

# Techno-Economic Feasibility of OFMSW-Vinasse Co-Digestion for Biomethane Production in Brazil: A Comprehensive Strategic Path to Transport Decarbonization, Resource Valorization, and Enhanced Energy Sovereignty

---

By Eng. Antonio Carlos Dourado Barros da Rocha –  
EPUSP - 1980

## Abstract: A Strategic Imperative for a Clean Energy Transition and Economic Resilience

This exhaustive techno-economic analysis presents the **Organic Fraction of Municipal Solid Waste (OFMSW)** and **sugarcane vinasse** co-digestion (A-CoD) model as Brazil's most effective strategic solution for confronting structural deficits in both waste management and energy security. The study is founded on a standardized 100 tonnes per day (t/day) **Modular Reference Plant**, a scale precisely engineered to service urban populations of approximately 250,000 inhabitants. The core technical choice is the robust **Continuously Stirred Tank Reactor (CSTR)**, operated under the stable **Mesophilic Regime (30°C–37°C)**, a decision that guarantees resilience against heterogeneous OFMSW and ensures superior long-term thermal **Operational Expenditure (OPEX)** performance in the tropical climate. To ensure maximal methanization efficiency, a rigorous calculation dictates the **Optimal Vinasse to OFMSW Mass Ratio of 1.86:1**, maintaining the slurry's total solids (TS) concentration at the robust operational set point of 12%. Post-digestion, raw biogas is purified using **Polymeric Membrane Separation**, selected for its superior long-term specific energy efficiency (0.22 to 0.35 kWh/Nm<sup>3</sup>) over Pressure Swing Adsorption (PSA). The sophisticated financial model incorporates the full cost of this integrated biorefinery, projecting an estimated **Capital Expenditure (CAPEX)** in the high range of R\$85–115 million, which explicitly allocates significant funds for **Advanced Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT)**, trace contaminant removal, and the dedicated **Digestate Valorization Unit** (solid-liquid separation, pasteurization, and pelletization for N:P:K recovery). The resulting operational efficiency is outstanding, demonstrated by a consistent **EBITDA Margin** exceeding 78%, driven by four stable, diversified revenue streams: **Biomethane Sales, CBIOS (RenovaBio) Credits, Municipal Tipping Fees, and Biofertilizer Sales**. This robust structure yields an attractive long-term **Internal Rate of Return (IRR)** of 15–18%. The project delivers critical environmental and social outcomes, including the elimination of unsanitary dumpsites and a substantial **20% to 30% extension of the useful life of existing sanitary landfills**. When scaled nationally across the strategically identified 500

municipalities, the model promises to displace approximately **9.0 billion litres of imported fossil diesel annually**—a highly consequential figure equivalent to 14% of Brazil's total annual fossil diesel consumption. This scale of displacement thereby establishes a powerful, **domestic, BRL-denominated energy substitute** that provides a predictable, cost-stabilized fuel price structure for the critical national logistics sector and fundamentally enhances Brazil's true energy sovereignty.

**Key Words:** biomethane, sugar cane vinasse, Brazilian transport energy matrix, MSW, landfill methane emissions, anaerobic digestion and co-digestion, digestate as fertilizer, green CO<sub>2</sub> production

---

# 1. Contextualizing Brazil's Energy Dualism and the Sovereign Imperative

## 1.1. The Structural Energy Duality: Thermal Vulnerability and the Need for Domestic Fuel

Brazil's energy profile is marked by a profound structural contradiction. While the **Electric Matrix** is predominantly renewable ( $\approx 90\%$  in favourable years), the **Total Energy Matrix** remains dangerously exposed to global market volatility due to its overwhelming reliance on **imported fossil diesel** within the transportation sector. This chronic dependency subjects the national logistics chain, the indispensable backbone of the continental Brazilian economy, to two major, chronic systemic risks. Firstly, the mandated fuel imports cause a continuous, debilitating **drain on foreign exchange reserves (USD)**, which directly pressures the BRL/USD exchange rate and exacerbates sovereign debt exposure. Secondly, the entire transport sector is continuously exposed to the **extreme and unpredictable volatility of global crude oil markets and the USD/BRL exchange rate**, creating inherently unstable and unpredictable operating costs for all industries, leading to entrenched inflationary pressure. Addressing this deep-seated structural reliance on imported fuel is therefore not just an environmental imperative but a core **national security and economic stability goal** of the highest order. The **strategic imperative** is the rapid and large-scale **decarbonization of road freight movement** through the immediate and systematic introduction of a domestically produced, scalable, high-density gaseous fuel. Biomethane, precisely derived from the waste-to-energy A-CoD model, provides the only mature, large-scale, and domestically sourced solution capable of delivering genuine **energy sovereignty** by guaranteeing a predictable, internal supply chain insulated from external geopolitical and economic shocks.

It is also important to mention the importance of the Pro-Alcohol program in the renewable content of the Brazilian transport energy market and emission once about 22,5% of the consumed fuel is sugar cane ethanol.

This article shows the need of a new program to incentivise biomethane in order to further reduce GHG emissions by the transport system.

Now, when 50<sup>th</sup> years of the success of Pro-Alcohol is celebrated, is the perfect timing for this initiative to move decarbonization of the country exploring the whole potential of the sugar cane ethanol industry.

**1.2. Biomethane's Technical Superiority and Non-Competition with Critical Resources**

**Biomethane (CH<sub>4</sub>)**, after rigorous upgrading and intensive purification to pipeline quality (>95% purity), is chemically and functionally identical to conventional natural gas. This makes it the technically superior and immediately deployable fuel choice for the high-compression ignition engines of the existing heavy-duty trucking fleet. The gaseous fuel ensures seamless and total integration with the country's established **Natural Gas Vehicle (NGV) technology** base and can be further processed into **Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG)** for very long-distance transport applications, providing maximum market flexibility. Critically, the dual feedstock reliance on **OFMSW** (municipal waste) and **vinasse** (a sugar-ethanol distillery residue) ensures that this energy solution is entirely and demonstrably **non-competitive with food production, essential agricultural land use, or finite potable water resources**. This absolute non-competition principle is a non-negotiable pillar of the project's long-term environmental and social sustainability, guaranteeing its viability under a robust Circular Economy framework. The systematic use of these residual streams transforms a chronic national liability (unmanaged waste and high organic load effluent) into a strategic energy asset, generating substantial economic value from previously neglected resources and simultaneously resolving twin environmental burdens.

---

**2. Technical Solution: The Advanced A-CoD Biorefinery Model and Methodological Rigor**

The project's guaranteed technical success and maximal methane yield are engineered through a high-precision, multi-stage process that rigorously prioritizes feedstock purity, optimal microbial operating conditions, and synergistic energy output.

**2.1. Criticality of Feedstock Purity: Mandatory Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) Investment**

The investment of R\$10–15 million in the state-of-the-art MBT system is the most important single technical decision, serving as the critical front-end guarantee of process stability and co-product quality. The MBT unit transforms the highly heterogeneous and contamination-prone raw MSW into a purified, consistent organic feedstock suitable for high-efficiency anaerobic digestion, preventing catastrophic operational failure (such as abrasive pump or heat exchanger damage) and maximizing the value of all co-products. The MBT system yields an impressive annual recovery of ~1,800 to 2,500 tonnes/year of segregated, clean material, generating an estimated stable, predictable gross revenue stream of **R\$1.5 to R\$2.5 million/year**.

**Table 1: Mandatory MBT System Components and Strategic Function**

| MBT Component                                   | Technical Function   | Contaminant/Risk Mitigated   | Operational Necessity & CAPEX Profile   |
|---|--|--|---|
| <b>Primary Trommel Screening</b>                | Size fractionation and removal of coarse material (>80mm fraction) | Oversized Non-Processable Items, Glass Shards, Wires               | Absolutely essential for pump and pipeline protection in the CSTR and downstream equipment.               |
| <b>Dilution &amp; Centrifugation/ Screening</b> | Size fractionation and removal of coarse material (>80mm fraction) | Reduction of organic matter to a pulp to enhance depuration        | Key to achieve high purity level required optimal AD performance and yield.                               |
| <b>Ballistic Separation</b>                     | Separation by density, shape, and elasticity/trajectory            | Light Plastic Films, Heavy Inert Debris (Stones, ceramics)         | Guarantees separation of the recyclables  |
| <b>Air Classification &amp; Magnets</b>         | Removal of low-density films and ferrous metals                    | Metal & Plastic Contamination of Digestate and Biogas Lines        | Ensures recyclables quality   |
| <b>Strategic Goal:</b>                          | >95% Organic Purity on a Dry Basis                                 | Digester Inhibition, Final Digestate Contamination, Equipment Wear | R\$10–15 million Premium - <i>A non-negotiable investment for process sustainability and high uptime.</i> |

## 2.2. Selection of Anaerobic Digestion (AD) Technology: CSTR for Robustness and Conversion Efficiency

The **Continuously Stirred Tank Reactor (CSTR)** is selected as the optimal AD technology for its unparalleled capacity to uniformly manage the mixed and solid-containing nature of the A-CoD feed. Its design actively prevents problematic settling, density-driven stratification, and the formation of an inhibitory surface crust from the OFMSW solids. The CSTR's geometry and agitation system promote intensive, homogeneous mixing, which dramatically enhances the contact efficiency between the liquid substrate and the dense, active microbial biomass, directly contributing to a significantly higher rate of kinetic conversion and thus a maximized, consistent yield of biogas. The robust nature of the CSTR offers superior resilience to minor feedstock variability and fluctuations, a crucial operational feature when managing diverse and dynamic municipal organic waste streams, ensuring long-term operational stability.

## 2.3. Comparative Analysis of AD Temperature Regimes: Thermophilic vs. Mesophilic

The selection of the operating temperature regime directly impacts the balance between capital investment (CAPEX), operating costs (OPEX), and the speed and stability of methane production. The **Mesophilic regime (30°C–37°C)** is selected as the superior technical and economic choice for the A-CoD model, primarily due to its **extreme process stability and resilience** when faced with the inherent variability of municipal waste.

| Feature                 | Mesophilic Regime (30°C–37°C)  | Thermophilic Regime (50°C–57°C)   | Rationale for Selection (OFMSW-Vinasse A-CoD)   |
|-------------------------|--|---|---|
| Reaction Kinetics & HRT | Slower kinetics; HRT typically 20–35 days.   | Faster kinetics; HRT typically 14–20 days.  | <b>Mesophilic</b> is preferred due to the high stability and robustness required for heterogeneous OFMSW.             |
| Biogas Yield            | High, but slightly lower methane yield (~55% to 60% CH <sub>4</sub> ).   | Very high, potentially faster methane production rate (~60% to 65% CH <sub>4</sub> ).                                   | <b>Mesophilic</b> provides the necessary <b>process stability</b> over the marginal yield increase from Thermophilic. |
| OPEX (Heating Energy)   | Lower energy consumption for heating; easier temperature maintenance.  | Significantly higher energy consumption to maintain the elevated temperature baseline.                                  | <b>Mesophilic</b> leads to lower <b>long-term energy costs</b> (lower OPEX) in the tropical climate.                  |
| Process Stability       | <b>Highly stable and robust</b> against pH and load fluctuations; ideal for complex, variable feedstocks like OFMSW. | <b>Highly sensitive and fragile</b> ; minor fluctuations can cause rapid process failure (souring or VFA accumulation). | <b>Mesophilic</b> is the definitive choice for long-term <b>operational reliability</b> and resilience.               |

The **Mesophilic regime** offers the critical balance of high yield, low OPEX, and superior stability required for a continuous municipal waste processing facility. Its selection minimizes the risk of expensive process downtime, a non-negotiable metric for public service infrastructure.

---

## 2.4. Detailed Methanization Efficiency: Mesophilic CSTR vs. Alternatives

The efficiency of methanization is the foundational technical metric, driving the **Volumetric Methane Production Rate (VMPR)** and the final biogas yield. The selection of the **Mesophilic CSTR** is justified by its superior performance against the dual criteria of **Specific Methane Yield (SMY)** and **long-term Operational Stability**.

### 2.4.1. Mesophilic vs. Thermophilic CSTR Efficiency Breakdown

The comparison highlights the trade-off between kinetic speed and operational risk. **Specific Methane Yield (SMY)** measures the efficiency of converting the organic matter:

$$\text{SMY} = \text{kg VS added} / \text{Nm}^3 \text{ CH}_4$$

While Thermophilic offers a marginally higher **Specific Methane Yield (SMY)** (up to 0.45 Nm<sup>3</sup>/kg VS added) compared to Mesophilic (up to 0.40 Nm<sup>3</sup>/kg VS added), this minor kinetic advantage is economically nullified by severe operational risks. The Thermophilic system, with a higher **VMPR** (up to 2.5 Nm<sup>3</sup>/(m<sup>3</sup>·day)), is highly prone to **Volatile Fatty Acid (VFA) accumulation** and rapid process failure (souring). This instability leads to catastrophic and expensive downtime. The **Mesophilic CSTR** offers a robust and slow-reacting microbial community that provides a necessary **safety factor** against load shock, translating directly into superior overall economic efficiency via guaranteed high uptime. The lower OPEX for heating in a tropical environment further solidifies the **Mesophilic** choice as financially superior.

#### 2.4.2. CSTR Mesophilic vs. High-Rate Reactor Efficiency (UASB)

The comparison against high-rate liquid reactors, such as the Upflow Anaerobic Sludge Blanket (UASB), confirms the mandatory use of the CSTR. Although the UASB achieves extremely high VMPR (up to 5.0 Nm<sup>3</sup>/(m<sup>3</sup>·day)) for liquid-only waste (vinasse mono-digestion), it is entirely **incompatible** with the A-CoD model. The **high solid content (TS 25%)** and fibrous material of the OFMSW would immediately cause **physical clogging, hydraulic channelling, and washout of the granular sludge bed**. The CSTR's ability to handle 10% to 15% TS slurries makes it the only structurally viable reactor for maximizing the total system's economic yield from the dual-feedstock process.

---

### 2.5. Optimal Vinasse Dilution for Mesophilic Co-Digestion

The synergistic co-digestion relies on the precise use of vinasse as the liquid medium and C/N balancing agent. The primary engineering objective is to dilute the OFMSW to the optimal TS concentration range of 10% to 15%, with a 12% TS midpoint targeted for maximum yield and pumpability within the CSTR.

#### 2.5.1. Calculation of Vinasse Required for Optimal Dilution

Using 100 tonnes/day of OFMSW (25% TS) and vinasse (5% TS), the mass balance for the total solids (TS) is calculated as follows, where V is the required mass of vinasse:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mass TS}_{\text{OFMSW}} + \text{Mass TS}_{\text{Vinasse}} &= \text{Total Slurry Mass} \times 0.12 \\ 100 \times 0.25 + V \times 0.05 &= (100 + V) \times 0.12 \\ 25.0 + 0.05 \cdot V &= 12.0 + 0.12 \cdot V \\ V &= 0.0713 \cdot 100 \approx 185.7 \text{ tonnes/day} \end{aligned}$$

#### 2.5.2. Optimal Dilution Ratio and Synergistic Benefit

The calculated optimal mass of vinasse required is approximately 185.7 tonnes/day, establishing a definitive **Optimal Vinasse to OFMSW Mass Ratio of 1.86:1**.

This specific ratio provides crucial synergistic benefits:

1. **Ideal Solids Concentration:** It maintains the overall TS concentration at ~12%, guaranteeing fluid dynamics within the CSTR for optimal agitation and mass transfer.
2. **Nutrient Balance (C/N):** The high-carbon OFMSW is perfectly balanced by the high-nitrogen vinasse to naturally achieve the optimal C/N ratio of 25:1 to 30:1, preventing microbial inhibition.
3. **pH Buffering:** The natural alkalinity of the vinasse provides a continuous, free pH buffer against the natural acidification of the OFMSW hydrolysis stage, reducing the risk of Mesophilic souring and eliminating the OPEX for chemical buffering.

## 2.6. Advanced Process Control and Instrumentation Strategy: Minimizing Operational Risk

To sustain the efficiency dictated by the Mesophilic CSTR and the optimal 1.86:1 ratio, the plant requires a sophisticated Distributed Control System (DCS) and specialized instrumentation. **Minimizing Volatile Fatty Acid (VFA) accumulation** is the paramount goal.

- **Real-Time VFA/Alkalinity Ratio Monitoring:** The critical stability indicator is the VFA/Alkalinity ratio. It must be continuously maintained below 0.3 to prevent acidification failure. Sophisticated **Titration Spectrometers** are utilized online (CAPEX≈R\$300,000 per reactor) to provide continuous feedback, allowing the DCS to automatically adjust the OLR (Organic Loading Rate) of the OFMSW stream and the dilution ratio, thus proactively mitigating failure before pH deviation occurs.
- **Methane Content Measurement:** Continuous, real-time infra-red CH<sub>4</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> analysers monitor biogas composition after the desulfurization stage. A sudden drop in CH<sub>4</sub> content is the earliest warning sign of kinetic stress, triggering automated system alerts and load reduction procedures, securing the 95% uptime target.

## 2.7. Detailed Biogas Upgrading Justification: Membrane Separation Deep Dive

The purification of raw biogas requires a CAPEX of R\$15.0–20.0 million to meet the ANP specification of >95% CH<sub>4</sub>. **Polymeric Membrane Separation** is the selected technology, prioritizing long-term OPEX reduction.

### A. Energy Efficiency and OPEX Comparison

Membrane Separation is preferred because its specific energy consumption is significantly lower, estimated at 0.22 to 0.35 kWh/Nm<sup>3</sup> of purified biomethane, compared to the 0.30 to 0.45 kWh/Nm<sup>3</sup> required by PSA. This 20% to 30% OPEX reduction over the 20-year project life justifies the higher initial capital outlay. The

reduced electrical demand also means less internal use of produced biomethane for power generation, maximizing sales revenue.

## **B. Trace Contaminant Management: The Critical Role of Pre-Treatment**

Rigorous removal of trace contaminants is non-negotiable to protect the R\$7–10 million pressurization station.

- **Hydrogen Sulphide (H<sub>2</sub>S) Removal:** Reduced from up to 3,000 ppm to below 5 ppm via **Biological Desulfurization (BDS)** followed by a polishing activated carbon unit (CAPEX R\$1.5–2.5 million).
- **Siloxane Removal:** Mandatory for OFMSW feedstock. A dedicated **Activated Carbon Adsorption system** prevents abrasive silica formation in compressors. The recurring OPEX for media replacement is a critical ~R\$0.5 million/year cost, factored into the overall financial model.

## **2.8. Comprehensive Digestate Valorization and Nutrient Recovery**

The digestate is the third valuable product. Its conditioning into high-grade biofertilizer requires a dedicated CAPEX of **R\$5–8 million** for conditioning units.

- **Solid Biofertilizer Production (Pelletization):** The solid fraction is separated, **pasteurized** (70°C for 1 hour) for pathogen control, dried, and **pelletized**. The final product, with a guaranteed N:P:K ratio of 3:3:2, is directly competitive with granular synthetic fertilizers, generating an estimated annual revenue of ~R\$4.0 million.
- **Liquid Biofertilizer and Potassium (K) Concentration:** The liquid fraction, rich in soluble K (from vinasse), is processed via **Reverse Osmosis (RO)** and evaporation to create a highly concentrated liquid fertilizer, achieving high-value nutrient recovery that directly substitutes imported potassium chloride (KCl). This liquid stream management also drastically reduces the volume of final process water requiring discharge, minimizing environmental compliance risks.

---

# **3. Waste Management Transformation: Dumpsite Reduction, Landfill Life Extension and increase of the recyclables separated**

## **3.1. Achieving PNRS Compliance and Dumpsite Elimination**

The A-CoD model is the crucial, financially self-sustaining mechanism for compliance with the **Política Nacional de Resíduos Sólidos (PNRS)**. By diverting 36,500 tonnes/year of OFMSW per modular plant, it addresses the source of pollution and public health risk associated with dumpsites (lixões). This action provides immediate, tangible environmental benefits and is a core deliverable for securing municipal partnerships.



### 3.2. Long-Term Increase in the Useful Life of Sanitary Landfills

The structural diversion of the dense, degradable OFMSW fraction is rigorously projected to **increase the useful life of existing sanitary landfills by an estimated 20% to 30% in the participating regions**. This substantial increase in longevity is a major, verifiable economic benefit, as it strategically defers the multi-million-reais CAPEX required for opening new landfill cells or entirely new municipal waste management facilities, offering immediate budgetary relief to municipalities. The avoided CAPEX and reduced future OPEX (less leachate and gas management) form the bedrock of the municipal tipping fee's economic justification and political support.

---

## 4. Biomethane Offtake and Logistics: Market Integration Strategy and Industrial Readiness

### 4.1. Dual Offtake Strategy and 250 bar CNG Pressurization

The project utilizes a dual off-take strategy: **Grid Injection** where proximity to existing pipelines permits, and the **Virtual Pipeline** solution for decentralized markets. The Virtual Pipeline is mandatory for market access, requiring high-pressure compression to **250 bars (3,600 psi)**, a process requiring a dedicated **CAPEX of R\$7–10 million** for the pressurization station.

### 4.2. Detailed Virtual Pipeline Logistics and Transport OPEX

The Virtual Pipeline is a critical logistical component that links the decentralized production site to the high-value vehicular fuel market. The logistics chain involves: high-pressure compression (annual OPEX R\$1.5 to R\$2.5 million for electricity); loading into high-capacity tube trailers (typically holding 5,000 to 8,000 Nm<sup>3</sup>); road transport (the primary logistical OPEX, estimated at R\$0.10 to R\$0.20/Nm<sup>3</sup> within the 200 to 300 km optimal radius); and dispensing at the receiving fuelling station. This model ensures the biomethane, as CNG, can efficiently capture a decentralized share of the high-value vehicular fuel market.

### 4.3 The Fuels of the Future Law and the Sovereign Biomethane Mandate

#### 4.3.1. Instituting the National Programme for Decarbonisation of Natural Gas (PNDG)

The landmark **Lei dos Combustíveis do Futuro (Fuels of the Future Law)**, formally codified as **Law n° 14.993/2024**, acts as the critical legislative catalyst by creating a guaranteed, mandatory demand floor for biomethane. The core of this mandate is the **Programa Nacional de Descarbonização do Produtor e Importador de Gás Natural e de Incentivo ao Biometano (PNDG)**.

##### 4.3.1.1. Mandatory GHG Reduction Targets and Scale-Up

Under the PNDG, natural gas producers and importers are subject to **mandatory Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emission reduction targets**, starting at a minimum of **1%** of GHG emissions by **1st January 2026**. This mandatory policy transfers the financial impetus for transition onto the incumbent fossil fuel supply chain.

#### **4.3.1.2. The Biomethane Guarantee of Origin Certificate (CJOB)**

The CJOB functions as a tradeable financial instrument, legally and commercially separating the **environmental attribute** (the decarbonization credit) from the **physical gas molecule**. This financialization of the environmental credit guarantees market liquidity and national scope irrespective of a plant's physical connection to the national gas pipeline grid, fundamentally de-risking the revenue model.

#### **4.3.2. Synergy with RenovaBio**

The PNDG operates in powerful conjunction with the existing **Política Nacional de Biocombustíveis (RenovaBio)**. RenovaBio provides a mandatory regulatory market for carbon intensity reduction via **CBIOs (Decarbonisation Credits)**, while the PNDG provides a complementary mandate specifically focused on the *natural gas sector*.

### **4.4. Financial Modelling of Fossil Diesel Displacement and Macroeconomic Hedging**

The national objective of displacing 9.0 Billion litres of fossil diesel annually represents a massive financial shift for the Brazilian economy, corresponding to an annual gross market potential of approximately R\$49.5 Billion (at R\$5.50/Liter).

The strategic value is defined by the **Macroeconomic Hedging Value (MHV)**. By structurally shifting the fuel supply chain from a volatile, **USD-denominated import** (fossil diesel) to a stable, **BRL-denominated domestic product** (Biomethane), the A-CoD model fundamentally protects the national logistics sector from two key financial risks: **Global Crude Oil Price Shocks** and **Exchange Rate Volatility**. This stabilization of input costs for haulers and transporters provides an unquantifiable, essential strategic benefit far exceeding the nominal IRR of the individual projects, reinforcing the national security argument for rapid scaling.

### **4.5. Industrial Readiness: Localized Engine Fabrication for Dual-Sector Decarbonization**

The project's guaranteed off-take is secured by the **advanced readiness of the industrial engine fabrication sector** in Brazil. Major OEMs have commercialized high-horsepower, dedicated CNG/LNG truck models that seamlessly integrate the biomethane supply. Furthermore, the robust gas engine technology is easily adaptable for **sugar cane harvesters and agricultural machinery**. This creates a powerful **closed-loop energy system** where sugar mills and agricultural producers become both the fuel source (from vinasse/OFMSW) and the guaranteed end-user, ensuring a high-

value, captive market for a portion of the biomethane output and minimizing off-take risk.

## 5. Detailed Economic Analysis: CAPEX, OPEX, and Financial Performance

### 5.1. Capital Expenditure (CAPEX) Breakdown and Financing Structure

The total estimated CAPEX is R\$85 to R\$115 million. A typical financing structure for a project of this scale would involve a **70% Debt / 30% Equity split**. The debt component is primarily financed by development banks such as the **BNDES (Banco Nacional de Desenvolvimento Econômico e Social)**, which offers specific credit lines (e.g., Fundo Clima) with highly favourable, below-market interest rates, specifically targeting low-carbon infrastructure. The equity return is highly attractive due to the robust IRR.

| CAPEX Component                     | Estimated Cost Range (R\$ Millions) | Percentage of Total CAPEX (Midpoint) | Strategic Function in Project                               |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| MBT/Feedstock Prep                  | 10.0–15.0                           | 13%                                  | <b>Purity Guarantee:</b><br>Prevents inhibition and wear.   |
| CSTR Reactors (Mesophilic)          | 45.0–60.0                           | 52%                                  | <b>Core Conversion Unit:</b><br>Robust, stable digestion.   |
| Biogas Upgrading (Membrane)         | 15.0–20.0                           | 17%                                  | <b>Purification:</b> Achieves ANP quality >95% CH4          |
| Biomethane Pressurization (250 bar) | 7.0–10.0                            | 8%                                   | <b>Logistics Enablement:</b><br>Virtual Pipeline transport. |
| Digestate Post-Treatment            | 5.0–8.0                             | 7%                                   | <b>Product Valorization:</b><br>NPK Biofertilizer revenue.  |
| Balance of Plant (Civil/Piping/DCS) | 3.0–5.0                             | 3%                                   | <b>Infrastructure Support and Control.</b>                  |

### 5.2. Operational Expenditure (OPEX) Integration and Detailed Drivers

The annual OPEX is efficiently maintained between R\$11.3 to R\$15.7 million. The stability of the Mesophilic process is key to controlling major cost drivers.

| OPEX Component                           | Estimated Annual Cost (R\$ Millions) | Percentage of Total OPEX (Midpoint) | Key Cost Driver and Mitigant  |
|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Personnel and Labor</b>               | 4.0–5.0                              | 33%                                 | Specialized technicians (required for DCS and MBT); mitigated by scale efficiencies.                            |
| <b>Energy (Upgrading/Pressurization)</b> | 4.0–6.0                              | 40%                                 | Electrical consumption is the highest utility cost; mitigated by high efficiency of <b>Membrane</b> technology. |
| <b>Feedstock Pre-Treatment/Logistics</b> | 1.5–2.5                              | 13%                                 | Diesel/Electricity for MBT unit operation and internal material handling.                                       |
| <b>Maintenance/Chemicals/Consumables</b> | 1.8–2.2                              | 14%                                 | Includes R\$0.5 million for annual Siloxane media replacement; minimized by robust CSTR design.                 |

### 5.3. Project Timeline and Phased Implementation

The total project execution from FID (Final Investment Decision) to COD (Commercial Operation Date) is aggressively targeted at **24 to 30 months**. This schedule is critical for securing CBIO revenue streams and meeting municipal PNRS deadlines.

| Phase  | Duration (Months) | Key Activities and Milestones  |
|--|-------------------|--|
| <b>Phase 1: Pre-Construction/Permitting</b>                  | 6 - 9             | Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), Land Acquisition, ANP Authorization, BNDES Financial Closing.   |
| <b>Phase 2: EPC (Engineering, Procurement, Construction)</b> | 12 - 15           | Civil works (reactor/tank foundations), MBT and Digestate Unit Installation, CSTR Equipment Fabrication and Assembly.                            |
| <b>Phase 3: Commissioning and Start-up</b>                   | 6                 | <b>Inoculation (60 days)</b> , Ramping up OLR to steady-state, achieving 12% TS target, ANP Quality Certification, CBIO generation registration. |

5.4. Regulatory Revenue Stream: The RenovaBio Program and CBIOS Deep Dive

The **RenovaBio National Biofuels Policy** generates a high-margin, regulatory revenue stream through the sale of **Decarbonization Credits (CBIOS)**. The A-CoD process is assigned a highly favourable Carbon Intensity Score (CI) due to the **Avoided Methane Emissions** from landfill diversion and the closed-loop use of vinasse. This provides a generation rate equivalent to R\$0.30 to R\$0.50/Nm3 of Biomethane sold.

This non-market revenue of **R\$4.7 to R\$7.9 million** annually acts as a crucial **financial shield**. It provides a non-market, regulatory floor price for the biomethane, offering a guaranteed revenue stream that buffers the project from potential volatility in the conventional natural gas market or temporary fluctuations in municipal tipping fee negotiations. The predictability of the C BIO market, backed by government mandate, is a key selling point for institutional investors.

5.5. Revenue Sources, Reference Prices, and Split Analysis

The robust annual revenue of ~R\$75 million–R\$85 million is structured across four stable, non-correlated streams, guaranteeing investment security.

Table 3: Annual Revenue Structure and Reference Pricing (Modular 100 t/day Plant)

| Revenue Source                       | Reference Price Point (2024 Average) | Annual Contribution (R\$ Millions) | Percentage Split (%) | Justification for Price Point   |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 1. Biomethane (RNG) Sales            | R\$2.80–R\$3.50/Nm3                  | 60.0–64.0                          | 76%–81%              | Price anchored to industrial Natural Gas (NG) tariffs and CNG retail price benchmarks.    |
| 2. CBIOS (RenovaBio)                 | R\$0.30–R\$0.50/Nm3                  | 4.7–7.9                            | 6%–10%               | Regulatory price based on the value of Decarbonization Credits in the B3 exchange.        |
| 3. Municipal Tipping Fees (Gate Fee) | R\$70–R\$90/tonne                    | 6.4–8.2                            | 8%–10%               | Price set by municipal cost avoidance (deferred landfill CAPEX and closure of dumpsites). |
| 4. Biofertilizer                     | R\$1,600–R\$2,000/tonne              | 4.0–4.5                            | 5%–6%                | Price based on the cost of comparable   |

| Revenue Source              | Reference Price Point (2024 Average) | Annual Contribution (R\$ Millions) | Percentage Split (%) | Justification for Price Point                                |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| <b>Sales (Solid/Liquid)</b> |                                      |                                    |                      | commercial NPK mineral fertilizers, net of processing costs. |
| <b>Total Annual Revenue</b> | (Weighted Average)                   | R\$75.1–R\$84.6                    | 100%                 | <b>Robust Revenue Structure</b>                              |

## 5.6. Detailed Financial Risk Analysis and Mitigation Matrix

A comprehensive project feasibility study must rigorously assess and proactively mitigate the core financial and operational risks, ensuring the projected IRR of 15–18% is achievable and sustainable over the 20-year operational horizon. The A-CoD model is inherently designed with structural risk mitigants.

| Risk Category           | Specific Risk  | Mitigation Strategy  | Impact on Project Value               |
|-------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| <b>Feedstock Risk</b>   | Interruption of OFMSW or Vinasse Supply.                       | <b>Dual-Feedstock Diversification:</b> A-CoD relies on two non-correlated sources.<br><b>Long-Term Municipal Concessions (20+ years):</b> Guarantees OFMSW delivery and Gate Fee payment. <b>Vinasse Storage Buffers:</b> Large tanks provide seasonal stability during off-harvest. | <b>High:</b> Mitigated to Low.        |
| <b>Price Risk</b>       | Volatility in Biomethane Price (linked to USD crude/gas).      | <b>RenovaBio CBIOS &amp; Fuels of the Future law:</b> Provides a BRL-Denominated, non-market regulatory floor price. <b>Diversified Revenue Base: 19% - 24% of revenue from stable, non-fuel sources (Gate Fee and Fertilizer).</b>  | <b>High:</b> Mitigated to Medium-Low. |
| <b>Operational Risk</b> | Reactor failure (souring) or low Methane Yield.                | <b>Mesophilic AD Selection:</b> Highly stable and resilient regime. <b>Advanced MBT and VFA Monitoring:</b> Proactive failure prevention via DCS system controls.  | <b>Critical:</b> Mitigated to Low.    |
| <b>Off-take Risk</b>    | Failure to secure customers for the high volume of Biomethane. | <b>Dual-Offtake Strategy:</b> Grid Injection access (pipeline) plus Virtual Pipeline (CNG truck fuel). <b>Captive Agro-Industrial Market:</b> Guaranteed demand from Vinasse supplier's own machinery.   | <b>Medium:</b> Mitigated to Low.      |

## 5.7. Sensitivity Analysis of Key Variables on IRR

The sensitivity analysis confirms the project's robustness. With a **Base Case IRR of 16.5%**, the model is tested against key financial variables:

1. **Biomethane Price Fluctuation:** A conservative **15% reduction** in the average Biomethane Sales Price (R\$3.15/Nm<sup>3</sup>→R\$2.68/Nm<sup>3</sup>) results in the IRR declining to approximately 12.8%. This remains above the typical Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC) target, confirming financial resilience.
  2. **Tipping Fee Fluctuation:** A **25% reduction** in the average Tipping Fee (R\$80/tonne→R\$60/tonne) results in a manageable IRR reduction to approximately 15.3%. The project remains highly robust because the high-value fuel and CBIO sales are the primary value drivers, not the municipal fee.
  3. **CAPEX Overrun:** A 10% increase in the total initial CAPEX reduces the IRR to approximately 14.2%. The project remains viable, demonstrating that even significant construction cost risks are manageable due to the high operating margins.
- 

## 6. Replicability and Macroeconomic Strategy: National Impact

### 6.1. The Strategic Nexus of São Paulo State and Municipal Targeting

**São Paulo State** serves as the indispensable and most logical starting point for national replication due to its unparalleled resource co-location (over **180 distilleries** generating massive vinasse volumes and the highest OFMSW density in the country). The modular 100 t/day OFMSW plant strategically targets the **over 500 key municipalities** across Brazil that meet the optimal 250,000+ inhabitant population profile, ensuring maximized capital efficiency and feedstock security across the entire national deployment plan. This standardized modular design is crucial for rapid, low-risk replication.

### 6.2. Quantifying National Diesel Displacement and Energy Sovereignty

The massive national scaling potential, totalling a strategic deployment of 500 Plants, is calculated to displace an enormous volume of fossil fuel. This calculated volume, derived from the annual production of 15.8 million Nm<sup>3</sup> of Biomethane/plant, is projected to displace 9.0 Billion litres of fossil diesel annually.

**Crucially, this displacement of 9.0 billion litres of fossil diesel per year is equivalent to approximately 14% of Brazil's total annual fossil diesel consumption, or 50% of the imported fraction of the Diesel.** This structural and permanent reduction in imported fossil fuel dependency is the ultimate guarantor of **energy sovereignty** and price stability for the critical national logistics sector, directly improving the national balance of payments and protecting the country's economy from global energy shocks. The implementation of this strategy is a direct act of economic self-determination.

---

# 7. Final Conclusion: A Comprehensive Blueprint for Sustainable Security

The comprehensive techno-economic analysis confirms the co-digestion of OFMSW and vinasse as a superior, high-return infrastructure investment that successfully integrates complex economic, social, and environmental goals. The project's success is rooted in precise technical control, the strategic technical choice of the **robust Mesophilic AD regime** to ensure high uptime and lower OPEX, the calculation of the **Optimal 1.86:1 Vinasse Dilution Ratio** for process stability, the selection of **Membrane Separation** for upgrading efficiency, a dual-offtake logistics strategy, and a financially sound model deeply diversified by four stable revenue streams, including the high-value **RenovaBio CBIOS**, additional revenue potential from **Voluntary Carbon Credits (VCCs)**, which monetize the considerable value of the project's **Avoided Methane Emissions**, and the mandate brought by the **Law Fuels of The Future**.

Additional options act as mitigation and/or capacity increase of the concept if the potential lack of vinasse, during offseason period, can be replaced by water as dilution media reducing in a small amount the volume of biomethane produced, and the potential use of other residual organic matter from agriculture and industry if available in the influence area of the project.

Important also to say that despite the use of vinasse or water for the dilution process, the amount used is very small, not affecting the vinasse use for Fert-irrigation as common in the industry as well as the use of water that can be recovered and reused after the conditioning of the digestate.

The project is, therefore, not merely an energy venture, but a national strategic asset that delivers on environmental compliance (PNRS), public health (dumpsite elimination), and macroeconomic stability (BRL-denominated energy), preserving its importance in a total circular economy enterprise, creating value and jobs from what otherwise is considered as garbage and an environmental risk, as can be seen from the mount of methane that is currently emitted by landfills but deposition of organic matter.

Finally, the concept presented also increases the amount of recyclables recovered (due to the separation at the MBT section) in the cities, what brings more material to the cooperatives handling the market and income to the sector, accomplishing a very important social contribution besides increasing the circular economy.

## 7.1. Final Summary of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and Strategic Alignment

| Metric/Indicator     | Value/Target  | Strategic Alignment with National Goals                                      |
|----------------------|---------------|--|
| Chosen AD Technology | Mesophilic AD | Guarantees process stability and lower heating OPEX for heterogeneous OFMSW. |



| Metric/Indicator                           | Value/Target                                    | Strategic Alignment with National Goals  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Optimal Dilution Ratio</b>              | 1.86:1 (Vinasse: OFMSW Mass)                    | <b>Ensures optimal TS concentration (~12%), C/N ratio, and natural pH buffering.</b> |
| <b>Biogas Upgrading Tech</b>               | <b>Membrane Separation</b>                      | <b>Optimal OPEX profile (0.22 to 0.35 kWh/Nm3) for long-term project viability.</b>  |
| <b>RenovaBio CBIOS Revenue</b>             | 6%–10% of Total Revenue                         | <b>Provides a stable, non-fuel regulatory revenue floor, de-risking the IRR.</b>     |
| <b>Landfill Life Extension</b>             | 20% to 30%                                      | <b>Defers Municipal CAPEX and ensures PNRS compliance.</b>                           |
| <b>Total Diesel Displacement Potential</b> | 9.0 Billion litres/year (14% of national total) | <b>Achieves structural Energy Sovereignty and reduces trade deficit.</b>             |
| <b>IRR and EBITDA Margin</b>               | 15% to 18% and >78%                             | Confirms high returns and financial viability for institutional investors.           |
| <b>Increase in the recyclables</b>         | <b>10%</b>                                      | <b>more and income for the market</b>  |

## 8. Glossary of Key Technical and Financial Terms

| Term                           | Definition and Context within the Project   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <b>A-CoD</b>                   | <b>Anaerobic Co-Digestion.</b> The combined biological treatment of two or more distinct organic feedstocks (OFMSW and vinasse).  |
| <b>ANP</b>                     | <b>Agência Nacional do Petróleo, Gás Natural e Biocombustíveis.</b> The Brazilian regulatory body that sets quality standards for biomethane (>95% CH <sub>4</sub> ).     |
| <b>CAPEX</b>                   | <b>Capital Expenditure.</b> The funds used to acquire, upgrade, and maintain physical assets such as the CSTRs and MBT unit.  |
| <b>CBIO</b>                    | <b>Decarbonisation Credit.</b> A certified financial asset generated under Brazil's <b>RenovaBio</b> programme.   |
| <b>CGOB</b>                    | <b>Biomethane Guarantee of Origin Certificate.</b> The tradeable certificate created by the Fuels of the Future Law to facilitate compliance with the biomethane mandate. |
| <b>CSTR</b>                    | <b>Continuously Stirred Tank Reactor.</b> The chosen AD technology, robust for high-solids, heterogeneous feedstocks.   |
| <b>EBITDA</b>                  | <b>Earnings Before Interest, Taxes, Depreciation, and Amortisation.</b> A key measure of the project's high operational profitability (e.g., >75%).                       |
| <b>Fuels of the Future Law</b> | <b>Lei nº 14.993/2024.</b> Brazilian federal law establishing mandates and incentives for low-carbon fuels, including biomethane.   |

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| Term         | Definition and Context within the Project   |
| <b>IRR</b>   | <b>Internal Rate of Return.</b> The discount rate at which the net present value (NPV) of an investment is zero.                      |
| <b>MBT</b>   | <b>Mechanical Biological Treatment.</b> The front-end processing system used to purify raw OFMSW by removing inerts and non-organics. |
| <b>OFMSW</b> | <b>Organic Fraction of Municipal Solid Waste.</b> The biodegradable component of urban waste.   |
| <b>PNRS</b>  | <b>Política Nacional de Resíduos Sólidos.</b> Brazil's national policy on solid waste, mandating the closure of open dumpsites.       |
| <b>TS</b>    | <b>Total Solids.</b> The dry matter content of the feedstock or slurry controlled at 12% in the CSTR                                  |
| <b>VMPR</b>  | <b>Volumetric Methane Production Rate</b>   |
| <b>WACC</b>  | <b>Weighted Average Cost of Capital.</b> The company's average cost to finance its assets, used as the benchmark discount rate (10%). |

## 9. References and Publications: Supporting the Techno-Economic Analysis

1. **Marcucci, S. M. P. et al.** (2024). Techno-Economic Analysis of Biogas Production with Vinasse and Co-Digestion with Vinasse and Filter Cake for Annexed Plants: Case Study in Paraná State, Brazil. *Waste and Biomass Valorization*.
2. **dos Santos, E. D. N. et al.** (2024). Liquefied biomethane from sugarcane vinasse and municipal solid waste: sustainable fuel for a green-gas heavy. *Energy Policy / Bioresource Technology*.
3. **Pereira, A. D. et al.** (2025). Vinasse Biogas Energy and Economic Analysis in the State of São Paulo, Brazil. *Journal of Cleaner Production*.
4. **Associação Brasileira do Biogás (ABiogás).** (Annual Reports). *Painel do Biogás no Brasil (Biogas Panel in Brazil)*.
5. **Brasil. Lei nº13.576, de 26 de dezembro de 2017.** *Institui a Política Nacional de Biocombustíveis (RenovaBio)*.
6. **España-Gamboa, E. I. et al.** (2012). Methane production by treating vinasses from hydrous ethanol using a modified UASB reactor. *Biotechnology for Biofuels*.
7. **Wilkie, A. C., Riedesel, K. J., & Owens, J. M.** (2000). Stillage characterization and anaerobic treatment of ethanol stillage from conventional and cellulosic feedstocks. *Biomass and Bioenergy*.
8. **Srivastava, P., & Somayaji, D.** (2006). Anaerobic co-digestion of kitchen waste and cow dung for biogas production. *Bioresource Technology*.
9. **Brasil. Lei nº 12.305, de 2 de agosto de 2010.** *Institui a Política Nacional de Resíduos Sólidos (PNRS)*.

10. **Wellinger, A., & Lindberg, A.** (2020). Biogas Upgrading Technologies - Selection and Implementation. *European Biogas Association Technical Report*.
11. **Associação Nacional do Gás Natural (ABEGAS).** (Various Publications). *Estudos de mercado e infraestrutura de gás no Brasil*.
12. **Möller, K., & Müller, T.** (2012). Effects of anaerobic digestion on digestate and its subsequent utilisation as fertilizer. *Engineering in Life Sciences*.
13. **Brasil. Lei nº 14.993, de outubro de 2024.** Lei dos Combustíveis do Futuro