

# **Pre-feasibility Study on : Waste to Electricity in Dhaka City**

**Promotion of Renewable Energy, Energy Efficiency and  
Greenhouse Gas Abatement (PREGA)**

## **Socio-Economic Aspects**

**11 February, 2004**

**Khandaker Mainuddin  
Fellow**



**BANGLADESH CENTRE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES**

House 10, Road 16A, Gulshan-1, Dhaka 1212, Bangladesh

Ph. (880-2) 8851237, 8851986, 8852217; Fax: (880-2) 8851417

E-mail: [info@bcas.net](mailto:info@bcas.net); Website: [www.bcas.net](http://www.bcas.net)

The views expressed in this paper are the views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Asian Development Bank (ADB), or its Board of Directors or the governments they represent. ADB makes no representation concerning and does not guarantee the source, originality, accuracy, completeness or reliability of any statement, information, data, finding, interpretation, advice, opinion, or view presented.

## Population

### Dhaka City

Year	Population (in Million)
1981	3.4
1991	6.10
2001	9.9

### Generation of Waste in Dhaka City per day

Year	Waste (in Ton)
2003	5650
2010	8280
2021	15110

## **Financial Aspects**

### **Base case**

Investment cost : 1573.66 million Taka

Annual operating cost : 61.8 million Taka

IRR : -6%

NPV (at 10%) : -77.57 million Taka

B-C Ratio (at 10%) : 0.81

### **Project Sensitivity**

(15% Fall in Revenue)

IRR : -10.79%

NPV (at 10%) : -328 million Taka

B-C, Ratio (at 10%) : 0.20

## **15% Increase in Investment Cost**

IRR = -3.20%

NPV (at 10%) = -278.50 million Taka

B-C Ratio (at 10%) = 0.41

**Financial Analysis with Carbon Benefit (1.13 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> Reduction per annum)**

**with 5 dollar per ton of CO<sub>2</sub>**

IRR = 84.02%

NPV (at 10%) = 2136.99 million Taka

B-C ratio (at 10%) = 6.2

**with 3 dollars per ton of CO<sub>2</sub>**

IRR = 54.73%

NPV (at 10%) = 1251.79 million Taka

B-C ratio (at 10%) = 4.4

### **15% Fall in Revenue (with Carbon Benefit)**

IRR = 39.62%

NPV (at 10%) = 801.25 million Taka

B-C (at 10%) = 2.95

### **15% Increase in Investment Cost (with carbon benefit)**

IRR = 43.24%

NPV (at 10%) = 1050.25 million Taka

B-C Ratio (at 10%) = 3.21

## **Benefits from local Environmental Improvement**

### **Dump Site**

Affected Group 4,500 Households

Sample : 50 Households.

82% willing to pay Tk.30 per month

Demand Curve :  $D = a - 1.67p$

Annual benefit : 1.6 million Taka (1)

### **Garbage Collection Point**

4,920 Garbage Points

Affected group 23,800 Households

Sample size 50 Households

68 percent would pay 50 Taka per month

Demand Curve  $D = a - 1.56p$

Annual benefit = 28.3 million Taka (2)

**Total Annual Benefits (1+2)  $1.6 + 28.3 = 29.9$  million Taka**

## **Economic Analysis**

Health, Environment Benefit, (Taka 30 million per annum) and adjustment with appropriate shadow pricing

IRR = 14.5%

NPV (at 10%) = 114.92 million Taka

B-C Ratio (at 10%) = 1.25

### **15% reduction in Benefit**

IRR = 1.26%

NPV (at 10%) = -191.37 million Taka

B-C Ratio (at 10%) = 0.58

### **For 15% increase in Project Cost**

IRR = 6.10%

NPV (at 10%) = -106.17 million Taka

B-C Ratio (at 10%) = 0.8

**With carbon benefit the project becomes highly viable and its economic viability is greater than financial viability**

## **Other Economic, Social Benefits**

- Job creation : New jobs will be created through landfill project.
- Income generation : Incremental wage increase at land-fill energy plant compared to alternative jobs.
- Trade Balance : Positive trade balance due to reduction of fuel import.
- Efficient use of land : Density of waste in land fill project is higher than present dump-site. The higher the density, the better is the land use.
- Renewable Energy : It is renewable.
- The project will lead to technology transfer and which can be replicated.