



CCSP Deliverable D547  
Turku 2016

Ron Zevenhoven  
Martin Slotte

**Selection of dry gas/solid ( $\text{Mg}(\text{OH})_2$ ) or wet  
aqueous ( $\text{MgSO}_4$ ) carbonation of lime kiln  
gas  $\text{CO}_2$**

FP4 report



ccsp

Carbon Capture and Storage Program

**CLIC Innovation Oy**  
ETELÄRANTA 10  
P.O. BOX 10  
FI-00131 HELSINKI  
FINLAND  
[www.clicinnovation.fi](http://www.clicinnovation.fi)

CLIC Innovation Oy  
Carbon Capture and Storage Program (CCSP)  
Deliverable D547

Ron Zevenhoven, Martin Slotte  
Åbo Akademi University, Turku

## **Selection of dry gas/solid ( $\text{Mg}(\text{OH})_2$ ) or wet aqueous ( $\text{MgSO}_4$ ) carbonation of lime kiln gas $\text{CO}_2$**

FP4 report

**Report Title:** Selection of dry gas/solid ( $\text{Mg}(\text{OH})_2$ ) or wet aqueous ( $\text{MgSO}_4$ ) carbonation of lime kiln gas  $\text{CO}_2$

Delayed report for FP4 (scheduled for September 2014)

**Key words:** mineral carbonation, silicate raw materials, lime kiln application

## **Abstract:**

Aiming at a large-scale application of magnesium (Mg) silicate rock mineral carbonation at an industrial-scale lime kiln in Finland (presumably at Parainen) implies the choice of a process route. For this, two routes developed at ÅA can be considered: both operate directly on flue gas (no separate  $\text{CO}_2$  capture) and involve solid/solid extraction of Mg from serpentinite rock, but differ in the carbonation step. The "original" ÅA route implies carbonation of  $\text{Mg}(\text{OH})_2$  in a pressurised fluidised bed (PFB) reactor, giving recoverable heat and  $\text{MgCO}_3$  as product, while the "alternative" ÅA route implies carbonation of  $\text{MgSO}_4$  in an aqueous solution, giving hydromagnesite  $4\text{MgCO}_3 \cdot \text{Mg}(\text{OH})_2$  and nesquehonite  $\text{MgCO}_3 \cdot 3\text{H}_2\text{O}$  as products. The latter won't give heat that can be recovered for further use but offers the great benefit of a simpler process.

Awaiting Tekes' funding decision, parallel work commenced in cooperation with ICES/A\*Star in Singapore, under Tekes/A\*Star project cooperation *Novel low energy routes to activate minerals for large-scale carbonation for useful products (NEACAP) (2010-2014)* with a natural gas-fired power plant as the application of this CCS technology.

As one outcome, a study titled *A comparison of  $\text{CO}_2$  mineral sequestration processes involving a dry or wet carbonation step* was produced for the ECOS'2015 conference in Pau (France) June 29 – July 3, 2015. The (already peer-reviewed) manuscript was during autumn 2015 slightly reworked for ENERGY and was recently accepted for publication.

In this paper four case studies are compared from an energy (heat and power) use point of view, being an industrial scale lime kiln and a natural gas-fired power plant, with either the "original" (dry carbonation) or "alternative" (wet carbonation) ÅA route, all without a  $\text{CO}_2$  capture step, as the applied CCS technology.

The content of this paper covers the goal and objectives of Deliverable D547. (Unfortunately IPR limits sharing of results from the NEACAP project to publications in the open literature.)

**The full paper can be found, as [doi:10.1016/j.energy.2016.05.066](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2016.05.066)  
at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360544216306831>**