

# RSC Sustainability

Accepted Manuscript

This article can be cited before page numbers have been issued, to do this please use: K. M. Ripley, F. H. Saadi and Z. L. Burke, *RSC Sustain.*, 2024, DOI: 10.1039/D4SU00590B.



This is an Accepted Manuscript, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. We will replace this Accepted Manuscript with the edited and formatted Advance Article as soon as it is available.

You can find more information about Accepted Manuscripts in the [Information for Authors](#).

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard [Terms & Conditions](#) and the [Ethical guidelines](#) still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this Accepted Manuscript or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.

## Sustainability Spotlight Statement

Advancing novel, sustainable technologies for hard-to-decarbonize industries such as cement, steel, and chemicals has been a major research focus in recent years, but to meet global net-zero emission goals by 2050, we need to rapidly decarbonize these sectors. This necessitates that presently available, retrofit technologies are scaled rapidly to abate existing emissions. Consequently, in this work, we investigate the decarbonization potential and costs associated with high TRL technologies available as retrofit alternatives for the cement industry. The findings and methodology presented offer a unique perspective to help existing industrial facilities pursue a cost-optimized combination of approaches to reach their decarbonization goals. This work firmly falls under UN SDGs 9 (industry, innovation, and infrastructure) and 13 (climate action).



# Cost-motivated pathways towards near-term decarbonization of the cement industry

Katelyn M. Ripley, Fadl H. Saadi\*, Zara L'Heureux Burke\*

*Science for America, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, United States*

\* Corresponding author email address: [fadl.saadi@scienceforamerica.org](mailto:fadl.saadi@scienceforamerica.org) and [zara.burke@scienceforamerica.org](mailto:zara.burke@scienceforamerica.org)

## Abstract

Cement production facilities contribute over 8% of global carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions, with approximately 60% of these emissions stemming from process-related activities and the remaining 40% from energy consumption. This unique emission profile means that merely decarbonizing the energy source will be insufficient to achieve net-zero emissions for this sector. Recognizing the hard-to-decarbonize nature of the cement industry, this perspective investigates the costs associated with implementing retrofit decarbonization options at existing cement facilities to expedite emissions reduction. We evaluate the impact of clinker replacement, alternative fuels, point source capture, and direct air capture on both total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and cement production costs. After validating the emissions and costs for baseline cement production and each decarbonization strategy, we develop dispatch curves (a method to sequentially compare costs and removal capacities across available technologies) to identify the most cost-effective pathways to achieve net-zero emissions. Through this analysis, we reveal that utilizing all four decarbonization strategies is potentially the most cost effective and can facilitate a net-zero future for the cement industry with a 29% increase in cement costs. We also explore deployment strategies and tailored solutions for individual facilities. This work builds on substantial progress in the field by analyzing the combined potential of these sustainable technologies to help the industry meet its decarbonization goals.



## 1. Introduction

The effects of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions are recognized as a major challenge of the 21<sup>st</sup> century as global energy use and economic growth continue to rise. This growth and development, especially in low and middle-income countries, often necessitates the deployment of fossil fuels, steel, and cement – each of which are responsible for the release of large quantities of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and other gaseous pollutants that can contribute to accelerated global warming. Global cement production is currently responsible for 8% of global CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and, according to the International Energy Agency (IEA), demand for cement is forecasted to increase by 12–23% by 2050 compared to 2018 levels, with significant growth expected in regions such as South Asia and Africa.<sup>1</sup> If conventional processes are used, this increase in demand will also significantly increase CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Multiple organizations have considered the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions that the cement industry will need to avoid in order to hit specific global temperature rise targets. Specifically, the IEA estimates that to ensure at least a 50% chance of limiting global warming to 2 °C above pre-industrial revolution era average temperatures, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from cement production must decrease by at least 24% between 2018 and 2050 by introducing alternative fuels to reduce energy emissions.<sup>1,2</sup> Alternatively, the Global Cement and Concrete Association (GCCA) has set a more ambitious, net-zero by 2050 goal in order to limit global warming to 1.5 °C.<sup>3</sup> To meet these goals, significant technological advancements in reducing and/or capturing CO<sub>2</sub> emitted during the cement production process must be implemented.

Currently, 95% of hydraulic cement production in the United States is Ordinary Portland Cement (OPC), which is comprised of a mixture of clinker (a binder made of alite, belite, tricalcium aluminate, and calcium aluminoferrite) and gypsum.<sup>4,5</sup> The production of OPC generally requires the integration of several process units and begins with grinding mixtures of limestone and gypsum rocks for calcination in the kiln, as shown in **Figure 1**.<sup>4</sup> To produce the clinker material, the finely ground materials are heated to temperatures as high as 1450 °C, enabling the conversion of limestone to lime ( $\text{CaCO}_3 \xrightarrow{+\text{heat}} \text{CaO} + \text{CO}_2$ ), releasing process related CO<sub>2</sub> emissions that ultimately make up 60% of all cement emissions.<sup>4,6</sup> The



remaining 40% of cement production emissions come from the combustion of either coal or petcoke to heat the kiln.<sup>6–9</sup> Finally, to make OPC after calcination in the kiln, the clinker is cooled and mixed with gypsum to produce the final cement product that is 80–90 wt.% clinker.<sup>4,9,10</sup> Given the direct CO<sub>2</sub> emissions released during cement production, it is evident why such an industry can be “hard-to-decarbonize,” as identifying alternative, clean fuels can only reduce emissions by a fraction of the total. Despite this, there have been significant strides in decarbonizing the cement industry via retrofit technologies that can update OPC manufacturing sites to emit less CO<sub>2</sub>. While new cement production pathways that target reduced process emissions have recently seen growth,<sup>11,12</sup> in this perspective, we will focus on how the utilization of high technology readiness level retrofit alternatives can combat emissions from existing cement plants with long remaining lifetimes. These alternatives include fuel mixtures, clinker replacement, and carbon capture technologies (**Figure 1**).

One extensively investigated retrofit technology involves replacing carbon intensive coal and petcoke with cleaner fuel alternatives. While in other industries, such as the power sector, coal can be phased out of use due to the availability of renewables and other clean energy sources,<sup>13</sup> the high temperatures required for the calcination of limestone and the importance of the flame temperature in ensuring high quality clinker product has historically limited the shift from coal/petcoke to clean, alternative fuels or electricity.<sup>8,9</sup> In the last several decades, however, the shift from a single, wet kiln (i.e., a kiln that dries, dehydrates, calcines, and sinters/burns the raw materials) to a combination of a pre-calciner with a dry kiln (i.e., a kiln that only performs the sintering/burning process) has reduced the clinker calcination time and nearly halved the energy required at elevated temperatures.<sup>14,15</sup> This allows more time to be spent operating at lower temperatures which can be achieved using alternative fuels.<sup>14,15</sup> Lower carbon content fuels such as natural gas, biomass, and municipal solid waste have been considered as alternatives to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from cement plants.<sup>9</sup> In industrial applications, biomass-based alternative fuels are often used in mixtures with coal/petcoke, and it is estimated that by 2050, this mixture will comprise of 30% coal, 10% petcoke, and 60% biomass-based fuels.<sup>14</sup> While some cement plants have explored alternative, higher rates of



replacement fractions, regulatory requirements and restrictions often limit the extent of replacement. Given the importance of maintaining high quality clinker, monitoring the relevant operating conditions associated with alternative fuels (i.e., a fuel mixture or full replacement by natural gas) has been shown to prevent the loss of clinker quality.<sup>9,16</sup> In order to ensure that the biomass-based fuels are properly pre-treated (i.e., ground to ideal sizes, dried, cleaned, etc.) and that appropriate kilns are used to burn the fuel completely, additional capital expenditures must be made to upgrade the fuel choice.<sup>17</sup>

Next, given the large fraction of emissions that stem from clinker production (i.e., both process and energy emissions), significant research has been done to investigate the replacement of clinker with alternative supplementary cementing materials (SCMs). SCMs can be used to reduce the total mass of clinker required per ton of cement produced, while still maintaining similar mechanical properties to OPC.<sup>18</sup> Fly ash or blast furnace slag, two of the main SCMs used to date, are byproducts of the combustion of pulverized coal and of steel production, respectively.<sup>10</sup> While over the last 20 years their use in cement has increased (with fly ash utilization approaching 60% in 2021 in the United States), it is anticipated that the combined supply of fly ash and slag will decrease as the carbon-heavy industries attempt to improve their sustainable practices as well.<sup>10,19</sup> Alternatively, calcined clays have been identified as a promising option for the future of SCMs, as they are found in abundance across all sections of the earth's crust.<sup>18,20</sup> Despite their use in India in the 1970s before fly ash was widely available, clay is not used extensively across the world. Specifically, blends of calcined clays, non-calcined limestone, and clinker (LC<sup>3</sup>) can reduce clinker content in cement from 80–90% of the total cement mass down to 50%.<sup>18,21</sup> Because large fractions of clinker are replaced by clay that does not emit CO<sub>2</sub> during calcination, the process CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are substantially reduced: prior studies reported that by reducing the clinker content in cement from just 70 to 60% by mass, it is possible to reduce the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 13.6% from a fossil fuel baseline.<sup>22</sup> Additionally, current cement facilities can produce LC<sup>3</sup> cement with little alterations to the equipment infrastructure, specifically the kiln.



A third decarbonization technology involves removing and storing CO<sub>2</sub> from the effluent gas streams leaving the cement facility. Given the “hard-to-decarbonize” nature of cement manufacturing, carbon capture, utilization, and storage (CCUS) is anticipated to play a large role in addressing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with cement manufacturing. Gaseous waste streams leaving cement plants have concentrations of 14–33 vol. % CO<sub>2</sub>, thus it is likely that point-source capture (PSC) can be a viable option for reducing up to 90% of the total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.<sup>23,24</sup> The exact mechanism by which PSC is most efficient and cost-effective might vary by application, as both post-combustion capture and oxy-combustion capture have been proposed for use in cement plants.<sup>25</sup> Because both options have unique advantages and disadvantages, in this investigation, we will treat the carbon capture facility as technology agnostic and simply estimate viable cost ranges for a PSC facility. These costs will outline goals for each technology to optimize the emissions reductions and associated costs.


Finally, net negative CO<sub>2</sub> capture platforms such as direct air capture (DAC) and storage are likely necessary for cement manufacturing, as the high process emissions and lack of alternative methods to produce OPC will make it incredibly difficult to reach net-zero emissions. Thus, in addition to PSC, DAC can help remove CO<sub>2</sub> from the atmosphere without making any changes to the cement plant. To the best of our knowledge, a full analysis comparing the cost of upgrading a cement manufacturing plant to reduce total emissions (i.e., via retrofit options) with the cost of simply buying carbon credits generated from proven DAC and storage facilities has yet to be done. Assuming the carbon credits purchased from DAC would be in line with any carbon taxes, this sets an upper limit for the cost at which cement manufacturers will eventually be willing to pay for upgrading to a more sustainable framework.

Growing awareness surrounding the need to decarbonize the cement industry has led to several reviews and perspectives outlining the technological viability of pursuing the above tactics.<sup>4,8,9,20,26,27</sup> Despite this interest, there have been limited publications to inform the most promising and affordable pathways towards decarbonization at scale. It is unlikely that one technology will be the single solution to decarbonizing the cement industry, thus a variety of options will need to be pursued.<sup>6</sup> The deployment of these options will



depend on the scale of the cement plant and CO<sub>2</sub> removal, requiring a marginal cost analysis that not only investigates the raw cost of implementing such technologies, but can also prioritize which technology should be pursued first to achieve a baseline level of emissions reduction while limiting the costs to the cement manufacturer. Technoeconomic studies have been done on these individual platforms, but, to the best of our knowledge, further recommendations surrounding optimal pathways to pursue have not been investigated.<sup>25,28–30</sup>

In this perspective, we approach the problem of decarbonizing the cement industry by developing an in-house model to compare the decarbonization potential of each retrofit technology on removing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the United States cement industry. We first validate the estimated emissions with prior data and develop a holistic cost analysis of each platform in order to investigate the impacts of implementing a single technology or combining any/all the retrofit options. We use this technoeconomic model to evaluate the optimal sequence for deploying technologies to decarbonize the industry, aiming to minimize the total costs of abatement. The final costs associated with these decarbonization pathways are ultimately compared to inform which combination of technologies can minimize the costs to the manufacturer while achieving emissions removal goals. This technoeconomic analysis and discussion provides a basis upon which cement facilities can prioritize currently available technologies to meet near-term decarbonization goals.



**Figure 1.** Schematic of the cement production outlining the key process steps and retrofit decarbonization options that we will discuss in this work. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with this process can come from process emissions from the calcination of limestone (CaCO<sub>3</sub>) to lime (CaO) and fuel consumption. In this work, we consider mitigating these emissions by evaluating the costs of 1) alternative fuels, 2) clinker





replacement by supplementary cementing materials (SCMs), 3) point-source capture (PSC), and 4) direct-air capture (DAC).

## 2. Methodology

To provide insight to the most viable decarbonization pathways, we consider both the total emissions avoided and the associated retrofitting costs of the decarbonization technologies outlined above. We start by developing an accurate baseline emissions model and describe further calculations of the emissions reductions associated with the decarbonization pathways. Following this, we discuss the approach we take to calculate the costs of implementing the technologies.

### 2.1. Model Validation

To calculate the baseline emissions associated with the cement industry, we assume uniform fuel, clinker fraction, and kiln efficiencies based on average values reported in 2021 in the Getting the Numbers Right (GNR) database for the United States cement industry.<sup>10</sup> While these assumptions oversimplify the nature of the cement industry in the United States, the trends in operating emissions still apply regardless of the absolute values of the above metrics for specific plants. Additionally, we assume that the reported baseline kiln efficiencies and fuel consumption rates apply to a fuel comprised of only coal. Using the reported emissions factor values for coal (an average of the emissions factors for bituminous, subbituminous, and lignite coal) and the U.S. average yearly cement production (**SI Section S.1.**), we calculate that the U.S. emitted 55.9 Mt CO<sub>2</sub> from cement production in 2021, which agrees well with the 54.2 Mt CO<sub>2</sub> reported in the GNR report.<sup>10</sup> Additional details surrounding our estimation of carbon emissions for both the baseline scenario and the retrofit decarbonization options are included in the **SI Section S.1.**

A further validation of the model involves investigating the effects of replacing clinker with alternative SCMs. When performing a similar investigation of clinker replacement, Fennel et al. found that total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions dropped by 13.6% when reducing clinker content from 0.7 to 0.6.<sup>22</sup> Using the framework outlined



in the **SI Section S.1.**, our model predicts that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions will drop from 47 Mt<sub>CO<sub>2</sub></sub> yr<sup>-1</sup> to 42 Mt<sub>CO<sub>2</sub></sub> yr<sup>-1</sup> (or a 10.6% drop in emissions) between clinker contents of 0.7 and 0.6, confirming alignment with the prior findings.

## 2.2. Costing Analysis Framework

When a technology is upgraded, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are reduced in accordance with the relationships developed in the **SI Section S.1.**; however, additional upfront investments may be required, and operating costs may be altered, affecting the overall production costs. Assuming a constant cement production rate per year, we can price the new materials and fuels according to **Eq. 1**.

$$C_{\text{cement}} = C_{\text{CAPEX}} + C_{\text{OPEX, fuel}} + C_{\text{OPEX, raw materials}} + C_{\text{capture}} \quad (\text{Eq. 1})$$

Where  $C_{\text{cement}}$  (\$ t<sub>cement</sub><sup>-1</sup>) is the total cost to produce a single ton of cement,  $C_{\text{CAPEX}}$  (\$ t<sub>cement</sub><sup>-1</sup>) is the capital cost amortized over the lifetime of the plant,  $C_{\text{OPEX, fuel}}$  (\$ t<sub>cement</sub><sup>-1</sup>) is the fuel cost to produce a ton of cement,  $C_{\text{OPEX, raw materials}}$  (\$ t<sub>cement</sub><sup>-1</sup>) is the raw material cost required to produce a ton of cement, and  $C_{\text{capture}}$  (\$ t<sub>cement</sub><sup>-1</sup>) is the cost per ton of cement to capture CO<sub>2</sub> over the lifetime of the plant, if relevant. The expressions used to calculate the value of each of these terms are expanded in the **SI, Section S.2.**

In this model, we assume 1) additional capital costs associated with implementing the retrofit technologies apply regardless of the marginal amount of CO<sub>2</sub> removed (**SI, Table S2**); 2) we use the heating values of relevant fuels (**SI, Table S1**) to convert between mass and energy based cost estimates; 3) baseline cost of PSC is \$60 t<sub>CO<sub>2</sub></sub><sup>-1</sup> while that of DAC is \$200 t<sub>CO<sub>2</sub></sub><sup>-1</sup>; <sup>31–34</sup> 4) PSC can only capture up to 90% of the remaining CO<sub>2</sub> emitted from the cement facility; 5) DAC occurs at an external location and credits must be purchased by the cement manufacturer to achieve 100% CO<sub>2</sub> abatement; and 6) there are no policy initiatives that exist to improve process economics. The baseline costs of PSC are selected from a 2020 article by Feron et al. which estimated benchmark PSC costs for amine-based PCC systems.<sup>31</sup> Those of DAC are selected assuming reported, optimistic targets can be achieved at scale.<sup>32–34</sup> Performing PSC at



all cement facilities may not be practical / feasible given the different costs associated with CO<sub>2</sub> transportation and / or storage at different geographic locations.<sup>35,36</sup>

Using the above set of assumptions, combined with additional costs reported in a prior analysis (outlined in the **SI, Table S3**),<sup>37</sup> we calculate the baseline costs (i.e., coal only, 90% clinker) to be \$99.9 t<sub>cement</sub><sup>-1</sup>. This establishes an estimate of the costs that may be anticipated; however, the specific production costs of each cement plant will vary, and thus this generalized analysis likely oversimplifies some of the nuances associated with operating each cement plant. Despite this, current cement prices in the United States are ~\$132 t<sub>cement</sub><sup>-1</sup>.<sup>38</sup> To estimate the cost of the cement produced in the United States, one can remove the profits that the cement company earns (the cement industry is estimated to have a 10% profit margin)<sup>39</sup> and any additional taxes or operating costs (estimated to be ~\$15 t<sub>cement</sub><sup>-1</sup>).<sup>37</sup> Removing profits and taxes, we achieve an estimated cost of cement production in the United States of ~\$106 t<sub>cement</sub><sup>-1</sup>, well in alignment with our model. Given this, we conclude that we have captured the major production costs that are likely to change with clinker and energy replacements. This suggests that studying the additional costs (\$ t<sub>cement</sub><sup>-1</sup>) incurred beyond the baseline conditions that result from implementing any decarbonization option are representative of the changes to commercial plant total costs. Thus, for the remainder of the discussion, costs presented will be the additional decarbonization costs required beyond the baseline of \$106 t<sub>cement</sub><sup>-1</sup> (i.e., current cost at 0% CO<sub>2</sub> removal).

### 3. Costing Pathways Towards Decarbonization

Using the above emission and costing frameworks, we first address the costs associated with pursuing each of the decarbonization pathways individually in order to assess their decarbonization potential and understand the rough order of magnitude cost increases that may be expected for each technology. We then consider the benefits of combining decarbonization options by developing an analysis to determine the most cost-effective way to achieve net-zero emissions in the cement industry. We use this analysis to recommend a cost-effective path forward for individual facilities looking to achieve their decarbonization goals. While



we focus on a single cement plant here, we note that the cost of implementing these new technologies may vary depending on the specific plant considered.

### 3.1. Individual Decarbonization Options

Each of the technologies introduced above can be considered independently, as has often been done by cement plants and researchers in the past.<sup>18,40,41</sup> According to **Figure 2a**, we observe that simply replacing clinker with alternative SCMs or exchanging coal with natural gas for the kiln fuel can lower total costs below the current baseline conditions. Previous studies have reported similar trends in clinker replacement costs, but regulatory approval is still needed for use of 50% clinker by mass in all cement applications.<sup>18</sup> On the contrary, the replacement of coal with natural gas has not been studied as extensively. This is because historically, natural gas prices have been much higher than those of solid fuels and natural gas still emits CO<sub>2</sub>.<sup>42</sup> Additionally, switching to a gaseous fuel requires adjustments for changes in radiative heat transfer, which can lead to inconsistent production and increased CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.<sup>42</sup> Instead, it is more likely that the fuel mixture discussed previously (30% coal, 10% petcoke, and 60% biomass-based fuels) will be used in the next several decades (*vide supra*), which only has the potential to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 16.7% while increasing the costs of cement production by \$3 t<sub>cement</sub><sup>-1</sup>, or 3% from the current baseline cement cost in the United States. Because fuel mixtures are more likely to prevail, we will not explore natural gas as a part of this analysis. When considered in isolation, all options to replace raw materials (i.e., clinker or fuel replacement) cannot achieve large abatement fractions: at most, we predict that only 35% of the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions can be removed by lowering the clinker fraction from 0.90 to 0.50 (or 90% to 50% clinker). While this has the potential to hit the described IEA 24% target for cement by 2050, it will be insufficient for the net-zero by 2050 goal set by the GCCA.<sup>3</sup>


Instead of replacing raw materials, capturing any CO<sub>2</sub> emissions via PSC (**Figure 2a**) can clearly achieve at least 90% removal, depending on the capture fraction of the implemented technology.<sup>43</sup> However, a major limitation of PSC technologies are their large capital and operating costs. Specifically, we note that regardless of the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> removed for PSC, a large capital cost expenditure will elevate



the production costs, as indicated by the increase in cost to  $\$18 \text{ t}_{\text{cement}}^{-1}$  at 0% removal in **Figure 2a**. For PSC costs of  $\$60 \text{ t}_{\text{CO}_2}^{-1}$  reported for amine-based post-combustion capture platforms (that can achieve 90% removal), cement costs could rise by  $\$42 \text{ t}_{\text{cement}}^{-1}$ , or 40%. Such a large increase in price is likely to be unacceptable for an industry with low margins and, thus, would likely require external motivation to encourage industrial implementation (i.e., policy incentives).

In addition to simply understanding the impact of these decarbonization costs on the cost of cement production ( $\$ \text{ t}_{\text{cement}}^{-1}$ ), we can also translate the costs into the cost of  $\text{CO}_2$  removal ( $\$ \text{ t}_{\text{CO}_2}^{-1}$ ) (**Figure 2b**). This allows us to compare cement decarbonization costs to decarbonization technologies implemented in other industries. In **Figure 2b**, we observe that, as expected, it is possible to save money by fully implementing alternative SCMs or by replacing coal with natural gas; however, if clinker replacement were only pursued to reduce  $\text{CO}_2$  emissions by  $\leq 2\%$ , there would be no cost savings to be had due to both the capital cost investment (**SI, Table S2**) in order to upgrade the flash calciner for clay and the low carbon removal rates. Notably, PSC costs are minimized when the total  $\text{CO}_2$  removed is maximized due to the large capital cost that applies across all capture fractions and causes the observed non-linear drop in costs. The nominal cost of PSC that we investigate here (i.e.,  $\$60 \text{ t}_{\text{CO}_2}^{-1}$ ) is only achieved when the  $\text{CO}_2$  removed achieves its design targets of 90%. At any removal rates below this, the marginal amount of  $\text{CO}_2$  avoided is not enough to access the benefits of economies of scale in PSC systems. The cost magnitudes predicted in **Figure 2b** align with other decarbonization technologies and projections for the total costs to decarbonize power industries, agriculture, and other industrial sectors (i.e., iron and steel, chemicals).<sup>44</sup>





**Figure 2.** (a) Additional costs of implementing the decarbonization technology for cement production ( $\$ t_{\text{cement}}^{-1}$ ) beyond the current baseline costs of cement production ( $\$106 t_{\text{cement}}^{-1}$ ). (b) Costs of  $\text{CO}_2$  removal ( $\$ t_{\text{CO}_2}^{-1}$ ) associated with pursuing clinker replacement, fuel replacement, and/or retrofitting a capture unit onto the plant with varying costs of capture. The costs of capture at the maximum capture fraction of 90% are  $\$60 t_{\text{CO}_2}^{-1}$ , in-line with current PSC systems. The fuel alternatives are single data points because the technology can only remove a set amount of  $\text{CO}_2$  when the fuel is replaced. On the contrary, the clinker replacement and PSC curves represent the range of decarbonization amounts that can result by varying the amount of clinker replaced or  $\text{CO}_2$  captured, respectively. The dashed gray line at  $\$0$  in both figures represents the baseline costs.

### 3.2. Optimizing pathways towards complete decarbonization

It is evident from the above analysis that achieving high  $\text{CO}_2$  removal rates via  $\text{CO}_2$  capture can be quite expensive, thus we choose to further investigate the possibility of implementing a combination of decarbonization platforms that can both achieve 100%  $\text{CO}_2$  removal and lower the total costs to the cement manufacturers. To assess this, we consider combining some/all the decarbonization pathways to optimize their deployment and achieve complete decarbonization (i.e., net-zero emissions). We outline 8 different pathways using combinations of clinker replacement with LC<sup>3</sup> SCMs (i.e., lower the clinker content to 50%), coal replacement by a fuel mixture, PSC, and DAC. The introduction of DAC at this point in the investigation allows us to achieve 100%  $\text{CO}_2$  avoidance by simply offsetting any emissions that are not covered by the retrofit alternatives introduced in **Section 3.1**. Each of the pathways are outlined in **Table 1**.



**Table 1.** Pathways towards complete decarbonization of the cement industry. These options only consider technologies that are currently available for retrofit or carbon credit purchase via direct air capture to achieve 100% CO<sub>2</sub> removal. In each scenario, baseline clinker content is 90% while clinker replacement diminishes clinker content to 50%. Baseline fuel is coal while the fuel mixture is 30% coal, 10% petcoke, and 60% biomass-based fuels. When implemented, point source capture removes 90% of any remaining emissions after clinker replacement and fuel mixtures have been implemented (if relevant).

| Scenario | Technologies Implemented in Scenario |                |                            |                          |
|----------|--------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
|          | Clinker Replacement                  | Fuel Mixture   | Point Source Capture (PSC) | Direct Air Capture (DAC) |
| 1        |                                      |                |                            | ✓ <sup>2</sup>           |
| 2        |                                      |                | ✓ <sup>2</sup>             | ✓ <sup>2</sup>           |
| 3        | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                       |                |                            | ✓ <sup>2</sup>           |
| 4        | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                       |                | ✓ <sup>2</sup>             | ✓ <sup>2</sup>           |
| 5        |                                      | ✓ <sup>2</sup> |                            | ✓ <sup>2</sup>           |
| 6        |                                      | ✓ <sup>2</sup> | ✓ <sup>2</sup>             | ✓ <sup>2</sup>           |
| 7        | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                       | ✓ <sup>2</sup> |                            | ✓ <sup>2</sup>           |
| 8        | ✓ <sup>2</sup>                       | ✓ <sup>2</sup> | ✓ <sup>2</sup>             | ✓ <sup>2</sup>           |


Given the observations in **Figure 2**, while the total cost of cement production ( $\$ t_{\text{cement}}^{-1}$ ) may increase, the marginal cost of CO<sub>2</sub> removal ( $\$ t_{\text{CO}_2}^{-1}$ ) is minimized by avoiding as much CO<sub>2</sub> as possible when using a selected method. Thus, for this investigation, we do not consider intermediate values of CO<sub>2</sub> removal (i.e., only 50% clinker fractions are considered when replacing clinker with alternative SCMs and 90% of any remaining CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are always removed via PSC). Additionally, we consider each of the scenarios from **Table 1** to determine the total costs of decarbonizing via the selected method. These investigations allow us to outline the most cost-effective pathways for a cement company to pursue or a regulatory body to recommend when outlining their decarbonization goals, as the pathway chosen will likely depend on the long-term plan for CO<sub>2</sub> removal.

To capture the difference in each of the scenarios, we developed dispatch curves (**Figure 3**) for each of the 8 scenarios outlined in **Table 1** to inform the most cost-effective pathways towards achieving net-zero emissions in the cement industry. We base this dispatch curve on the costs of CO<sub>2</sub> abatement ( $\$ t_{\text{CO}_2}^{-1}$ ) to align with prior dispatch curves for industrial decarbonization.<sup>44</sup> As observed previously, clinker removal offers the most benefit to both removing CO<sub>2</sub> while lowering the cement facility costs, thus across each of





the scenarios, it is always the first option that should be deployed. After clinker replacement, the fuel mixture replacement is the next most affordable, but it cannot achieve large amounts of CO<sub>2</sub> abatement due to both the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with fuel mixtures and the presence of process emissions. As expected, when PSC is an option for and analyzed in terms of the marginal cost of removal ( $\$ t_{\text{CO}_2}^{-1}$ ), it should be pursued prior to deploying DAC and DAC should serve as a “catch all” for any remaining emissions, as the cost of DAC is comparatively high per ton of CO<sub>2</sub> ( $\$200 t_{\text{CO}_2}^{-1}$ ).



**Figure 3.** Dispatch curve of technologies for each of the decarbonization pathways outlined in **Table 1** (a – h). Dispatch curve is developed based on the costs of CO<sub>2</sub> removal ( $\$ t_{\text{CO}_2}^{-1}$ ). The black line indicates the costs associated with decarbonizing via the technology associated with the color under/above the curve.

As previously mentioned, these curves are based on the cost of abatement ( $\$ t_{\text{CO}_2}^{-1}$ ); however, given the low margins in the cement industry, the direct costs of cement production ( $\$ t_{\text{cement}}^{-1}$ ) are critical to determine how likely producers are to implement such technologies. By calculating the area under each of the dispatch curves in **Figure 3**, we can derive the total costs of cement production, allowing us to compare the final costs that result from each scenario and pick the option that minimizes the total costs for 100% decarbonization (**Figure 4a**, 100% removal). From this calculation, we observe that Scenario #8 minimizes the total costs at  $\$31 t_{\text{cement}}^{-1}$  (or a 29% increase from the current cost of cement), with Scenario #4 a close






competitor at  $\$34 \text{ t}_{\text{cement}}^{-1}$  (or a 32% increase from the current cost of cement), suggesting that pursuing fuel mixture replacement may not be worth it to minimize the total costs.

We performed a brief sensitivity analysis to understand the effects that capture costs might have on the preferred decarbonization pathway by lowering both PSC and DAC costs to  $\$20 \text{ t}_{\text{CO}_2}^{-1}$  and  $\$100 \text{ t}_{\text{CO}_2}^{-1}$ , respectively (**SI, Figure S1**). The metric for PSC was selected as the lowest reported cost estimate<sup>45</sup> while that of DAC was chosen because it is a well-known, near-term cost target.<sup>46,47</sup> We observed that at these lower, optimistic cost estimates, the preferred pathway for decarbonization remained the same, but the lowest cost option available for 100% decarbonization (Scenario #8) dropped to only a  $\$7 \text{ t}_{\text{cement}}^{-1}$  increase from the current cost of cement (or a 7% increase). This brief study reveals that improvements in the costs of carbon capture can make decarbonizing the cement industry much more economically feasible, enabling additional time for non-retrofit alternative cement production technologies (i.e., technologies under development by companies such as Sublime and Brimstone) to have more time to develop for later deployment.

Achieving net-zero emissions in the cement industry is an ambitious goal and thus, in case companies want to partially reduce their emissions, we have included the projected costs associated with partially decarbonizing 25%, 50%, or 75% of current emissions (**Figure 4a**). The costs associated with intermediate fractional removal quantities are included in the **SI, Figure S2**. These analyses reveal an interesting deviation from the prior observations, whereby Scenario 7 becomes more affordable than Scenario 8 if a company is looking to achieve 50% removal. At 50% capture, only a small amount of  $\text{CO}_2$  needs to be removed by carbon capture, while the rest is avoided by pursuing clinker and fuel replacement. Because we assume that DAC is implemented offsite without any capital costs to the cement company, it always costs  $\$200 \text{ t}_{\text{CO}_2}^{-1}$  regardless of the amount of  $\text{CO}_2$  captured; however, PSC requires that the capture facility is retrofitted to the cement plant with extensive capital investments. These high capital investments prevent PSC from being affordable at low capture amounts, leading to large increases in the cost of cement production. This trend is further emphasized in **Figure 4b** between 0.48 and 0.61 removal fractions where



cement facilities would save significantly by pursuing only DAC and not PSC (i.e., Scenario #7 would be preferred over Scenario #8). Like the sensitivity study we performed previously, we also chose to lower the cost of DAC to  $\$100 \text{ t}_{\text{CO}_2}^{-1}$  while keeping PSC costs at  $\$60 \text{ t}_{\text{CO}_2}^{-1}$  to investigate the effect this had on the optimal cost and pathway (SI, Figure S3). While this is unlikely to occur, it highlights that the favorable range for Scenario #7 over Scenario #8 extends to  $\sim 80\%$  removal, making the DAC option more desirable over a wider range of decarbonization amounts. Consequently, if DAC costs are lowered significantly, the difference between installing a PSC facility and only performing DAC may be minimal, allowing the cement facility to avoid new plant construction and further capital expenditures.



**Figure 4.** (a) Additional costs to a cement plant ( $\$ \text{ t}_{\text{cement}}^{-1}$ ) to achieve up to net-zero  $\text{CO}_2$  removal assuming PSC =  $\$60 \text{ t}_{\text{CO}_2}^{-1}$  and DAC =  $\$200 \text{ t}_{\text{CO}_2}^{-1}$ . The costs at 25%, 50%, 75%, and 100% removal are representative of actual costs that will be incurred by the cement manufacturing facility to achieve the desired  $\text{CO}_2$  removal. (b) The total additional costs to a cement plant ( $\$ \text{ t}_{\text{cement}}^{-1}$ ) to achieve a fraction of  $\text{CO}_2$  removal in Scenarios #4, #7, and #8. The dashed gray line at  $\$0 \text{ t}_{\text{cement}}^{-1}$  represents the baseline costs.

#### 4. Conclusions

Considering the “hard-to-decarbonize” nature of the cement industry and the breadth of research dedicated to this challenge, it is clear that initiating decarbonization efforts in the near term is crucial. The perspective presented here identifies a potential pathway forward using technologies that are at higher technology readiness levels compared to the more nascent platforms aimed at eliminating cement process emissions entirely. While there are still significant strides in cement regulation that are required to begin pursuing these retrofit technologies, we show that the breadth of available research supports the transition



towards replacing clinker, implementing fuel alternatives, and employing carbon capture technologies to significantly reduce carbon emissions. In this work, we show that it is possible to eliminate carbon emissions with a  $\$31 \text{ t}_{\text{cement}}^{-1}$  increase in production costs by pursuing a combination of all four decarbonization options. If even more aggressive point source and direct air capture system costs of  $\$20 \text{ t}_{\text{CO}_2}^{-1}$  and  $\$100 \text{ t}_{\text{CO}_2}^{-1}$ , respectively, are assumed, cement costs may only increase by  $\$7 \text{ t}_{\text{cement}}^{-1}$ . While the margins are low in the cement industry, we hope that regulatory changes and policy incentives will enable the deployment of the technologies outlined in this work. It is also important to acknowledge that there are potentially other aspects for cement companies to consider such as the high capital costs associated with PSC, how easy retrofitting a decarbonization pathway may be in a particular facility, and/or the experience the facility has with altering operating conditions to account for varying system inputs. While the approach presented herein is used to broadly analyze the United States cement industry, it can be adapted to perform similar investigations of other countries and regions. Further, the operating conditions, costs, efficiencies, etc. that are associated with operational plants can be considered to improve the model's accuracy for specific applications.

The analysis presented here supports the idea that these pathways can help achieve the decarbonization goals set by the IEA and GCCA, however, we also want to emphasize the need for continued support for new cement manufacturing pathways that avoid  $\text{CO}_2$  process emissions. The high emissions rate and the costs associated with decarbonizing often make net-zero emissions extremely difficult to envision for the industry, but the search for new technologies that rely on electrical inputs may warrant continued attention. These futuristic goals are important to continue investigating but, in this perspective, we have used an analytical framework to support that it is possible to begin transitioning towards a cleaner industrial platform to prevent the magnitude of cement industry emissions from continuing to contribute to the broader climate issues.



## 5. Author Information

### Corresponding Author

**Zara L'Heureux Burke** - *Science for America Climate and Energy, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, United States*; Email: [zara.burke@scienceforamerica.org](mailto:zara.burke@scienceforamerica.org)

**Fadl H. Saadi** - *Science for America Climate and Energy, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, United States*; Email: [fadl.saadi@scienceforamerica.org](mailto:fadl.saadi@scienceforamerica.org)

### Author

**Katelyn M. Ripley** – *Science for America Climate and Energy, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, United States*

## 6. Author Contributions

K.M.R.: Conceptualization, methodology, validation, formal analysis, investigation, data collection, data analysis, writing (original draft), writing (review and editing), and visualization. F.H.S.: data analysis and writing (review and editing). Z.L.B.: Conceptualization, data analysis, and writing (review and editing).

## 7. Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

## 8. Supporting Information

The supporting information includes a detailed explanation of the calculations used to calculate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and costs (both capital and operating) associated with each decarbonization pathway. We also include documentation of the emission factors, heating values, and fuel prices used for the variety of replacement fuel options as well as capital cost estimations for representative cement plants. We also include additional figures to investigate the sensitivity of total cement costs to improvements in PSC and DAC costs.



## 9. Acknowledgements

We thank Eric S. Lander, Fikile R. Brushett, and Victoria Chernow for their helpful recommendations and discussions.



## 10. References

- (1) International Energy Agency; Cement Sustainability Initiative. *Technology Roadmap: Low-Carbon Transition in the Cement Industry*; 2018.
- (2) Global Cement and Concrete Association. *GCCA Sustainability Guidelines for the Monitoring and Reporting of CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions from Cement Manufacturing*; 2019.
- (3) GCCA. Concrete Future - Roadmap to Net Zero. *Global Cement and Concrete Association* **2021**, 1–48.
- (4) Griffiths, S.; Sovacool, B. K.; Furszyfer Del Rio, D. D.; Foley, A. M.; Bazilian, M. D.; Kim, J.; Uratani, J. M. Decarbonizing the Cement and Concrete Industry: A Systematic Review of Socio-Technical Systems, Technological Innovations, and Policy Options. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* **2023**, *180* (March), 113291. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2023.113291>.
- (5) EPA. 11.6 Portland Cement Manufacturing. In *Mineral Products Industry*; 2020.
- (6) Cresko, J.; Rightor, E.; Carpenter, A.; Peretti, K.; Elliott, N.; Nimbalkar, S.; Morrow, W. R.; Hasanbeigi, A.; Hedman, B.; Supekar, S.; McMillan, C.; Hoffmeister, A.; Whitlock, A.; Lgogo, T.; Walzberg, J.; D'Alessandro, C.; Anderson, S.; Atnoorkar, S.; Upsani, S.; King, P.; Grgich, J.; Ovard, L.; Foist, R.; Conner, A.; Meshek, M.; Hicks, A.; Dollinger, C.; Liddell, H. *Industrial Decarbonization Roadmap*; 2022.
- (7) Fadayini, O. M.; Madu, C.; Oshin, T. T.; Obisanya, A. A.; Ajiboye, G. O.; Ipaye, T. O.; Rabi, T. O.; Akintola, J. T.; Ajayi, S. J.; Kingsley, N. A. Energy and Economic Comparison of Different Fuels in Cement Production. In *Cement Industry - Optimization, Characterization and Sustainable Application*; IntechOpen, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.96812>.
- (8) Rahman, A.; Rasul, M. G.; Khan, M. M. K.; Sharma, S. Impact of Alternative Fuels on the Cement Manufacturing Plant Performance: An Overview. *Procedia Eng* **2013**, *56*, 393–400. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2013.03.138>.
- (9) Imbabi, M. S.; Carrigan, C.; McKenna, S. Trends and Developments in Green Cement and Concrete Technology. *International Journal of Sustainable Built Environment* **2012**, *1* (2), 194–216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijbsbe.2013.05.001>.
- (10) Global Cement and Concrete Association. *Getting the Numbers Right (GNR)*; 2021.
- (11) *Sublime Systems*. <https://sublime-systems.com/>.
- (12) *Brimstone*. <https://www.brimstone.com/>.
- (13) U.S. Energy Information Administration. 1. The Electricity Mix in the United States Shifts from Fossil Fuels to Renewables. In *Annual Energy Outlook 2023*; EIA, 2023; pp 9–13.
- (14) The European Cement Association. *The Role of Cement in the 2050 Low Carbon Economy*; 2013.
- (15) Van Oss, H. G.; Padovani, A. C. Cement Manufacture and the Environment, Part II: Environmental Challenges and Opportunities. *J Ind Ecol* **2003**, *7* (1), 93–126. <https://doi.org/10.1162/108819803766729212>.
- (16) Rahman, A.; Rasul, M. G.; Khan, M. M. K.; Sharma, S. Recent Development on the Uses of Alternative Fuels in Cement Manufacturing Process. *Fuel* **2015**, *145*, 84–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2014.12.029>.



- (17) CSI-ECRA. CSI/ECRA - Technology Papers 2017 Development of State of the Art Techniques in Cement Manufacturing: Trying to Look Ahead. *Technology Papers* **2017**, No. March, 190.
- (18) Scrivener, K.; Martirena, F.; Bishnoi, S.; Maity, S. Calcined Clay Limestone Cements (LC3). *Cem Concr Res* **2018**, *114*, 49–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cemconres.2017.08.017>.
- (19) Perilli, D. *Update on Fly Ash in the US, April 2023*; 2023. <https://www.globalcement.com/news/item/15657-update-on-fly-ash-in-the-us-april-2023>.
- (20) Scrivener, K. L. Options for the Future of Cement. *The Indian Concrete Journal* **2014**, *88* (7), 11–21.
- (21) Alujas, A.; Fernandez, R.; Quintana, R.; Scrivener, K. L.; Martirena, F. Pozzolanic Reactivity of Low Grade Kaolinitic Clays: Influence of Calcination Temperature and Impact of Calcination Products on OPC Hydration. *Appl Clay Sci* **2015**, *108*, 94–101.
- (22) Fennell, P. S.; Davis, S. J.; Mohammed, A. Decarbonizing Cement Production. *Joule* **2021**, *5* (6), 1305–1311. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joule.2021.04.011>.
- (23) Moya, J. A.; Pardo, N.; Mercier, A. The Potential for Improvements in Energy Efficiency and CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions in the EU27 Cement Industry and the Relationship with the Capital Budgeting Decision Criteria. *J Clean Prod* **2011**, *19* (11), 1207–1215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2011.03.003>.
- (24) IPCC. *IPCC Special Report on Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage*; Metz, B., Davidson, O., de Coninck, H., Loos, M., Meyer, L., Eds.; 2005.
- (25) Gerbelová, H.; Van Der Spek, M.; Schakel, W. Feasibility Assessment of CO<sub>2</sub> Capture Retrofitted to an Existing Cement Plant: Post-Combustion vs. Oxy-Fuel Combustion Technology. *Energy Procedia* **2017**, *114* (November 2016), 6141–6149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2017.03.1751>.
- (26) Antunes, M.; Santos, R. L.; Pereira, J.; Rocha, P.; Horta, R. B.; Colaço, R. Alternative Clinker Technologies for Reducing Carbon Emissions in Cement Industry: A Critical Review. *Materials* **2022**, *15* (1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ma15010209>.
- (27) Habert, G.; Miller, S. A.; John, V. M.; Provis, J. L.; Favier, A.; Horvath, A.; Scrivener, K. L. Environmental Impacts and Decarbonization Strategies in the Cement and Concrete Industries. *Nat Rev Earth Environ* **2020**, *1* (11), 559–573. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-020-0093-3>.
- (28) Yang, F.; Meerman, J. C.; Faaij, A. P. C. Carbon Capture and Biomass in Industry: A Techno-Economic Analysis and Comparison of Negative Emission Options. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* **2021**, *144* (December 2020), 111028. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2021.111028>.
- (29) Cormos, A. M.; Cormos, C. C. Reducing the Carbon Footprint of Cement Industry by Post-Combustion CO<sub>2</sub> Capture: Techno-Economic and Environmental Assessment of a CCS Project in Romania. *Chemical Engineering Research and Design* **2017**, *123*, 230–239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cherd.2017.05.013>.
- (30) Sakhamuru, D. R. Techno-Economic Analysis and Strategic Decarbonization of the Indian Cement Industry, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2022.
- (31) Feron, P. H. M.; Cousins, A.; Jiang, K.; Zhai, R.; Garcia, M. An Update of the Benchmark Post-Combustion CO<sub>2</sub>-Capture Technology. *Fuel* **2020**, *273* (April), 117776. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2020.117776>.





- (32) Danaci, D.; Bui, M.; Petit, C.; MacDowell, N. En Route to Zero Emissions for Power and Industry with Amine-Based Post-Combustion Capture. *Environ Sci Technol* **2021**, *55* (15), 10619–10632. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c07261>.
- (33) Azarabadi, H.; Lackner, K. S. Postcombustion Capture or Direct Air Capture in Decarbonizing US Natural Gas Power? *Environ Sci Technol* **2020**, *54* (8), 5102–5111. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c00161>.
- (34) Keith, D. W.; Holmes, G.; St. Angelo, D.; Heidel, K. A Process for Capturing CO<sub>2</sub> from the Atmosphere. *Joule* **2018**, *2* (8), 1573–1594. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joule.2018.05.006>.
- (35) Smith, E.; Morris, J.; Khesghi, H.; Teletzke, G.; Herzog, H.; Paltsev, S. The Cost of CO<sub>2</sub> Transport and Storage in Global Integrated Assessment Modeling. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control* **2021**, *109*, 1–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2021.103367>.
- (36) Schmelz, W. J.; Hochman, G.; Miller, K. G. Total Cost of Carbon Capture and Storage Implemented at a Regional Scale: Northeastern and Midwestern United States. *Interface Focus* **2020**, *10*, 20190065.
- (37) Thunder Said Energy. *Cement Costs and Energy Economics?*; 2024. <https://thundersaidenergy.com/downloads/cement-costs-and-energy-economics/>.
- (38) *IBIS World*. <https://www.ibisworld.com/us/bed/price-of-cement/190/>.
- (39) Baldeira, S.; Hovenko, I. Building Materials: Industry Profitability and Growth. *Bloomberg Professional Services*. 2016. <https://www.bloomberg.com/professional/insights/commodities/building-materials-industry-profitability-and-growth/>.
- (40) Beguedou, E.; Narra, S.; Afrakoma Armoo, E.; Agboka, K.; Damgou, M. K. Alternative Fuels Substitution in Cement Industries for Improved Energy Efficiency and Sustainability. *Energies (Basel)* **2023**, *16* (8), 3533. <https://doi.org/10.3390/EN16083533>.
- (41) Gailani, A.; Cooper, S.; Allen, S.; Pimm, A.; Taylor, P.; Gross, R. Assessing the Potential of Decarbonization Options for Industrial Sectors. *Joule* **2024**, 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joule.2024.01.007>.
- (42) Akhtar, S. S.; Ervin, E.; Raza, S.; Abbas, T. From Coal to Natural Gas: Its Impact on Kiln Production, Clinker Quality and Emissions. *IEEE Cement Industry Technical Conference (Paper)* **2013**, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CITCON.2013.6525276>.
- (43) Dods, M. N.; Kim, E. J.; Long, J. R.; Weston, S. C. Deep CCS: Moving beyond 90% Carbon Dioxide Capture. *Environ Sci Technol* **2021**, *55* (13), 8524–8534. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c07390>.
- (44) Vigna, M. Della; Bocharnikova, Y.; Gandolfi, A.; Marbach, Q.; Shalaeva, A.; Bhandari, N. *Carbonomics*; 2023.
- (45) U.S. Department of Energy. *Basic Research Needs for Carbon Capture: Beyond 2020*; 2010.
- (46) *Negative Emissions Technologies and Reliable Sequestration*; 2019. <https://doi.org/10.17226/25259>.
- (47) U.S. Department of Energy. Carbon Negative Shot. 2024. <https://www.energy.gov/fecm/carbon-negative-shot>.





## Data Availability Statement

The data supporting the findings in this study have been included within the article or as part of the supplementary information.

