantity of activating powder in the mix has a significant effect on the
665 environmental performances: a decrease of its dosage (mass ratio of activator/binder) of
666 about 4% (i.e. passing from 18.8% to 15%) led to a reduction of 9% on average, whereas
667 the increase of its dosage of about 6% (i.e. passing from 18.8% to 25%) resulted in a
668 general increase in impact indicator of about 14%. There is therefore a significant potential
669 for further reducing the environmental impacts of AABR concretes through the optimisation
670 of the mix proportions and activation.

671

672 **4.4. Limitations of the study**

673 The objective of this research was to assess the environmental impact of a novel, waste-
674 based activator, and to compare it to alkali-activated concrete produced with commercial
675 chemicals and to OPC concrete. Some choices and assumptions have been made about the
676 boundary of the study, and therefore some limitations need to be pointed out:

677 (1) The system boundaries of the study included the energy consumption for the production
678 of the materials composing the concrete, but did not include the energy for mixing and
679 casting the concrete. The reasons for this choice are as follows:

- 680 ○ Concrete batching can be carried out following different methods and equipment
681 according to the typology of the production (precast or onsite placement) and the
682 end-products, these factors can further vary between different construction sites.
683 This huge variability would affect the impact results and would require a focussed
684 study, limited to specific context.
- 685 ○ As concluded by Flower and Sanjayan (2007), concrete-batching and placement
686 activities contributed to a minor share of CO₂ to total concrete emissions. However,
687 if this was true for OPC concrete, this contribution can be as high as 15% when
688 considering low-carbon binders such as the materials investigated in the present
689 study. Yang et al. (2013) suggested emissions equal to 0.008 CO₂ kg/kg of concrete
690 due to the concrete production, while Flower and Sanjayan (2007) calculated
691 emissions of 12.3 kg CO₂/m³ for the concrete-batching and placement activities.

692 Since the bulk density of the concrete mixes summarised in Table 2 is on average
693 2459 kg/m³ with small fluctuations, the CO₂ emissions related to the concrete
694 production phase can be estimated about between 12 and 20 kg/m³ and results
695 would therefore need to be offset by this amount. This estimation is in line with
696 values declared in the literature of about 17 kg/m³ (Salas et al., 2018).

697 (2) Similarly, the study did not attempt at covering the end of life stage for the three
698 investigated concretes, since the reusing/recycling/recovering options would strongly
699 depend on the engineering application, concrete end-product and site-specific
700 strategies, and would anyway be similar for the three mixes. From a comparison
701 perspective, this further analysis would not have added information to the objectives of
702 the study. A further investigation could be carried out assessing likely scenarios for the
703 end of life stage as recommended for Environmental Product Declaration (EPD)
704 preparation (BS EN 15804, 2012).

705 (3) The generation of waste during concrete production was not included in the analysis.

706 This choice was due to the following considerations:

- 707 ○ The huge variability of the waste generation in concrete production, which relates to
708 the different construction methods and approaches. Whilst wastage of concrete
709 during on-site civil engineering works can be very high, precast production can
710 reduce the waste concrete by 50% to 60% (Tam et al., 2005), and a WRAP report
711 suggested even further benefits such as negligible wastage and 100% re-use of
712 material (WRAP, 2019). Due to the large variability of this parameter, its detailed
713 investigation was considered to fall outside the scope of this research.
- 714 ○ Due to the similarities in the production processes of the three concrete mixes, the
715 assessment of the emissions due to the waste production would have been more or
716 less the same when talking into account the same context, and thus it would only
717 offset the emission amounts, without affecting the comparison.

718 (4) The transportation of raw materials (Portland cement, fly ash, GGBS, waste glass) from
719 the production units to the mixing plant was modelled under some assumptions:

- 720 ○ The transportation of Portland cement was not included in the analysis. It is
721 commonly assumed that the relevant geographic market for Portland cement is
722 between 150 – 250 km. However, several precast units on mixing plants are located
723 nearby the cement production factory, since, due to the relatively low economic
724 margins of some precast concrete products, the typical market radius is about 50
725 km (Soutsos et al., 2019), and transportation costs may make the business
726 unprofitable. As this study did not focus on a specific plant but rather on a
727 comparison among concretes of different nature, it was decided not to include the
728 transportation distance in order to avoid this further complication that would have
729 affected the result variability.
- 730 ○ Similarly, the availability of fly ash and GGBS is a complex issue that cannot be
731 easily modelled, e.g. the current UK construction market sources GGBS from local
732 production, import from Europe and import from China. Furthermore, due to the
733 industrial trends in steel production and coal-fuelled power stations, future
734 scenarios and availability of GGBS and fly ash are even more uncertain. However,
735 acknowledging that fly ash and GGBS are typically sourced farther away than
736 Portland cement, a transportation distance of 100 km was included in the
737 calculation. Having neglected the transportation distance in the analysis of Portland
738 cement-based concrete, such distance of 250 km can be considered an “offset” in
739 the comparison between mixes. The “extra” 100 km added for fly ash and GGBS
740 would therefore implicitly represent a scenario where these materials are procured
741 some 350 km away from the concrete mixing plant, which is considered reasonable
742 for most of the real cases. In order to assess the impact of transportation, the
743 analysis of AABR production included a sensitivity step in which these materials
744 (including glass waste and sodium hydroxide) were transported with lorries over a
745 distance of 500 km (i.e. 750 km when considering the offset discussed for Portland
746 cement).

747

748 **CONCLUSIONS**

749 The environmental impacts associated to the use of Portland cement in concrete are a
750 growing concern worldwide. Alkali activated binders have been proposed for a low carbon,
751 low impact alternative to Portland cement. However, a debate exists on the actual
752 environmental profile of alkali activated binders, mainly due to the high impacts associated
753 with the use of chemicals for the activation. This paper described the outcomes from a
754 research investigating the environmental impacts of three compressive strength classes of
755 concretes when produced with Portland cement, with alkali activated binders using
756 commercially available chemicals, and with a novel, waste glass-based activator recently
757 described in the literature.

758 The main outcomes from the study were:

- 759 • The adoption of AAB concrete allows a significant reduction in several environmental
760 indicators such as global warming (63%-65% reduction), acidification potential (17%-
761 30% reduction), and terrestrial eutrophication (47%-58% reduction).
- 762 • The use of a waste glass-derived activators allowed a further reduction of the
763 aforementioned impacts i.e. global warming (68%-71% reduction), acidification
764 potential (29%-40% reduction), and terrestrial eutrophication (57%-63% reduction).
- 765 • AAB concrete production has a negative impacts on freshwater ecotoxicity,
766 particulate matter and resource depletion.
- 767 • The use of waste glass-based activator allowed a consistent reduction in every
768 environmental indicator when compared to the use of commercially available
769 chemicals. CO₂ eq. emissions directly allocated to the activators were found to be
770 30%-32% lower.
- 771 • The parameters with the highest impacts on the environmental performances of the
772 waste glass-based alkali activated concretes were the GGBS allocation, the
773 transportation of raw materials and the amount of activating powder in the mix. The
774 energy mix and the fly ash allocations were found to be insignificant, as well as
775 milling glass cullet for the production of glass powder.

776 Further research should concentrate on the optimisation of the mix proportions in order to
777 minimise the use of activators in concrete. The investigation of other Si-rich waste streams
778 for the production of waste-derived solid activator is another promising research direction.

779

780 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

781 Authors wish to gratefully acknowledge Prof Gian Andrea Blengini for his guidance in the
782 development of the LCA model. This research did not receive any specific grant from funding
783 agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

784

785 **References**

786 BOUZÓN, N., PAYÁ, J., BORRACHERO, M., SORIANO, L., TASHIMA, M. & MONZÓ, J.

787 2014. Refluxed rice husk ash/NaOH suspension for preparing alkali activated

788 binders. *Materials letters*, 115, 72-74.

789 BRITISH STANDARD, 2011. Sustainability of construction works — Assessment of

790 environmental performance of buildings — Calculation method. *BS EN 15978:2011*,

791 *British Standard Institution*.

792 BRITISH STANDARD, 2019. Sustainability of construction works – Environmental product

793 declarations - Core rules for the product category of construction products. *BS EN*

794 *15804:2012+A2:2019*, *British Standard Institution*.

795 COSTA, F.N. & RIBEIRO, D.V., 2020. Reduction in CO₂ emissions during production of

796 cement, with partial replacement of traditional raw materials by civil construction

797 waste (CCW). *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 276, p.123302.

798 CEMBUREAU, 2019. Activity Report 2018. [https://cembureau.eu/media/1818/activity-report-](https://cembureau.eu/media/1818/activity-report-2018.pdf)

799 [2018.pdf](https://cembureau.eu/media/1818/activity-report-2018.pdf), accessed 08/07/2020.

800 CRENNNA, E., SECCHI, M., BENINI, L. & SALA, S. 2019. Global environmental impacts: data

801 sources and methodological choices for calculating normalization factors for LCA.

802 *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, 24, 1851-1877.

803 DAVIDOVITS, J. 1993. Geopolymer cements to minimize carbon dioxide greenhouse
804 warming. *Ceram. Trans.*, 37, 165-182.

805 DAVIDOVITS, J. 2015. False values on CO2 emission for geopolymer cement/concrete
806 published in scientific papers. *Technical Paper*, 24.

807 DIXIT, M.K., 2017. Embodied energy and cost of building materials: correlation
808 analysis. *Building Research & Information*, 45(5), pp.508-523.

809 ECOINVENT, 2013. Forum water for chemicals in solution state. Available at
810 <https://www.ecoinvent.org/support/ecoinvent-forum/topic.html?&tid=61>, accessed
811 08/07/2020.

812 EUROPEAN COMMISSION, JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE, INSTITUTE FOR
813 ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY, 2011. International Reference Life Cycle
814 Data System (ILCD) Handbook- Recommendations for Life Cycle Impact
815 Assessment in the European context. First edition November 2011. EUR 24571 EN.
816 Luxembourg. Publications Office of the European Union.

817 EUROPEAN COMMISSION, JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE, INSTITUTE FOR
818 ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY, 2012. Characterisation factors of the ILCD
819 Recommended Life Cycle Impact Assessment methods. Database and Supporting
820 Information. First edition. February 2012. EUR 25167. Luxembourg. Publications
821 Office of the European Union.

822 EUROSTAT, 2019. Electricity price statistics. Available at
823 [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Electricity_price_statistics#Electricity_prices_for_non-household_consumers)
824 [explained/index.php/Electricity_price_statistics#Electricity_prices_for_non-](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Electricity_price_statistics#Electricity_prices_for_non-household_consumers)
825 [household_consumers](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Electricity_price_statistics#Electricity_prices_for_non-household_consumers), accessed 14/07/2020.

826 DI MARIA, A., SALMAN, M., DUBOIS, M. & VAN ACKER, K. 2018. Life cycle assessment to
827 evaluate the environmental performance of new construction material from stainless
828 steel slag. *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, 23, 2091-2109.

829 FAWER, M., CONCANNON, M. & RIEBER, W. 1999. Life cycle inventories for the
830 production of sodium silicates. *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, 4,
831 207.

832 FENG, D., PROVIS, J. L. & VAN DEVENTER, J. S. 2012. Thermal activation of albite for the
833 synthesis of one-part mix geopolymers. *Journal of the American Ceramic Society*, 95,
834 565-572.

835 FLOWER, D.J. & SANJAYAN, J.G., 2007. Green house gas emissions due to concrete
836 manufacture. *The international Journal of life cycle assessment*, 12(5), p.282.

837 HABERT, G., DE LACAILLERIE, J. B. D. & ROUSSEL, N. 2011. An environmental
838 evaluation of geopolymer based concrete production: reviewing current research
839 trends. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 19, 1229-1238.

840 HABERT, G. & OUELLET-PLAMONDON, C. 2016. Recent update on the environmental
841 impact of geopolymers. *RILEM technical Letters*, 1, 17-23.

842 HAMMOND, G.P. & JONES, C.I., 2008. Embodied energy and carbon in construction
843 materials. *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers-Energy*, 161(2), pp.87-98.

844 HEATH, A., PAINE, K. & MCMANUS, M. 2014. Minimising the global warming potential of
845 clay based geopolymers. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 78, 75-83.

846 KOTSAY, G. & JASKULSKI, R. 2019. Belite cement as an ecological alternative to Portland
847 cement – a review. *Materials Structures Technology*, 2(1), 70-76

848 LEHNE, J. & PRESTON, F. 2018. Making Concrete Change: Innovation in Low-Carbon
849 Cement and Concrete. *Chatham House Report, Energy Environment and Resources*
850 *Department: London, UK*, 1-66.

851 MADDALENA, R., ROBERTS, J. J. & HAMILTON, A. 2018. Can Portland cement be
852 replaced by low-carbon alternative materials? A study on the thermal properties and
853 carbon emissions of innovative cements. *Journal of cleaner production*, 186, 933-
854 942.

855 MARSH, B., TEYCHENNE, D., FRANKLIN, R. & ERNTROY, H. 1997. Design of normal
856 concrete mixes. *Construction Research Communications Ltd: United Kingdom*.

857 MATHEU, P., ELLIS, K. & VARELA, B. 2015. Comparing the environmental impacts of alkali
858 activated mortar and traditional Portland cement mortar using life cycle assessment.
859 *IOP Conf. Ser. Mater. Sci. Eng*, 012080.

860 MCLELLAN, B. C., WILLIAMS, R. P., LAY, J., VAN RIESSEN, A. & CORDER, G. D. 2011.
861 Costs and carbon emissions for geopolymer pastes in comparison to ordinary
862 Portland cement. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 19, 1080-1090.

863 MEIRELES, P. D., PEREIRA, D. S., MELO, M. A., BRAGA, R. M., FREITAS, J. C., MELO,
864 D. M. & SILVESTRE, F. 2019. Technical evaluation of calcium sulphate α -
865 hemihydrate in oilwell application: An alternative to reduce the environmental impacts
866 of Portland cement. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 220, 1215-1221.

867 MORINI, A.A., RIBEIRO, M.J. & HOTZA, D., 2019. Early-stage materials selection based on
868 embodied energy and carbon footprint. *Materials & Design*, 178, p.107861.

869 NWANKWO, C.O., BAMIGBOYE, G.O., DAVIES, I.E. & MICHAELS, T.A., 2020. High
870 volume Portland cement replacement: A review. *Construction and Building*
871 *Materials*, 260, p.120445.

872 PASSUELLO, A., RODRIGUEZ, E. D., HIRT, E., LONGHI, M., BERNAL, S. A., PROVIS, J.
873 L. & KIRCHHEIM, A. P. 2017. Evaluation of the potential improvement in the
874 environmental footprint of geopolymers using waste-derived activators. *Journal of*
875 *Cleaner Production*, 166, 680-689.

876 PETRILLO, A., CIOFFI, R., DE FELICE, F., COLANGELO, F. & BORRELLI, C. 2016. An
877 Environmental Evaluation: A Comparison Between Geopolymer and OPC Concrete
878 Paving Blocks Manufacturing Process in Italy. *Environmental Progress & Sustainable*
879 *Energy*, 35, 1699-1708.

880 PEYS, A., ARNOUT, L., BLANPAIN, B., RAHIER, H., VAN ACKER, K. & PONTIKES, Y.
881 2018. Mix-design parameters and real-life considerations in the pursuit of lower
882 environmental impact inorganic polymers. *Waste and biomass valorization*, 9, 879-
883 889.

884 PRÉ, 2020. SimaPro Database Manual – Methods Library, version 4.15. *SimaPro Help*
885 *Center*. Available at [https://simapro.com/wp-](https://simapro.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/DatabaseManualMethods.pdf)
886 [content/uploads/2020/10/DatabaseManualMethods.pdf](https://simapro.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/DatabaseManualMethods.pdf), accessed 25/10/2020.

887 PROVIS, J. L. 2018. Alkali-activated materials. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 114, 40-48.

888 RAFEET, A., VINAI, R., SOUTSOS, M. & SHA, W. 2017. Guidelines for mix proportioning of
889 fly ash/GGBS based alkali activated concretes. *Construction and Building Materials*,
890 147, 130-142.

891 ROBAYO-SALAZAR, R., MEJÍA-ARCILA, J., DE GUTIÉRREZ, R.M. & MARTÍNEZ, E.,
892 2018. Life cycle assessment (LCA) of an alkali-activated binary concrete based on
893 natural volcanic pozzolan: A comparative analysis to OPC concrete. *Construction*
894 *and Building Materials*, 176, pp.103-111.

895 ROGELJ, J., DEN ELZEN, M., HÖHNE, N., FRANSEN, T., FEKETE, H., WINKLER, H.,
896 SCHAEFFER, R., SHA, F., RIAHI, K. & MEINSHAUSEN, M. 2016. Paris Agreement
897 climate proposals need a boost to keep warming well below 2 C. *Nature*, 534, 631-
898 639.

899 SALAS, D. A., RAMIREZ, A. D., ULLOA, N., BAYKARA, H. & BOERO, A. J. 2018. Life cycle
900 assessment of geopolymers concrete. *Construction and Building Materials*, 190, 170-
901 177.

902 SAMARAKOON, M., RANJITH, P., DUAN, W. H. & DE SILVA, V. 2020. Properties of one-
903 part fly ash/slag-based binders activated by thermally-treated waste glass/NaOH
904 blends: A comparative study. *Cement and Concrete Composites*, 103679.

905 SANDANAYAKE, M., GUNASEKARA, C., LAW, D., ZHANG, G. & SETUNGE, S. 2018.
906 Greenhouse gas emissions of different fly ash based geopolymers concretes in
907 building construction. *Journal of cleaner production*, 204, 399-408.

908 SCRIVENER, K. L., JOHN, V. M., GARTNER, E. M. & ENVIRONMENT, U. 2018. Eco-
909 efficient cements: Potential economically viable solutions for a low-CO₂ cement-
910 based materials industry. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 114, 2-26.

911 SHI, C., QU, B. & PROVIS, J. L. 2019. Recent progress in low-carbon binders. *Cement and*
912 *Concrete Research*, 122, 227-250.

913 SOUTSOS, M., VINAI, R. & RAFEET, A. 2019. Alkali-activated concrete for the production of
914 building blocks: research achievements and future challenges. *International*
915 *Conference on Building Materials - Science and Technology of Building Materials for*
916 *Sustainable Development*, Hanoi, Vietnam, 31 October - 2 November 2019, pp. 354-
917 366.

918 STEELONTHENET.COM, 2020. Pig Iron Prices. Available at
919 <https://www.steelonthenet.com/files/pig-iron.html>, accessed 14/07/2020

920 TAM, C.M., TAM, V.W., CHAN, J.K. & NG, W.C., 2005. Use of prefabrication to minimize
921 construction waste-a case study approach. *International Journal of Construction*
922 *Management*, 5(1), pp.91-101.

923 THE GUARDIAN, 2019. Guardian Concrete Week.
924 <https://www.theguardian.com/cities/series/guardian-concrete-week>, accessed
925 08/07/2020.

926 TONG, K.T., VINAI, R. & SOUTSOS, M.N., 2018. Use of Vietnamese rice husk ash for the
927 production of sodium silicate as the activator for alkali-activated binders. *Journal of*
928 *cleaner production*, 201, pp.272-286.

929 TURNER, L. K. & COLLINS, F. G. 2013. Carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂-e) emissions: A
930 comparison between geopolymers and OPC cement concrete. *Construction and*
931 *Building Materials*, 43, 125-130.

932 VINAI, R. & SOUTSOS, M. 2019. Production of sodium silicate powder from waste glass
933 cullet for alkali activation of alternative binders. *Cement and Concrete Research*,
934 116, 45-56.

935 WRAP, 2019. Waste Reduction Potential of Precast concrete Manufactured Offsite [Online].
936 Available: [http://www.wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/Pre-cast%20concrete%20-](http://www.wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/Pre-cast%20concrete%20-%20Full%20case%20study1.pdf)
937 [%20Full%20case%20study1.pdf](http://www.wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/Pre-cast%20concrete%20-%20Full%20case%20study1.pdf)

938 YANG, K.-H., SONG, J.-K. & SONG, K.-I. 2013. Assessment of CO₂ reduction of alkali-
939 activated concrete. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 39, 265-272.