

# **UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

# DEVELOPMENT OF AN INDUSTRIAL TOXIC AND HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT MODEL BASED ON END-OF-PIPE AND INDUSTRIAL ECOLOGY APPROACHES

# AHMAD FARIZ MOHAMED

FPAS 2007 6



## DEVELOPMENT OF AN INDUSTRIAL TOXIC AND HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT MODEL BASED ON END-OF-PIPE AND INDUSTRIAL ECOLOGY APPROACHES

By

# AHMAD FARIZ MOHAMED

Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

August 2007



## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

#### Page

ABSTRACT	ii
ABSTRAK	V
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
APPROVAL	ix
DECLARATION	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xvi
LIST OF FIGURES	xviii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	XX

# CHAPTER

1 IN	1 INTRODUCTION		
1.1	Introduction	1.1	
1.2	Statement of Problem	1.2	
1.3	The Need to Conduct the Study	1.5	
1.4	Objective of the Study	1.7	
1.5	Outline of the Thesis	1.8	

# 2 GLOBAL INITIATIVE AND COUNTRY EXAMPLES IN MANAGING INDUSTRIAL TOXIC AND HAZARDOUS WASTE

2.1	Introduction	2.1
2.2	Sustainable Development	2.3
2.3	Managing Waste for Sustainable Development	2.5
2.4	Industrial Waste Definition	2.7
2.5	Country Example of Industrial Waste Management	2.11
	2.5.1 Federal Republic of Germany	2.11
	2.5.2 Japan	2.15
	2.5.3. The United States of America	2.24
	2.5.4 Taiwan	2.30
	2.5.5 Thailand	2.36
2.6	Implication of Waste Generation by Industry	2.40
2.7	Summary and Conclusion	2.45

## **3 TOXIC AND HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT IN MALAYSIA AND GLOBAL INDUSTRIAL ECOLOGY INITIATIVES**

	GLODAL INDUSTRIAL ECOLOGI INTIATIVES	
3.1	Development of Manufacturing Industry in Malaysia	3.1
3.2	Industrial Waste Management in Malaysia	3.3
3.3	Issues in Managing Industrial Toxic and Hazardous Waste	3.9
3.4	Definition of Industrial Toxic and Hazardous Waste in Malaysia	3.15
3.5	Stakeholders in Industrial Toxic and Hazardous Waste Management	3.18
3.6	Industrial Ecology	3.19
	3.6.1 Examples of Industrial Ecology Applied in Industry	3.24
3.7	The Significance of Industrial Ecology for Industrial Toxic and	3.32



Hazardous Waste Management in Malaysia.

3.8 Summary of Toxic and Hazardous Waste Management in Malaysia and 3.33 Global Industrial Ecology Initiative

# **4 METHODOLOGY**

4.1	Introd	uction	4.1
4.2	Literat	ture Review	4.4
4.3	Data (	Collection	4.5
	4.3.1	Survey	4.6
	4.3.2	Questionnaire	4.8
	4.3.3	Secondary Data Collection	4.11
4.4	Data A	Analysis	4.12
	4.4.1	Trend Analysis	4.14
	4.4.2	Policy and Management Analysis	4.16
	4.4.3	Survey Analysis and Delphi Technique Analysis for Consensus	4.17
		Ranking	
	4.4.4	SWOT Analysis	4.19
	4.4.5	SWOT-AHP Analysis for Comparison Between End-of-Pipe and	4.22
		Industrial Ecology Approach	
4.5	Devel	oping the <i>Ex-ante</i> Industrial Ecology Model for Toxic and	4.24
	Hazar	dous Waste Management in Malaysia	
	4.5.1	Evaluating Existing Policies and Management Systems for	4.24
		Industrial Toxic and Hazardous Waste.	
	4.5.2	Analyzing Industrial Ecology Approach for Industrial Toxic and	4.25
		Hazardous Waste Management Model.	
4.6	Identit	fying Potential Indicators for Industrial Toxic and Hazardous Waste	4.32
	Manag	gement System Applying Industrial Ecology Approach	
4.7	Illustra	ation of Example: Implementation of Industrial Ecology Concept	4.33
	and A	pproach for Industrial Toxic and Hazardous Waste Management	
	4.7.1	Industrial Ecology Costs and Benefits Scenario	4.34
	4.7.2	Waste Recovery Case Example	4.36

# **5 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Introduction	5.1
Survey and Secondary Data collection	5.2
5.2.1 Survey	5.2
5.2.2 Secondary Data Collection	5.4
Trend Analysis of Toxic and Hazardous Waste	5.5
5.3.1 Economic Growth and Manufacturing Industry Development	5.5
5.3.2 Toxic and Hazardous Waste Generation in Malaysia	5.10
5.3.3 Distribution of Toxic and Hazardous Waste	5.17
5.3.4 Costs and Recovery of Toxic and Hazardous Waste	5.22
5.3.5 Risks and Costs of Toxic and Hazardous Waste	5.28
5.3.6 Summary of Toxic and Hazardous Waste Trends	5.31
Policy and Management Analysis for Toxic and Hazardous Waste	5.33
Management in Malaysia	
Survey Findings and Delphi Consensus Ranking for Policy and	5.35
Management Factor	
	Introduction Survey and Secondary Data collection 5.2.1 Survey 5.2.2 Secondary Data Collection Trend Analysis of Toxic and Hazardous Waste 5.3.1 Economic Growth and Manufacturing Industry Development 5.3.2 Toxic and Hazardous Waste Generation in Malaysia 5.3.3 Distribution of Toxic and Hazardous Waste 5.3.4 Costs and Recovery of Toxic and Hazardous Waste 5.3.5 Risks and Costs of Toxic and Hazardous Waste 5.3.6 Summary of Toxic and Hazardous Waste Trends Policy and Management Analysis for Toxic and Hazardous Waste Management in Malaysia Survey Findings and Delphi Consensus Ranking for Policy and Management Factor



5.6	5.5.1 5.5.2 SWO	Delphi Consensus Ranking for Policy and Management Factor Consensus Ranking of Factors for LIFT Sectors Cand SWOT-AHP Analysis for Toxic and Hazardous Wastes	5.36 5.37 5.42
5.0	Manag Ecolo	gement: Comparison between End-of-Pipe (EOP) and Industrial gy (IE) Approach	5.42
	5.6.1 5.6.2	SWOT Analysis and SWOT-AHP Analysis for Legislation SWOT Analysis and SWOT-AHP Analysis for the Institutional Sector	5.43 5.69
	5.6.3	SWOT Analysis and SWOT-AHP Analysis for the Financial Sector	5.90
	5.6.4	SWOT Analysis and SWOT-AHP Analysis for the Technology Sector	5.109
6 INI TOX	DUSTRI IC ANE	IAL ECOLOGY: AN <i>EX-ANTE</i> MODEL FOR INDUSTRIAL D HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT	
6.1	Introd	uction	6.1
6.2	Applio Hazar	cation of the Industrial Ecology Approach for Industrial Toxic and dous Waste in Malaysia	6.2
6.3	A Para	adigm Shift	6.4
6.4	Chang	ging the End-of-Pipe to an Industrial Ecology Approach for	6.5
- <b>-</b>	Indust	rial Toxic and Hazardous Waste Management	<b>C</b> 0
6.5	An Ec Indust	cosystem Approach for an <i>Ex-Ante</i> Industrial Ecology Model of rial Toxic and Hazardous Waste Management in Malaysia	6.8
	6.5.1	Industrial Toxic and Hazardous Waste Management Industrial	6.10
		Ecology <i>Ex-Ante</i> Model Ecosystem Component	
	6.5.2	Habitat One: Resource Extraction and Production	6.15
	6.5.3	Habitat Two: Manufacturing, Consumption and Wastes Generation	6.19
	6.5.4	Habitat Three: Waste Recovery	6.23
	6.5.5	Habitat Four: Treatment and Disposals	6.26
6.6	<i>Ex-an</i> Toxic	<i>te</i> Industry Ecology Model Indicators for Sustainable Industrial and Hazardous Waste Management	6.30
6.7	Costs Indust	and Benefits Scenario: Application of an Ecosystem Approach for rial Toxic and Hazardous Waste Management in Malaysia	6.32
	6.7.1	Exponential Model	6.33
	6.7.2	Linear Model	6.36
6.8	Waste	Recovery Case Study: Matsushita Electronic Company (Malaysia)	6.42
	Berha	d (MELCOM)	
	6.8.1	Example of Recycled Waste	6.45
	6.8.2	Example of Reuse of Waste	6.46
	6.8.3	Example of Waste Reduction	6.46
	6.8.4	Benefits of Recovery through Design for Environment (DfE),	6.46
		Resource Efficiency, Recycling, Reuse and Reduce	
6.9	An In	dustrial Ecology <i>Ex-Ante</i> Model for Toxic and Hazardous Waste	6.48
	Manag	gement: Summary	



7 CON	ICLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	7.1
7.1	Introduction	7.3
7.2	Overall Findings: The Need for Change from End-of-Pipe Approach to a	
	Ecosystem Approach for Sustainability	7.6
7.3	Overall Findings: an <i>Ex-Ante</i> Industrial Ecology (IE) Model for	
	Sustainable Industrial Toxic and Hazardous Waste Management in	
	Malaysia	7.10
7.4	Overall Findings: Challenges in Implementing an Industrial Ecology (IE)	
	Concept and Approach for Industrial Toxic and Hazardous Waste	
	Management in Malaysia	7.11
	7.4.1 Establishing the Industrial Ecology Concept and Approach for	
	Industrial Toxic and Hazardous Waste Management in Malaysia	7.16
7.5	Conclusion of the Study	7.18
7.6	Recommendations of The Study	

	R.1
REFERENCES	A.1
APPENDICES	B.1
<b>BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR</b>	



# LIST OF TABLES

Table

2.1	Industrial Wastes in Japan	2.10
2.2	Waste Generation in Germany - 1996 to 2000	2.12
2.3	Taiwan Industrial Waste Management Strategy	2.32
2.4	Future Objectives for Taiwan Industrial Waste Management	2.34
2.5	Agencies Responsible for Hazardous Wastes Management in Thailand	2.37
2.6	Hazardous Waste Treatment Centres in Thailand Prior to 1994	2.39
2.7	Known Industrial Toxic and Hazardous Waste Incidents	2.42
3.1	List of Agencies, Legislations and Their Scope in Managing Toxic and	3.7
	Hazardous Waste in Malaysia.	0.11
3.2	Reported Incidents of Toxic and Hazardous Dumping in Malaysia.	3.11
3.3	Summary of Selected Laws Related to Selected Components in the Life Cycle of Industrial Waste.	3.14
3.4	Agreed and Divergence Elements of Industrial Ecology Definitions.	3.22
3.5	Examples of Industrial Ecology Cases.	3.25
3.6	Exchange of Resources in Kalundborg Industrial Ecosystem.	3.27
3.7	The Profits of Kalundborg Industrial Ecosystem	3.29
4.1	Assessment Means Value Criteria	4.18
4.2	Magnitude of Importance	4.23
4.3	Priority Score for Magnitude of Importance	4.23
4.4	SWOT-AHP Analysis for Comparison Between IE and EOP Approach	4.24
4.5	Ecosystem Stakeholder Matrix for Ex-Ante Industrial Ecology Model of	4.27
	Toxic and Hazardous Waste Management in Malaysia	
4.6	Indicators Cluster According to Its Importance for Each Management Sector	4.33
4.7	Important Indicators for Industrial Toxic and Hazardous Wastes	4.33
	Management in Malaysia	
5.1	Number of Survey Respondents According to Group.	5.3
5.2	Selected Respondents for SWOT-AHP Analysis	5.4
5.3	Toxic and Hazardous Waste Generation According to Types from 1994 to 2003	5.12
54	Correlation between Industry Production Index and Waste Generation	5 1 5
5 5	Correlation between Manufacturing Production Index and Waste	5.15
5.5	Generation.	5.15
5.6	Correlation between Manufacturing Production GDP and Waste	5.15
57	Generation. Taxia and Hazardaya Wasta Exported (Matria Tar) by Veer	5 10
J.1 5 0	Toxic and Hazardous Waste Exponed (Metric Ton) by Year.	5.19
5.8	Toxic and Hazardous waste Imported (Metric 10n) by Year.	5.20
5.9	(Percent).	5.21
5.10:	Estimated Cost of Treatment of Toxic and Hazardous Waste Generated from 2000 to 2003 in Malaysia (RM Million)	5.23
5 1 1	Costs of Treatment Based on KA Rates of Treatment Fee	5 24
5 12	Estimated Costs (Ringgit Malaysia) for Treatment of Toxic and	5.2 <del>-</del> 5.26
J.14	Louinated Coold (Rungsit managera) for frouthout of forthe and	5.40



	Hazardous Waste Exported from 1997 to 2003.	
5.13	Estimated Value of Toxic and Hazardous Waste Exported from	5.27
	1997 to 2003.	
5.14	Risk Level of Toxic and Hazardous Waste.	5.29
5.15	Treatment Cost for Selected Toxic and Hazardous Waste Based on Their	5.30
	Risk.	
5.16	Risk Levels and Estimated Treatment Costs of Selected Toxic and	5.32
	Hazardous Waste for 1999 to 2003.	
5.17	Delphi Consensus Ranking for Legislation Factors.	5.38
5.18	Delphi Consensus Ranking for Institutional Factors.	5.39
5.19	Delphi Consensus Ranking for Financial Factors.	5.40
5.20	Delphi Consensus Ranking for Technology Factors.	5.41
5.21	<u>Results of SWOT Analysis</u> for Legislation Factors.	5.44
5.22	SWO1-AHP analysis priorities for End-of-Pipe (EOP) and Industrial	5.45
5.02	Ecology (IE) Approach for Legislation.	5 40
5.23	Number of Fines Issued under the Environmental Quality (Scheduled Wester), Regulation 1080	5.49
5.24	Wastes), Regulation 1969.	5 62
5.24	According to Activity	5.02
5 25	SWOT Analysis for End-of-Pine (EOP) Approach for Institutional	5 70
5.25	SWOT AHP Analysis for End-of-Pipe (EOP) and Industrial	5.70
5.20	Ecology (IE) Approach for Institutional	5.71
5.27	SWOT Cluster and Factors for Financial	5.91
5.28	SWOT-AHP Analysis Priorities for End-of-Pipe (EOP) and Industrial	5.92
0.20	Ecology (IE) Approach for Financial.	0172
5.29	R&D Expenditure by Government and Private Sectors for Waste	5.95
	Management and Recycling from 1994 to 2002.	
5.30	SWOT Cluster and Factors for Technology Sector.	5.111
5.31	SWOT-AHP Analysis Priorities for End-of-Pipe (EOP) and Industrial	5.112
	Ecology (IE) Approach for Technology.	
6.1	Habitats and Ecosystem Process for Industrial Toxic and Hazardous	6.13
	Waste Management Model in Malaysia.	
6.2	Habitat One Matrix for Stakeholders, Targets, Functions and Services.	6.17
6.3	Habitat Two Matrix for Stakeholders, Targets, Functions and Services.	6.21
6.4	Habitat Three Matrix for Stakeholders, Targets, Functions and Services.	6.25
6.5	Habitat Four Matrix for Stakeholders, Targets, Functions and Services.	6.29
6.6	Important Indicators for Industrial Toxic and Hazardous Waste	6.31
	Management in Malaysia	
6.7	Exponential Model: Waste Generation Scenario at $4\%$ per year (r = 0.04).	6.35
6.8	Exponential Model: Waste Recovery Scenario at 4% per year ( $r = 0.04$ ).	6.35
6.9	Linear Model: Waste Generation at 4% per year ( $r = 0.04$ ).	6.39
6.10	Linear Model: Waste Recovery at 4% per year ( $r = 0.04$ ).	6.40
6.11	Matsushita Group Green Plan 2010.	6.44

|



# LIST OF FIGURES

# Figure

2.1	Municipal Waste Generation in Japan 1965 to 1995.	2.17
2.2	Industrial Waste Generation in Japan 1989 to 2000.	2.17
2.3	Industrial Waste Composition in Japan Year 2000.	2.18
2.4	Industrial Waste Generator in Japan for Year 2000.	2.18
2.5	Industrial Waste Generation by Region in Japan for Year 2000.	2.19
2.6	Flow of Municipal Solid Waste in Japan, 1997.	2.20
2.7	Flow of Industrial Waste Management in Japan, 1997.	2.20
2.8	Legal system for the establishment of a Recycling Oriented Society in	2.22
	Janan.	
29	Role of Stakeholders for Waste Management in Japan	2.23
$\frac{2.9}{2.10}$	The Chronology of Legislation and Strategic Direction in US	2.29
2.10	Ton Ten Hazardous Waste Generation in Taiwan for Year 2000	2.2
2.11 2.12	Taiwan FPA IWCC Framework	2.31 2.32
2.12.		2.52
3.1	Quantity of Scheduled Waste Generation from 1994 to 2003.	3.10
3.2	Linear Materials Flow in Type I Ecology	3 23
33	Quasi-Cyclic Materials Flows in Type I Ecology	3.23
3.5	Type III Industrial Ecosystem	3.23
3. <del>1</del> 3.5	Kalundhorg Industrial Symbiosis	3.24
5.5	Kalandoorg industrial Symolosis.	5.20
4.1:	Methodology Diagram.	4.3
4.2	Results Analysis and an <i>Ex-Ante</i> Industrial Ecology Model Development	4.13
	Flow.	
4.3	Hierarchy of End-of-Pipe Approach for Industrial Toxic and Hazardous	4.20
	Waste Management.	
4.4:	End-of-pipe Approach in Managing Industrial Toxic and Hazardous	4.21
	Waste in Malaysia.	
4.5	Hierarchy of Industrial Ecology Approach for Industrial Toxic and	4.22
	Hazardous Waste Management.	4.29
4.6	Proposed Model of Industrial Ecology Approach in Managing Industrial	
	Toxic and Hazardous Waste in Malaysia.	4.30
4.7	Habitats in Industrial Ecology Model for Toxic and Hazardous Wastes	
	Management in Malaysia	4.31
		1101
5.1	Malaysian GDP from year 1992 to 2004.	5.7
5.2	Production Index for Industry and Manufacturing in Malaysia.	5.8
5.3	Percentage GDP Contribution of Manufacturing to National GDP from	5.8
010	1992 to 2004.	210
5.4	Trend of Factory Establishment in Malaysia from 1993 to 2002.	5.9
5.5	Scheduled Waste Generation from 1994 to 2003.	5.11
5.6	Number of Factories Generating Toxic and Hazardous Wastes and Waste	5.13
0.0	Generated in Malaysia from 1994 to 2002.	0110
5.7	Production Index for All Industries and Manufacturing Sector in	5.13
	Malavsia by Year.	
5.8	Relation between Industry Production Index and Waste Generation.	5.16
5.9	Relation between Manufacturing Production Index with Waste	5.16



Generation.

	Generation.	
5.10	Distribution of Toxic and Hazardous Wastes in Malaysia from Year 2000 to 2003.	5.19
5.11	Import and Export of Toxic and Hazardous Waste from 1995 to 2003.	5.21
5.12:	Fate of Toxic and Hazardous Waste in Malaysia for 2000 to 2003.	5.22
5.13:	Amount of Scheduled Waste Handled by Kualiti Alam Waste	5.61
5.14:	SWOT-AHP Analysis Comparison of Results between the EOP and IE	5.68
	Approaches for Legislation.	
5.15:	SWOT-AHP Analysis Comparison of Results between the EOP and IE Approaches for Institutional	5.89
5.15	SWOT-AHP Analysis Comparison of Results between the EOP and IE	5.107
0.110	Approaches for Financial.	01107
5.16	A Schematic Diagram of the Typical Life Cycle of the Relationship between the State of Technological Development of Society and its	5.110
	Resulting Environmental Impact.	
5.18	SWOT-AHP Analysis Comparison Results between EOP and IE	5.128
	Approach for Technology.	
6.1	Industrial Ecology Model for Toxic and Hazardous Waste Management	6.11
	in Malaysia.	
6.2	Habitats in Industrial Ecology Model for Toxic and Hazardous Wastes Management in Malaysia.	6.14
6.3	Habitat One: Resource Extraction and Production Components.	6.16
6.4	Habitat Two: Manufacturing, Consumption and Waste Generation	6.20
	Components.	
6.5	Habitat Three: Waste Recovery Components.	6.24
6.6	Habitat Four: Treatment and Disposals.	6.28
6.7	Exponential Scenario for Total Annual Value Treatment Costs of Acid	6.36
6.0	waste.	C 11
6.8	Waste.	6.41
6.9	Global Matsushita Electric Environmental Vision formulated in October 2001.	6.43
6.10	MELCOM Recovery Trends.	6.44
6.11	MELCOM Recycling Rate and Targets.	6.45
6.12	Shared Process between Habitat in The Ecosystem for Industrial	6.49
	Toxic and Hazardous Waste Management in Malaysia	



# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

3R	Reuse, Reduce and Recycle
AHP	Analytical hierarchy process
DfE	Design for Environment
DOE	Department of Environment Malaysia
DOSH	Department of Safety and Health Malaysia
DSD	Duales System Deutschland
EC	European Commission
EMS	Environmental Management System
EOP	End-of-Pipe Approach
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency Taiwan
EQA	Environmental Quality Act 1974, Malaysia
ESM	Environmentally Sound Management
EU	European Union
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GPS	Global Positioning System
IE	Industrial Ecology
IMP	Industrial Master Plan Malaysia
IMP2	Industrial Master Plan 2 Malaysia
ISO	International Standard Organization
IWCC	Industrial Waste Control Centre Taiwan
KA	Kualiti Alam Sdn Bhd
LDR	Land Disposal Restriction Program
LIFT	Legislation, Institutional, Financial and Technology



MIC	Methyl isocyanate
MIDA	Malaysian Industrial Development Authority
MOEA	Ministry of Economic Affair Taiwan
MOSTE	Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment Thailand
MSW	Municipal Solid Waste
NRE	Ministry of Natural Resource and Environment Malaysia
OECD	Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development
РСВ	Polychlorinated byphenil
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act 1976, United States
RM	Ringgit Malaysia
SIRIM	Standards and Industrial Research Institute of Malaysia
SMIDEC	Small and Medium Industry Development Corporation
SWDA	Solid Waste Disposal Act 1965, United States
SWOT	Strength, Weakness, Opportunities and Threat
UNEP	United Nation Environment Programme
US	United States
USA	United States of America
USEPA	United States Environment Protection Agency
WCED	World Commission on Environment and Development



Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Doktor Falsafah

## PEMBENTUKAN MODEL PENGURUSAN SISA TOKSIK DAN BERBAHAYA INDUSTRI BERASASKAN PENDEKATAN "END-OF-PIPE" DAN EKOLOGI INDUSTRI

Oleh

#### AHMAD FARIZ MOHAMED

**Ogos 2007** 

#### Pengerusi: Professor Muhammad Awang, PhD.

Fakulti: Pengajian Alam Sekitar

Kajian tesis ini menilai sistem pengurusan sisa toksik dan berbahaya industri di Malaysia. Kajian juga merangkumi analisa tren penghasilan sisa, pembangunan industri dan pengambilan semula sisa. Penilaian dan analisis dasar dan pengurusan menjurus kepada empat sektor iaitu perundangan, institusi, kewangan dan teknologi (LIFT). Hasil penilaian dan analisis dan juga maklumat lain yang dikumpul telah digunakan untuk menentukan isu-isu dan lompang dalam pengurusan sisa. Bahagian seterusnya kajian tesis ini membangunkan sistem pengurusan yang lebih baik melalui model exante ekologi industri untuk pengurusan sisa toksik dan berbahaya di Malaysia, yang menggunakan konsep dan pendekatan ekosistem dalam konteks sudut pandangan pembangunan lestari.

Analisa tren yang dilakukan termasuk analisa penghasilan sisa, pengembalian sisa, pembangunan industria dan pengeluaran industri. Industi Malaysia menghasilakn 4.1 juta metric ton sisa toksik dan berbahaya dari tahun 1994 hingga 2003, dengan purata



418,230 metrik ton setahun. Hasilan analisa menunjukan tren pertumbuhan industri pembuatan untuk indeks pengeluaran dan sumbangan KDNK menunjukkan hubungan korelasi positif dengan penghasilan sisa sebelum tahun 1996 dan selepas 1997. Pengurusan sisa di Malaysia boleh dikategorikan kepada tiga aktiviti iaitu, rawatan dan pelupusan, ekspot and pengembalian semula sisa. Analisa agihan telah menunjukkan ia menyokong pengurusan menggunakan pendekatan ekosistem. Ini adalah kerana peningkatan jumlah pengembalian semula sisa toksik dan berbahaya melalui perlaksanaan inisiatif kitar semula sisa dan keberkesana guna sumber. Jumlah pengembalian semula sisa meningkat dua kali ganda, dari 120,570 metric pada tahun 2000 kepada 250,260 metrik ton pada tahun 2003. Dalam peratus, pengembalian semula sisa menyumbang 34.99 % pada tahun 2000 dan 54.30 % pada tahun 2003, dengan jumlah anggaran nilai RM 2.83 bilion untuk tempoh dari tahun 2000 hingga 2003.

Penyiasatan dan analisa juga telah dilakukan untuk menentukan kebolehgunaan pendekatan ekosistem untuk pengurusan sisa toksik dan berbahaya di Malaysia. Analisa dasar dan pengurusan telah dilakukan untuk memeriksa kepentingan factor-faktor yang merujuk kepada sektor LIFT. Faktor-faktor yang telah dikenalpasti digunakan sebagai komponen utama untuk membangunkan model ex-ante Ekologi Industri untuk pengurusan sisa toksik dan berbahaya yang baik. Model ini dibangunkan dengan mempunyai ekosistem sendiri dan merangkumi empat habitat. Setiap habitat mempunyai peranan, fungsi dan memberi perkhidmatan. Rangkaian yang wujud antara habitat mempertingkatkan keberkesanan ekosistem. Model ex-ante ini memfokus kepada pengurusan aliran sisa toksik dan berbahaya sebagai sumber dan mensasarkan peningkatan kitaran sisa kepada sumber serta mengurangkan kitaran sumber sebagai



sisa. Intipati model ini ia mempromosikan peranan pro-aktif industri dan perniagaan serta membantu mempertingkatkan imej alam sekitar mereka. Sehubungan itu juga meningkatkan keyakinan pelanggan terhadap produk dan meningkatkan jualan. Secara keseluruhan kajian tesis ini jelas menunjukkan bahawa pendekatan ekosistem amat berguna. Antara laba yang penting adalah pengurangan pelupusan sisa ke persekitaran, pengurangan kebergantungan kepada sumber asli seperti tanah untuk pelupusan sisa serta peningkatan keberkesanan aktiviti permonitoran dan penguatkuasaan. Akhirnya kesemua laba ini juga menguntungkan kerajaan dan masyarakat untuk mencapai pembangunan industri lestari di Malaysia.



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

## DEVELOPMENT OF AN INDUSTRIAL TOXIC AND HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT MODEL BASED ON END-OF-PIPE AND INDUSTRIAL ECOLOGY APPROACHES

By

#### AHMAD FARIZ MOHAMED

#### August 2007

#### Chairman: Professor Muhammad Awang, PhD.

#### Faculty: Environmental Studies

This study attempts to evaluate the existing industrial toxic and hazardous wastes management systems in Malaysia and subsequently proposed a new model for enhancing the efficiency and sustainability of the system. This includes analyzing the trends in waste generation, industrial development, industrial production and waste recovery. Evaluation and analysis of policy and management were focused on four main sectors, namely, legislation, institutional, financial and technology (LIFT). Findings of evaluation and analysis as well as other information gathered were used to determine issues and gaps in managing wastes. Subsequently the study developed a model for a better management system based on ex-ante Industrial Ecology model for industrial toxic and hazardous waste management in Malaysia using ecosystem concept and approach within the sustainable industrial development perspective.

Trend analysis has been conducted which includes the analysis of waste generation, waste recovery, industrial development and industrial output. Malaysian industry



generated 4.1 million metric tons of toxic and hazardous wastes from 1994 to 2003, with an average of 418,230 metric tons per year. It appeared that the growth trend of manufacturing in terms of production index and GDP contribution had a positive correlation with waste generation prior to 1996 and after 1997. The management of wastes in Malaysia could be categorized into three activities namely, treatment and disposal, export to foreign countries, and waste recovery. The analysis of waste distribution supported the suggestion for the ecosystem approach management. This is due to the fact that increasing amounts of toxic and hazardous waste has been recovered following the adoption of waste recycling and resource efficiency initiatives. The amount of waste being recovered has doubled from 120,570 metric tons in 2000 to 250,260 metric tons in year 2003. In terms of percentage of waste recovery represented 34.99% for 2000 and 54.30% for 2003, respectively of total wastes generated with estimated value of RM 2.83 billion.

Further investigation and analysis has been performed to determine the applicability of ecosystem approach for toxic and hazardous management in Malaysia. Policy and management analyses were conducted to examine the importance of the factors based on LIFT sectors. These identified factors were adopted as the main components towards the development of an ex-ante Industrial Ecology model for a better toxic and hazardous waste management in Malaysia. The model was created as an ecosystem encompassing four habitats. Each of these habitats has its own role, function and service as well as the networks between the habitats improves the ecosystem efficiency. Essentially the ex-ante model ecosystem focused on managing the flow of waste as a resource with the main target being to increase the cycle of waste to resources and to reduce the flow of resources to waste. In essence it promotes more pro-active roles by industry and business



and helps to enhance their environmental image thus increasing consumer confidence in their products and therefore sales. The overall finding of the present study clearly indicates that ecosystem approach proved to be useful. The benefits include minimization of waste disposals to the environment, reduction of dependency on natural resources such as land use for disposal sites and enhancement of efficient monitoring and enforcement activity. Finally all these benefits would lead to increased benefits to government and the society in terms of achieving sustainable industrial development in Malaysia.



#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Alhamdullilah, I am grateful to Allah S.W.T for His guidance and blessing in enabling me to complete this thesis. I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisors Prof. Dr. Muhammad Awang, Associate Profesor Dr. Mohd Nasir Hassan and Dato' Dr. Abu Bakar Jaafar, as well as an advisor Prof. Dr. Karen Badri for their guidance and assistance in my research work and preparation of the thesis. I also would like to express my appreciation to Prof. Emeritus Dr. Mohd Nordin Hj. Hasan, Prof. Datuk Dr. Abdul Samad Hadi and friends in LESTARI, UKM and all the people who provide guidance, inspiration, support, ideas and assistance. Also a great appreciation to my late parents, Hj. Mohamed Kamdani and Hajah Jamaliah Jamil for the education and guidance of life they give. Lastly, I am grateful to my wife Haiza Ibrahim, for the inspiration and moral support throughout my thesis work.



I certify that an Examination Committee has met on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2007 to conduct the final examination of Ahmad Fariz Bin Hj Mohamed on his degree thesis entitled "Development of An Industrial Toxic and Hazardous Waste Management Model Based On End of Pipe and Industrial Ecology Approaches" in accordance with Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Act 1980 and Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Regulations 1981. The Committee recommends that the candidate be awarded the relevant degree. Members of the Examination Committee are as follows:

## Mohamed Ibrahim Hj. Mohamed, PhD.

Professor, Capt. Department of Environmental Management Faculty of Environmental Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia (Chairman)

## Mohd Ismail Yaziz, PhD.

Associate Professor Department of Environmental Science Faculty of Environmental Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia (Internal Examiner)

#### Puziah Abdul Latiff, PhD.

Department of Environmental Science Faculty of Environmental Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia (Internal Examiner)

## Raymond Cotê, PhD.

Professor School of Resource and Environmental Studies Faculty of Management Dalhousie University Canada (External Examiner)

HASANAH MOHD GHAZALI, PhD.

Professor/Deputy Dean School of Graduate Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 16 August 2007



This thesis submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee are as follows:

## Muhammad Awang, PhD.

Professor Faculty of Environmental Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia (Chairman)

## Mohd Nasir Hassan, PhD.

Associate Professor Faculty of Environmental Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia (Member)

# Dato' Abu Bakar Jaafar, PhD.

Enviro-LIFT Sdn Bhd (Member)

## AINI IDERIS, PhD.

Professor/Dean School of Graduate Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 13 September 2007



## DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the thesis is based on my original work except for quotations and citations which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously or concurrently submitted for any other degree at UPM or other institutions.

## AHMAD FARIZ BIN HJ MOHAMED

Date: 15 August 2007



#### **CHAPTER 1**

#### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Introduction

Industrial toxic and hazardous wastes are two of the key environmental pollutants. The absence of an effective management regime for these wastes has created many issues and opportunities. The impact and implication of these wastes go beyond the common production line of industries to the consumption of products. Illegal dumping and accidents involving toxic and hazardous wastes negatively affect humans and the environment, the impact of which will last many years (Carson, 1962, Bellandi, 1995 and Colten and Skinner, 1996). One of the world's well known examples was the case of Love Canal in Niagara Falls, USA where the impact of illegal dumping of hazardous wastes created negative incidents to human and the environment from 1954 to 1977 (Colten and Skinner, 1996). The costs of remediation of the dumping have come to over USD 250 million. These incidents lead to President Carter to issue two environmental emergencies for the Love Canal area in 1978 and 1980, resulting in the evacuation of 950 families from a 10 square block area surrounding the landfill (USEPA, 2004).

Therefore it is important to have a secured and efficient toxic and hazardous wastes management system. This system will ensure that the handling of these wastes would minimize its impact on humans and the environment. Rapid technological development enables these wastes to be handled and treated safely albeit increasing amount of toxic and hazardous wastes are generated. But the question remains, how long do we have to



manage these wastes using this end-of-pipe approach? Since the costs incurred in managing the waste keep increasing, a sustainable solution needs to be identified. The solution must ensure that toxic and hazardous wastes generation would not give negative impact on humans and the environment as well as to achieve sustainable industrial development in Malaysia.

#### **1.2** Statement of Problem

Malaysia, as one of the fastest developing countries in the Asia region has, for the last three decades, been experiencing rapid development. One of the key sectors contributing to Malaysia's economic growth is the manufacturing industry. For thirty years, the manufacturing sector has become Malaysia's key economic generator. The rapid growth of manufacturing industries increased income and quality of life. Industrial developments in Malaysia started in the early 1960s and in 1996 contributed RM 45.2 billion to the growth domestic product (GDP). Although during the economic recession from 1997 to 1998 manufacturing growth reduced to 13.4% of GDP contribution, the growth has bounced back to 13.5% in 1999 and 21% in 2000. This growth has contributed to 33.4% of Malaysia GDP in 2000 (Malaysia, 2001). The Manufacturing industry will continue as a key sector in the economy of Malaysia with target growth of 8.9% per annum from 2001 to 2005 which will contribute 35.8% to the GDP by 2005 (Malaysia, 2001). The positive impact of industrial growth in Malaysia however does have negative implications for the environment. One of the issues is the need to manage industrial toxic and hazardous waste effectively which has been one of the key environmental issues in Malaysia.



Toxic and hazardous waste generation varied where 417,413 metric tons of waste was generated in 1994. The amount of wastes generated then increased to 632,521 metric tons in 1996, however reduced to 460,865.74 metric tons in 2003 (DoE, 1995, 2000, 2004). Thus the existing management system needs to address measures in handling increasing and complex industrial toxic and hazardous waste issues. Based on the manufacturing production and consumption of resources scenario, industrial toxic and hazardous waste management in Malaysia has been focusing on end-of-pipe approach. Using the cradle to grave system, much of the waste was sent to facilities for treatment and disposal (Lindgren, 1989). Moreover, with the industrial community's attitude regarding waste as waste, some of them do not bother to manage their waste with care (Taiwan EPA, 2004). This promotes increasing generation of waste annually with only small amount being recovered, since the waste is currently regarded as a non-valuable resource. Furthermore the costs of handling and disposal of toxic and hazardous waste will increase industries operating costs which make managing waste a burden. Therefore, some industries illegally disposed the waste into lakes, rivers, seas and plantations or export to other countries illegally. Many cases of illegal disposals have taken place and have given significant negative impacts to the environment and human health (Third World Network. 1989, Goh, 1990, The Star, 2003a, The Star, 2003b). This is true, since a significant number of compounds have been issued by DoE under Environmental Quality (Scheduled Wastes) Regulation of 1989 for illegal dumping of toxic and hazardous wastes activities. The number of compounds issued have increased from 193 in 1994 to 599 in 1998 and then the number of compounds reduced to 450 in 2003 (DoE, 1995, 2000, 2004).

