

Modelling releases from tailings in life cycle assessments of the mining sector: From generic models to reactive transport modelling

Stéphanie Muller, Arnault Lassin, Frédéric Lai, Dominique Thiéry, Sylvain

Guignot

▶ To cite this version:

Stéphanie Muller, Arnault Lassin, Frédéric Lai, Dominique Thiéry, Sylvain Guignot. Modelling releases from tailings in life cycle assessments of the mining sector: From generic models to reactive transport modelling. Minerals Engineering, 2022, 180, pp.107481. 10.1016/j.mineng.2022.107481. hal-03659759

HAL Id: hal-03659759 https://brgm.hal.science/hal-03659759

Submitted on 22 Jul 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

Modelling releases from tailings in life cycle assessments of the mining sector: from generic models to reactive transport modelling

6 Stéphanie Muller, Arnault Lassin, Frédéric Lai, Dominique Thiéry and Sylvain Guignot

7 Affiliation: BRGM – 3 avenue Claude Guillemin – 45060 Orléans

- 8 **Corresponding author**: s.muller@brgm.fr
- 9

10 Highlights:

- Impacts associated with tailings releases are poorly quantified in LCA
- Comparison of different approaches to account for releases from tailings
 - Generic inventory datasets may overestimate tailings releases to environment
 - Interdisciplinarity is key to develop more complete models to be applied in LCA
- 14 15

13

16 Abstract

Extracting mineral ores to produce mineral concentrates and finally metals that enter the value chains of different sectors is a waste intensive activity. In particular, mineral processing activities generate yearly and globally several billion tons of wastes called tailings. Tailings storage is associated with significant environmental risks due to different sources such as releases to groundwater. Yet, these environmental impacts are poorly taken into account in the environmental life cycle assessment of a concentrate or metal production, in particular due to a lack of representative data in the inventory.

24 This paper aims at coupling geochemical modelling geochemical modelling with life cycle 25 assessment to quantify releases from tailings and the associated environmental impacts. In the 26 present work, reactive transport modelling was implemented to quantify more accurately short-27 term (100-year timeframe) and long-term (10,000 year-timeframe) tailings releases. Reactive 28 transport modelling allows modelling and estimating the distributions in space and in time of 29 chemical reactions occurring in a specific environment. The resulting tailings releases are 30 compared with those calculated through the approach, based on a first order law of kinetics, 31 used in the ecoinvent database. The results from the ecoinvent approach are calculated both 32 with generic and site-specific parameters. These different approaches are applied on the case-33 study of a polymetallic sulphidic ore from a mine in Northern Europe.

The tailings releases obtained through the different approaches differ. Overall, the reactive transport model leads to quantities released at both short-term and long-term timeframes being smaller than those calculated with the ecoinvent approach. As a result, the impacts on ecotoxicological and toxicological categories show differences between two to eight orders of magnitude. Each approach used to model the tailings releases differ in the nature and amount of data needed as well as in the sophistication of the model used. While the approach based on reactive transport modelling is exhaustive and presumably provides a more accurate prediction

- 41 for the releases from tailings, it also requires massive computational resources and much larger
- 42 volumes of data, some of which being difficult to obtain on-site. Consequently, a consensus has
- 43 to be found between the complexity of the model used, the data availability and the expected
- 44 reliability of the results.
- 45 **Keywords**: life cycle inventory, tailings, reactive transport, groundwater releases

47 **1. Introduction**

48 1.1. The problematic of tailings in the mining sector

49 The dependence of our modern societies to metals has no longer to be proven. From the 50 agricultural sector to the numerical sector, all industrial activities rely on metals, and by 51 extension on the mining and metallurgical sector. Extracting mineral ores to produce mineral 52 concentrates that are, *in fine*, refined into metals is a weak sustainable activity where the natural 53 capital, the ores, is irreversibly transformed to the human capital, e.g. infrastructures (Tost et al., 54 2018). Moreover, mining activities are linked to environmental costs such as land disturbances, 55 pollution legacies or solid waste generation (Azapagic, 2004; Moran et al., 2014; Mudd, 2007; 56 Worrall et al., 2009). Mining waste in particular have the potential to increase the environmental 57 liabilities associated with a mine site (Mudd, 2007). On a mine site, three main sources of waste can be cited, each associated with the unit processes transforming an extracted ore to a metal: 58 59 mining that extracts the ore from the ground, mineral processing that separates the valuable 60 minerals from the gangue, and metallurgical processing that refines the valuable minerals into 61 metals. Thus, leading to different types of waste: waste rocks (associated with mining); tailings 62 (mineral processing) and slag (metallurgical processing) (Lèbre et al., 2017; Lèbre and Corder, 63 2015).

64 This paper focuses more particularly on tailings, fine particles in suspension in water that 65 remain after the treatment of minerals by separation processes (Bellenfant et al., 2013; Cuesta-Lopez et al., 2016; Lèbre and Corder, 2015). In the 2010s, yearly tailings production ranged 66 67 between five and seven billion tons worldwide (Edraki et al., 2014; Xie et al., 2013). Given the 68 trends in the mining sector, where production increases to meet the demand and ore grades 69 decrease, tailings generation may also increase over the next decades (Mudd, 2007). Different 70 methods of mine tailings disposal, usually occurring on site, exist; see Edraki et al. for a review 71 (2014). In the European Union, the directive 2006/21/EC on the management of wastes from 72 extractive industries regulates mining companies to manage tailings in a way that limits their 73 effect on human health and the environment. In particular, the directive mentions the need for 74 the operator to have a major-accident prevention policy and to establish monitoring procedures 75 not only during the operation phase but also after closure of the site and its associated tailings 76 facilities (European Commission, 2006).

77 The storage of tailings poses environmental risks for the surrounding ecosystems and 78 residential areas, specifically due to contaminant releases through wind borne disposal, leakages 79 into groundwater or tailings dam failures (Bes et al., 2014; Broadhurst and Petrie, 2010; Edraki 80 et al., 2014; Xie et al., 2013). These risks might happen on a short to a long-term time frame 81 (after mine closure) (Kossoff et al., 2014). If tailings dam failures are catastrophic events with 82 harmful consequences for human lives and fauna in the local ecosystem (see for example the 83 case of the Córrego do Feijão mine in Brazil in January 2019¹ or the review of dam failures made 84 by Kossoff et al. (2014) and Rico et al. (2008)); the generation of leakages to groundwater can 85 also have long term harmful consequences. Since these environmental risks are directly linked 86 to the tailings properties, which are themselves related to the ore characteristics and the 87 technologies implemented in the mineral separation process (Broadhurst and Petrie, 2010), they 88 are by essence, site-specific. In particular, if the tailings contain sulfidic minerals, these latter can 89 oxidize in the unsaturated zone that is in direct contact with the atmosphere (Brookfield et al., 90 2006; Elberling et al., 1994). The produced sulfuric acid is dragged downward through the 91 tailings by precipitation (rainwater or snowmelt) leading itself to further leaching of metal

¹ CNN. February 1 2019. "Death toll rises in Brazil dam collapse as mining company faces criticism" https://edition.cnn.com/2019/01/27/americas/brazil-dam-collapse/index.html

elements from the tailings to the surrounding environment, especially in water (Bellenfant et al.,
2013; Broadhurst and Petrie, 2010; Edraki et al., 2014; Mudd, 2007).

94 1.2. Consideration of tailings releases in life cycle assessment

95 Life cycle assessment (LCA) is a decision-making tool that assesses the potential environmental 96 impacts a system (product, service or organization) has during its whole life cycle: from the 97 extraction of resources to its end of life management. LCA is an ISO standardized tool (ISO/TC 98 207/ SC 5, 2006) widely used in various sectors, including in the mining and metal sector (see 99 for example Durucan et al., 2006; Ferreira and Leite, 2015; Memary et al., 2012; Norgate and 100 Haque, 2010; Nuss and Eckelman, 2014; Santero and Hendry, 2016). Despite this wide use, only 101 few LCA studies currently include tailings management and their associated environmental 102 impacts within the boundaries of the mine site under study. (Beylot and Villeneuve, 2017; Edraki 103 et al., 2014). Edraki et al., underline that data availability regarding tailings management and the 104 associated emissions is a reason of this non-inclusion (2014). An assessment of the Web of 105 science bibliography database made in June 2020 shows that about 400 scientific publications 106 address the specific topics of "LCA" and "mining" while ten times less publications address "LCA" 107 and "tailings". Yet, when taken into account, tailings disposal generally contributes to the 108 environmental impacts of mining operations assessed in a life cycle perspective. For example, a 109 LCA of a lead-zinc ore mining and concentration system showed that tailings disposal is the 110 highest contributor for 4 environmental impact categories out of 18 using the ReCiPe life cycle impact assessment (LCIA) method (Tao et al., 2019). A similar conclusions can be drawn when 111 112 assessing the mining datasets of the ecoinvent 3.6 database, a life cycle inventory (LCI) database 113 widely used in the LCA community (Wernet et al., 2016). As an example, for the dataset 'copper 114 concentrate, sulphide ore, copper mine', tailings management contributes the most to 7 impact 115 categories out of 18 using ReCiPe as well.

116 Such important contributions to the environmental impacts emphasize the need to accurately 117 accounting for the releases induced by tailings when carrying out the LCA of mining operations. 118 However, the lack of consideration for tailings releases may, in part, pertain to the difficulty for 119 mining companies to obtain precise on-site measurements of direct leakages from tailings to 120 groundwater. Only two studies were found to rely on on-site measurements from mining 121 companies for quantifying these releases to water. Firstly, Beylot and Villeneuve (2017) 122 considered the volume of infiltrations to groundwater and measurements of pollutants 123 concentrations performed by KGHM (Polish mining company) in their study looking at the 124 storage of sulfidic tailings resulting from copper production. Secondly, Tao et al. (2019) 125 considered direct releases data (encompassing water discharge and metal ions migration) 126 monitored by a Chinese mining company in their study about lead-zinc ore mining and 127 beneficiation in China. Other studies rather rely on estimations, either based on experimental 128 data or on public literature information for quantifying tailings releases to water: Song et al. 129 (2017) estimated values of metals leaching from tailings to water based on experimental data 130 (electrodialytic extraction) obtained from samples of the mine tailings; Reid et al. (2009) 131 estimated them based on both data drawn from literature and data obtained from experiments 132 on samples of the mine tailings at a laboratory scale, further complemented by numerical 133 modelling for longer-term horizons; Broadhurst et al. (2015) primarily derived their 134 groundwater releases from literature information, their own knowledge and calculations. The 135 ecoinvent database, also relies on literature data and calculations to account for releases to 136 groundwater from tailings, considering worldwide averages in terms of tailings composition or 137 substances leakages to water. One may identify different limits with respect to these different 138 quantification approaches:

 Considering worldwide averages for the tailings composition may show significant uncertainties and a certain lack of representativeness, given that ores and tailings 141 compositions are significantly different from one deposit to another, which accordingly
142 may not reflect the characteristics relative to a specific mine site (Doka, 2008; Rader et
143 al., 2019; Turner et al., 2019).

- Toxicity-related impacts are highly sensitive to long-term temporal horizons (with releases from tailings up to 60,000 years as currently considered in LCA; (Beylot and Villeneuve, 2017; Doka, 2008), however, obtaining reliable data regarding such releases appears relatively complicated (Reid et al., 2009).
- The releases to water as considered in these different approaches may fail to capture the behavior of these releases when flowing from the tailings pond to groundwater e.g. in terms of temporal behavior (Broadhurst et al., 2015) or physical and chemical interactions with the surrounding environment.

This literature review accordingly reveals that, the modelling of releases from mine tailings overall suffers from a certain lack of representativeness. These limits are moreover present in a context where the legislation around the use of LCA is developing, e.g. through the implementation of the Product Environmental Footprint (PEF). Accurately accounting for the environmental impacts relative to tailings therefore appears crucial, especially for the mining industry, as such impacts may significantly stand out in the LCA of metals-containing products and accordingly affect decisions relative to these products (Rader et al., 2019).

159 In this paper we propose to couple the use of reactive transport modelling (RTM) with LCA to 160 quantify more accurately short-term and long-term releases associated with tailings. In 161 particular, this coupling enables the generation of new data associated with the management of 162 mine tailings (and by extension mining operations), towards more comprehensive and 163 representative LCIs for the mining sector. In fact, the goal of reactive transport modelling is to, 164 to better understand and represent the distribution in space and time of the chemical reactions 165 occurring in a specific environment (Muniruzzaman et al., 2020). In this study, reactive 166 transport modelling is applied on releases associated with tailings generated in an European 167 copper mine. The results are then compared with the approach used in the ecoinvent database, 168 using both generic and site-specific data. The different compared approaches as well as the 169 considered case study are described in the next chapter. Chapter 3 describes and discusses the 170 results of the comparison between the approaches used to quantify tailings releases to the 171 environment. Chapter 4 concludes on the assessment and provides some perspectives on the 172 coupling between RTM and LCA.

173 **2.** Materials and methods

174 2.1. Models to consider releases from tailings to groundwater

175 Releases to groundwater resulting from tailing ponds after mine closure can be modelled 176 through different methods. This section presents the three approaches applied in this study to 177 obtain these releases for each substance. These three approaches consider transfer coefficients 178 expressing the fraction of the element presents in the tailings that can be released during a 179 specific time period. From these transfer coefficients the releases are derived using Eq.1 where 180 the initial mass of the substance in the tailings is obtained from on-site data collection (see 181 section 2.2). In this study, the tailings releases are considered over two time frames representing respectively short-term and long-term behaviors (see section 2.3). 182

- 183 **Eq.1** $m_i(t) = TK_i(t) * m_{initial,i}$
- 184 Where $m_i(t)$: mass of substance *i* released to groundwater over a time period *t*
- 185 $TK_i(t)$: transfer coefficient of substance *i* that can be released during a time period *t*
- 186 *m*_{initial,i}: initial mass of substance *i* in the tailings

187 2.1.1. Generic and semi-specific approach: Use of Doka's model as applied in the188 ecoinvent database

189 The primary ecoinvent dataset "treatment of sulfidic tailings" (Althaus and Doka, 2018) was 190 developed by Gabor Doka (2017, 2009, 2008), originally to consider releases resulting from 191 landfills and then adapted for tailings ponds. For each chemical element present in the tailings, 192 the model defines a $TK_i(t)$ that expresses the cumulative mass fraction released at time t. Generic 193 TKs were determined for each element based on average tailings composition, leaching 194 concentration and climatic conditions derived from literature data. In the ecoinvent mining 195 datasets, these TKs are applied to quantify releases to groundwater following Eq.1 regardless of 196 the composition of the sulfidic ore mined and the geographic context, thus leading to significant 197 uncertainty factors associated with these TKs. Indeed, uncertainty values on parameters used to 198 derive TKs and expressed as GSD vary from 147% to 11500% (Doka, 2017, 2009, 2008). This 199 dataset "treatment of sulfidic tailings", is commonly used to model tailings management in 200 diverse sulfidic ores mining datasets in the ecoinvent database regardless the type of ore mined 201 or the mine's geographic location.

202 If generic TKs were used until the release of ecoinvent 3.5, the model developed by Doka could 203 also be applied to obtain more specific TK associated with a given mine site with a given tailings 204 composition. This was done for ecoinvent 3.6 in which specific literature data on tailings 205 composition and climatic conditions of various mine sites were gathered allowing defining TKs 206 for these specific cases turning the number of datasets concerning the treatment of tailings from 207 2 in ecoinvent 3.5 to almost 40 (Turner et al., 2019). The model developed by Doka is accessible 208 through a specific Excel file "Tailings Impoundment 2020" that can be retrieved from doka.ch 209 website (Doka, 2020). This Excel file allows determining specific TKs over different timeframes. 210 Depending on the leaking substance, either an exponential model (Eq.2) or a linear model (Eq.3) 211 is applied. In particular, the linear model is applied to substances that are not easily leached out. 212 Differences between both models are imperceptible for short time frames but grow larger for 213 longer period. For a complete description of the models developed, see Doka (2008).

214 **Eq. 2**:
$$TK_i(t) = TK_{\infty,i}(1 - e^{-(V_{eff}, c_{0,i}/m_{initial,i}, TK_{\infty,i}),t})$$

215 **Eq. 3**:
$$TK_i(t) = \frac{V_{eff}.c_{0,i}}{m_{initial,i}}$$
. t

Eq.2. represents a first order law of kinetics equation taking into account the initial composition of the tailings at the end of the active phase (i.e. at mine closure) and the volume of water that flows through the tailings depending on the site climatic conditions such as rainfall and evapotranspiration. All the parameters included in Eq.2 and Eq.3 are more specifically described in Table 1 and can be quantified from on-site data collection (see section 2.2) or using generic values.

222	Table 1 : Definition of parameters included in Equation 2 and Equation 3, as described in Doka
223	(2017, 2009)

Parameter	Description	Unit
$TK_{\infty,i}$	Fraction of the observed element <i>i</i> that can be mobilized at the end of the initial active phase, i.e. at the moment of mine closure	kg/kg _{tailings}
V _{eff}	Effective leachate volume, i.e. the water that interacts with the tailings $V_{eff} = \frac{1 - w\%}{\frac{h\delta}{I} - \frac{Tp.w\%}{v\%}}$	liter/kg.year
w%	Share of preferential water flow in the leachate output	%

h	Tailings dam height	m
δ	Tailings density	kg/m ³
Ι	Rain infiltration rate $I = (MAP - \frac{ETa}{2}) * (1 - e^{-ft(MAT+15)})$	mm/m²year
MAP	Mean annual precipitation	mm/m ² year
Eta	Actual evapotranspiration rate	mm/m ² year
ft	Factor for temperature dependence	
MAT	Mean annual temperature	°C
Тр	Residence time of the preferential water flow	year
v%	Water content in the tailings	%
C _{0,i}	Mean concentration of the observed element <i>i</i> in the leachate during the first year after the active phase, i.e. after mine closure	kg/l _{leachate}
m _{initial,i}	Total amount of the observed element <i>i</i> in the tailings at the end of the active phase, i.e. after mine closure	kg/kg _{tailings}

225 In this study, Doka's model will be applied to derive semi-specific TKs (referred to as semi-226 specific scenario) taking into account the specific composition and climatic conditions of the 227 studied mine site (see section 2.2). These calculated semi-specific TKs and the associated 228 releases will be compared to the ones from the generic dataset "treatment of sulfidic tailing, off-229 site – GLO" (referred to as *generic scenario*) and from the most representative dataset, regarding 230 both the main exploited metal and the climatic conditions, of the mine site under study 231 "treatment of sulfidic tailings, from copper mine operation, tailings impoundment – RU" 232 (generic, Cu dataset and referred as *generic*, Cu scenario) both as modeled in ecoinvent 3.6

233 2.1.2. Specific approach: reactive transport models

234 Reactive transport models are used in the mining industry to predict and describe the fate and 235 transport of metals, in particular for tailings ponds, during mine operations or after mine closure 236 in order to assess the associated environmental impacts (Butler et al., 2008; Nordstrom and 237 Nicholson, 2018; Strömberg and Banwart, 1994; Zhu et al., 2001). More specifically, multi-238 component transport modelling aims at understanding the distribution in space and time of 239 chemical reactions occurring in a specific environment and in particular at the interfaces 240 between the gas, aqueous and solid phases. Steefel and Maher described in details the rationale 241 and the physical and biochemical processes driving transport modelling, which depends on mass 242 transport, heat transport and geochemical reactions (2009). To facilitate the solving of the 243 thermodynamics and kinetics equations that drive the transport phenomena, specific databases 244 on properties of the chemical elements and specific software were developed (Jacques et al., 245 2008; Lichtner, 2007; Mayer et al., 2002; Steefel, 2009; Thiéry, 2015).

246 In this study, a representative cross-section of the tailings dam under assessment is considered 247 in a 2D model (see Figure 1). In this cross-section, several hydrogeochemical units are 248 considered, each with their specific properties: porosity, permeability, dispersivity, 249 mineralogical composition and pore water chemical composition. The numerical model applied 250 is the coupled reactive transport simulator MARTHE-PHREEQC (Thiéry, 2015) that couples a 251 geochemical code, PHREEQC (Parkhurst and Appelo, 2013; Parkhurst and Wissmeier, 2015), to a 252 flow and mass transport code MARTHE (Thiéry, 2013; Thiéry and Picot-Colbeaux, 2020). This 253 coupling, described in details as applied in this study in Lassin et al. (2021a), allow the simulation of chemical elements' fate in the modelled system and in particular their fate at the 254 255 boundary between the system, the tailings ponds, and the environment. At the outlet of the 256 system (Figure 1), releases into the groundwater are quantified. The groundwater is 257 consequently considered as the final receiving compartment. More specifically, this coupling 258 allows simulating the aqueous concentration of the studied chemical elements at the inlet and 259 outlet of the system at each simulated time step, permitting to determine the concentration at 260 the outlet and the cumulated mass outflow at a certain timeframe. However, the concentration at the outlet results both from the presence of the tailing pond and its leakages and the initial 261 262 concentration of the studied substances in the environment. In order to quantify the 263 concentration variation induced by the presence of the tailings ponds only, the difference 264 between the outlet and the inlet cumulated concentrations as reported in Lassin et al. (2021a) is 265 calculated and used to derive the specific TKs following Eq.4. and Eq.5. for which the specific data are available in the Supplementary Information. 266

Applying Eq.1 to these TKs will lead to **site-specific releases** (referred to as *site-specific scenario*) resulting from the tailings.

270 **Eq. 4**:
$$m_i(t) = \frac{(c_{outlet,i}(t)*M_i - c_{inlet,i}(t)*M_i)*1000}{m_{total}}$$

271 **Eq. 5**:
$$TK_i(t) = \frac{m_i(t)}{m_{initial,i}}$$

With: - $c_{outlet,i}$ and $c_{inlet,i}$ the cumulated outflows at the year *t* of the observed substance *i* respectively at the outlet and at the inlet of the system (expressed in mol);

- *M_i*: the molar mass of the observed substance *i* (expressed in g/mol);

275 - m_{total} : The total mass of tailings (expressed in kg);

276 - $m_i(t)$: the mass at the year t of the observed substance *i* that is effectively leached out;

277 - $m_{initial,i}$: Total amount of the observed element *i* in the tailings at the end of the active 278 phase, i.e. after mine closure (in kg/kg_{tailings})



Figure 1 : Simplified vertical cross-section of the system under study showing the different flows considered, adapted from Lassin et al. (2021a). The different layers are representative of the site's morphology

279 2.2. Case study and data

This study aims at analyzing specific methodological issues, the coupling between RTM and LCA. In line with the ILCD Handbook recommendations, this study therefore does not specifically meet the ISO 14040/14044 requirements. (ILCD, 2010). More particularly, only the post-closure tailings releases to the groundwater are considered in the scope of the study. As the specific modeling of air emissions as dust due to climatic conditions are outside the scope of the paper they are not considered here. Similarly, tailings management systems that can be put in place after closure are also not considered: in a conservative approach where no actions are supposed to be taken to limit tailings releases, they are considered out of the scope of this study.

288 The quantified releases are related to a mine site located in Northern Europe, which currently 289 exploits a polymetallic sulphidic ore. The operators of this site provided access to the required 290 data, in the frame of multi-partners R&D project funded under the European H2020 291 program. The exploited ore leads to copper and nickel as a primary concentrates and some other 292 metallic concentrates as co-products. The tailings generated during the mineral processing steps 293 are mainly wastes from flotation operations, where flotation uses chemical reagents and water 294 to separate and concentrate the minerals of interest using the hydrophobic and hydrophilic 295 properties of materials. Here, post-closure tailings releases are modelled using the three 296 approaches considering a short term and a long term timeframe (see section 2.3). The releases 297 are related to the specific functional unit "The post-mining storage of 1 kg sulfidic tailings 298 resulting from the exploitation of a polymetallic ore. In the absence of information as to potential 299 future post-mining operations, it is decided in this study to not consider any tailings 300 management operations that could potentially limit releases to groundwater from tailings in the 301 long-term.Different datasets are needed to apply Eq.1 in the different approaches. Table 3 302 provides a summary of the data and their sources needed to perform the TKs calculation for 303 each scenario. The first dataset is the initial tailings composition (i.e. $m_{initial,i}$) given in Table 2. This composition is quantified based on the assessment of the tailings mineralogical 304 305 composition using QXRD (quantitative X-Ray Diffraction) on a specific tailing sample and is used for the semi-specific and the site-specific scenarios. When available for the mine site, data needed 306 307 to derive Eq.2 for the *semi-specific scenario* were used. The specific term $c_{0,i}$ is obtained from the 308 simulation conducted by Lassin et al. (2021a). If data are not available from the mine site nor 309 from the simulation conducted by Lassin et al. (2021a), by default values used in Doka's model 310 are considered, cf. Table 1 and Table 3 (Doka, 2020, 2008). The quantification of Eq.2 311 parameters as well as the data sources are available in the Supporting Information. All data used 312 to simulate the TKs using the reactive transport model are also available in the Supporting 313 Information as well as in Lassin et al. (2021a).

Table 2 : Composition of the tailings assessed in this study, this composition was obtained using
 analytical techniques on site samples (QXRD)

Element	Symbol	m _{initial,i} (kg / kg _{tailings})
Sulfur	S	5.63E-3
Copper	Cu	5.19E-3
Silicon	Si	2.12E-0.1
Iron	Fe	1.70E-01
Calcium	Ca	9.71E-2
Aluminium	Al	1.26E-2

Potassium	К	4.61E-3
Magnesium	Mg	9.25E-2
Nickel	Ni	7.08E-4
Sodium	Na	6.16E-4

318

Table 3 : Summary of the data and their sources needed to perform the assessment for each

2	1	1	q	
J	-	-	,	

	Generic	Generic, Cu	Semi-specific	Site-specific
Initial composition m _{initial,i}	Data from Turner et al., (2019)	Data from Turner et al., (2019)	Data coming from on-site sampling, see Table 2	Data coming from on-site sampling, see Table 2
Parameters to estimate <i>TK_i(t)</i>	Data from Turner et al., (2019)	Data from Turner et al., (2019)	TK_{∞} , w%, T_p , v%, ft: Generic data available in (Doka, 2017) $c_{0,i}$: Simulated data Lassin et al. (2021a) h , δ , MAP, Eta, MAT: Values obtained from the mine site	Reactive transport modelling as described in Lassin et al. (2021a)
Model used to estimate <i>TK_i(t)</i>	First order law of kinetics: Equation 2 resolved using (Doka, 2020)	First order law of kinetics: Equation 2 resolved using (Doka, 2020)	First order law of kinetics: Equation 2 resolved using (Doka, 2020)	Reactive transport modelling: Equation 5 resolved using model from Lassin et al. (2021a)

320

321 In the context of LCA, specific limits exist in the quantification of the impacts associated with 322 metals emissions, especially on impacts related to ecotoxicity. First, not all LCIA characterization 323 models provide characterization factors for the same metals, and not all metals are 324 characterized. Then, metal speciation is often not considered (Aziz et al., 2018; Plouffe et al., 325 2016). In order to investigate these aspects in the present study, the releases determined from 326 the three approaches will be characterized using in a first place the EF LCIA method that is the 327 method used in the European environmental footprint initiative and recommended by the 328 European Commission (Fazio et al., 2018). The EF method based the calculation of toxicity and 329 ecotoxicity impacts on the USEtox 2.1 model. To assess the effects of the choice of the LCIA 330 method on the comparison results, two other methods will be used to characterize the releases: 331 the EDIP LCIA model with its specific characterization model (Hauschild and Potting, 2005) and 332 the ReCiPE LCIA method that is based on the USES-LCA characterization model for the toxicity 333 and ecotoxicity impacts (Huijbregts et al., 2017). The applied characterization factors are 334 available in the Supplementary Information. Furthermore, considering the EF characterization 335 method, recommendations from the European Commission to discard long-term releases 336 (beyond 100 years) in the impacts calculations for the three assessed impact categories ("Non 337 cancer human health effects", "Cancer human health effects" and "Ecotoxicity") are followed 338 (Fazio et al., 2018). That should be kept in mind when interpreting the results, if long-term 339 releases are quantified, they are not characterized using the EF method, only short-term releases 340 are. In other terms, for both the short-term and the long-term perspectives (see section 2.3), 341 only the cumulated emitted masses in the short-term time frame are characterized with the EF 342 method. For other methods, long-term releases are characterized.

343 2.3. Considered timeframes

In the approach applied in ecoinvent, transfer coefficients are calculated for two different time 344 345 horizons: 100 and 60,000 years. The 60,000 year-timeframe was chosen as it represents an 346 "ecological planning horizon" at which landscape and ecospheres would be redefined (for 347 example Swiss landscapes might be recovered with glaciers). The damages implied by diffuse 348 pollution as we know it will also be redefined (Doka, 2008). Doka also underlined that a 60,000 349 year-timeframe represents a conservative approach in the quantification of long-term releases 350 associated with a tailings dam (2008). In this study, the 100 year-timeframe is kept to consider 351 the short term perspective. However, for the long term perspective, a 10,000 year perspective is 352 preferred. This choice is justified by two considerations. Firstly, if for the generic and the semi-353 specific TKs determination, the chosen time frame has no incidence, this is not the case for the site specific TKs obtained by simulation. In fact, complex computer simulations 354 require significant computational resources, from 6 to 24 hours of computer calculations 355 356 depending on the initial considerations. Here the 10,000 year-timeframe is chosen as a 357 compromise between simulation time and representation of a long-term perspective. Secondly, 358 results in Lassin et al. (2021a) show that, for each followed parameter (water inflow and 359 outflow rates, pH, and substances' concentration) a steady state value seems to have been 360 reached out after around a 1,000 year-timeframe. Finally, to simplify the modelling, it is 361 assumed that no rehabilitation actions are done during these timeframes.

362 **3. Results and discussion**

363 3.1. Resulting TKs and impacts

Figure 2 presents the TKs obtained for the four scenarios and for the short-term and the long-364 365 term timeframes. The graphically represented TKs are the ones that correspond to the substance 366 initially present in the studied tailings (cf. Table 2). When looking at the scenario 'Generic' 367 (linked to the ecoinvent dataset "treatment of sulfidic tailing, off-site - GLO") or 'Generic, Cu' 368 (linked to the econvent dataset "treatment of sulfidic tailings, from copper mine operation, 369 tailings impoundment – RU") for which the model as applied in ecoinvent 3.6 are used, TKs are 370 available for a larger amount of substances. In fact, they are available for substances present in 371 the average tailings composition considered in the Doka model (Turner et al., 2019). These 372 generic TKs values are reported in the Supplementary Information.

373 The long-term TKs for four substances, calculated for the 'site specific' scenario are not 374 represented in Figure 2: copper, potassium, nickel and iron. These TKs, which are based on 375 reactive transport modelling, are obtained through the difference of masses between the outlet 376 and the inlet of the system (cf. Figure 1). In this case study, these four cumulated substances 377 flows at the inlet are larger than at the outlet (see Supplementary Information) showing that, 378 over the long term, the regional groundwater will be naturally more charged than the water 379 coming out of the tailings. Indeed, the surrounding groundwater are representative of the local 380 geochemical background which, in this case, is characterized by high contents in copper and 381 nickel. That means, that in a long timeframe, the presence of the tailings would not influence the

- 382 concentration of these four substances in the groundwater Conversely, at a shorter timeframe,
- 383 the TKs for these four substances are positive, leading to their short-term release, as illustrated
- in Figure 2 and in the Supplementary information.



Figure 2: Resulting short-term and long-term TKs for the four studied approaches, log-scale

388 The TKs obtained through Doka's formula using site specificities ('semi-specific') or through 389 transport modelling ('site specific') are often much smaller than the ones obtained using generic 390 values except for sodium and potassium, for which values from the semi-specific scenario are 391 larger than the generic values in both short-term and long-term. This might be due to the 392 parameter $c_{0,i}$ (average leachate concentration, see Table 1) that differs from two to three orders 393 of magnitude between the values used in ecoinvent that were obtained from a literature survey 394 and the ones used in the semi-specific approach that were obtained through reactive transport 395 simulations (see Table 3 and Supplementary Information). The differences between generic and 396 site specific TKs vary from zero (e.g. sodium, potassium) to four orders of magnitude (e.g. 397 copper) in a short-term timeframe. The differences between 'site specific' and 'semi-specific' TKs 398 result from the model employed to derive these values:a first order law of kinetics in the case of 399 the 'semi-specific' TKs and reactive transport modelling in the case of the 'site specific' TKs.

400 These differences in the TKs values translates into differences in the cumulative masses of 401 substances released, and therefore also in the calculated impacts. Regarding the mass released 402 (results in Supporting Information), the reactive transport modelling leads to quantities 403 released in both short-term and long term time perspectives smaller than masses calculated by 404 Doka's model, except for aluminum and potassium at short term. For these two substances, the 405 difference does not exceed an order of magnitude. As a result, the impacts of the site-specific scenario are smaller than the impacts calculated for the three other scenarios for every 406 407 characterization methods and impact categories. These impacts are presented in Table 4. 408 Besides being driven by differences in the models themselves, the orders of magnitude of 409 differences between the impacts of the Generic/Generic, Cu scenarios and the Semi-specific/Site 410 specific scenarios are also driven by the number of substances considered as released in both groups of scenarios. In fact and as stated above, in Doka's model for the "Generic" and the 411 412 "Generic, Cu" scenario it is assumed that a larger amount of substances are initially present in the tailings. In other terms, the initial tailings composition in the "Generic" and the "Generic, Cu" 413 414 scenarios, is assumed different from the on-site *real* composition.

415 Nickel and copper are the only contributive substances to the impacts when looking at the 416 "semi-specific" and the "site-specific" scenarios and at the EF method. This is due to the fact that 417 they are the only substances present initially in the assessed tailings pond that are characterized 418 in the EF method. Looking at these two scenarios, this is the same for ReCiPe, while in EDIP, iron 419 and aluminum complete this list of contributive substances because both present in the tailings 420 and characterized. If for the EF method only short term emissions are considered in the 421 characterization results (see Section 2.2), this is different for EDIP and ReCiPe where 422 characterized results differ for the short-term and the long-term perspectives (see Table 4). For 423 all scenarios and all impact categories, as expected, long-term impacts are greater than in a 424 short-term perspective by up to 4 orders of magnitude; except for ReCiPe and the "Site-specific" 425 scenario. This is due to the fact, as said earlier, that only copper and nickel are characterized in 426 ReCiPe and that in the long-term the presence of the tailings does not influence the 427 concentration of these substances in the environment.

428 However, when assessing the results obtained by the EF characterization methods for the 429 "Generic" scenario, respectively 99.9%, 96.6% and 70.5% of the impacts for the categories "Non-430 cancer human health effects", "Cancer human health effects" and "Ecotoxicity" are driven by 431 other substances, mainly zinc, arsenic and chromium VI. These substances that are not initially present in the tailings under study but assumed to be present in the average tailings 432 composition are used to derive TKs for the "Generic" scenario. Figure 3 shows the specific 433 434 contribution of such substances not present in the tailings generated by the mine under study for the "Generic" and "Generic, Cu" scenarios. 435

437Table 4 Resulting characterized toxicity and ecotoxicity impacts per kg of tailings for the four438studied scenarios for both the short term (ST) and the long term (LT) perspectives

			Scenario			
Method	Impact	Units	Generic	Generic, Cu	Semi- specific	Site- specific
EF (both	Non-cancer human health effects	CTUh	1.64E-09	1.39E-09	3.77E-13	1.10E-14
ST and LT)	Cancer human health effects	CTUh	9.19E-11	5.99E-11	6.53E-12	1.92E-13
	Ecotoxicity freshwater	CTUe	6.01E-02	4.52E-02	3.17E-03	8.69E-05
	Human toxicity water	m ³	1.32E-01	8.41E-02	3.12E-04	6.22E-06
EDIP (ST)	Ecotoxicity water chronic	m ³	8.32E00	5.50E00	4.59E-01	1.40E-02
	Ecotoxicity water acute	m ³	1.64E+02	1.38E+02	4.66E-02	2.83E-03
EDIP	Human toxicity water	m ³	2.86E+02	7.80E+01	3.12E-02	3.66E-05
(LT)	Ecotoxicity water chronic	m ³	1.12E+04	5.27E+03	4.58E+01	2.51E+00
	Ecotoxicity water acute	m ³	1.83E+03	1.21E+03	4.65E+00	1.14E+00
	Terrestrial ecotoxicity	kg 1.4- DCB	1.61E-20	1.28E-20	6.11E-22	1.68E-23
	Freshwater ecotoxicity	kg 1.4- DCB	2.62E-04	2.08E-04	9.68E-06	2.66E-07
ReCiPe	Marine ecotoxicity	kg 1.4- DCB	3.59E-04	2.89E-04	1.19E-05	3.29E-07
(ST)	Human carcinogenic toxicity	kg 1.4- DCB	6.53E-05	4.26E-05	3.89E-06	1.14E-07
	Human non- carcinogenic toxicity	kg 1.4- DCB	9.24E-03	7.91E-03	7.83E-07	2.27E-08
	Terrestrial ecotoxicity	kg 1.4- DCB	9.83E-18	5.21E-18	6.05E-20	0.00E+00
ReCiPe	Freshwater ecotoxicity	kg 1.4- DCB	1.59E-01	8.46E-02	9.59E-04	0.00E+00
(LT)	Marine ecotoxicity	kg 1.4- DCB	2.01E-01	1.12E-01	1.18E-03	0.00E+00
	Human carcinogenic toxicity	kg 1.4- DCB	4.45E-03	4.15E-03	3.84E-04	0.00E+00
	Human non- carcinogenic toxicity	kg 1.4- DCB	2.08E+00	2.03E+00	7.74E-05	0.00E+00





Figure 3 : Representation of the resulting toxicity and ecotoxicity impacts per kg of tailings using the EF method and for a 100 year-time frame. The left graphic is a zoom in of the representation of the right graphic window.

440 Results presented in both Table 4 and Figure 3 show large differences between the different scenarios, with a maximizing trend when looking at the 'Generic' and the 'Generic, Cu' scenarios 441 442 based on a first order law of kinetics equations and a minimizing trend when looking at the 'Site-443 specific' scenario based on reactive transport modelling. More specifically and as summarized in 444 Table 4, comparing results from the 'Site specific' scenario and the 'Semi-specific' scenario 445 underlines the differences implied by the model used to quantify the releases associated with 446 the tailings from the same initial composition dataset. When using a model based on the first 447 order law of kinetics ('Semi-specific' scenario), resulting impacts are overestimated from 0 to 4 orders of magnitude compared with the ones obtained through reactive transport modelling. 448 449 Comparing results from the 'Generic' scenario and the 'Semi-specific' scenario underlines the 450 differences implied by the use of different initial data conditions used in a same model 451 framework. In this case, the differences vary from 1 to 5 orders of magnitude. Mainly, differences 452 between 'site-specific' and 'semi-specific' scenarios are less or as significant as between 'generic' 453 and 'semi-specific' scenarios showing here the importance to consider the proper tailings 454 mineralogical composition when assessing its environmental impacts. However, this conclusion 455 should be considered with caution as only one case study is assessed here.

456 3.2. Representativeness of tailings releases modelling approaches

457 Table 5 : Data and approaches used to quantify the long-term releases associated with tailings

		GENERIC and GENERIC, Cu SCENARIO	SEMI-SPECIFIC SCENARIO	SITE-SPECIFIC SCENARIO	
Tailings	ings Initial Initial Composition Initial Sites Average data representing Worldwide mining Sites			Site specific data including mineralogical composition	
churacteristics	Initial leachate	(representing	Site specific		
	Dimensions	Russian copper	data		
	Density	mining sites in			
	Climatic conditions	case of the scenario 'Generic, Cu')			
Environmental parameters	Underground layers composition	Not considered	Not considered	Site specific data	
	Regional groundwater flow	Not considered	Not considered		
System hydrodynamics		Modeled using a first order law of kinetics considering only climatic waters		Modeled using MARTHE considering all waters inputs and outputs	
<i>Geochemical interactions including mass and heat transport</i>		Not considered	Not considered	Modeled using PHREEQC associated to the THERMODDEM database as well as MARTHE	

458

Table 5 summarizes the different elements that are effectively considered in each scenario.
Every scenario differs in terms of data needed to run the model and in terms of sophistication of

461 the considered model. If for the 'Generic' and the 'Generic, Cu' scenarios, resulting releases are 462 directly available in the ecoinvent database, for the 'semi-specific' scenario, a data collection 463 considering the site tailings characteristics and climatic conditions is necessary to perform the 464 calculation manually or using Doka's dedicated Excel's file (2020). More initial data as well as 465 competencies in modelling hydrogeochemical systems are needed in the case of the reactive 466 transport model ('Site-specific' scenario). Using a more sophisticated model helps reduce the 467 uncertainty associated with the model in the obtained results. It also allows a better 468 understanding and therefore interpretation of the resulting tailings releases. For example, 469 applying the reactive transport modelling to the studied tailings, Lassin et al. concluded that the 470 level of releases is quite small as there is a progressive dilution of tailings waters (with the 471 inputs of climatic waters and the regional groundwater flow) (2021a). Moreover, Lassin et al. 472 also explain the individual substances emission behavior based on the model results, for 473 example here aluminum is released in concordance with a pH rise in the system, induced by the 474 dissolution of carbonate minerals that leads to the dissolution of aluminate and aluminosilicate 475 minerals (2021a).

476 If model uncertainty can be reduced using more sophisticated models, another source of 477 uncertainty is parameter uncertainty. In the 'Generic' scenario based on the ecoinvent generic 478 dataset, the uncertainty, expressed in terms of a geometric standard deviation (GSD), associated 479 with the resulting long-term releases varies between 100 % and 3,158 %. This parameter 480 uncertainty takes into account uncertainty associated with the considered waste composition 481 and the TKs calculations (Doka, 2020). Expressing uncertainty in terms of GSD implies 482 expressing the uncertainty as following: there is a 95% chance that the studied value belongs to 483 the interval $[\mu_g/GSD; \mu_g^*GSD]$ where μ_g expresses the geometric mean. Thus, a GSD value of 484 3,158% implies quite a large interval where maximal values might not even be physically 485 reached (for explanation on uncertainty as defined and expressed in the ecoinvent database see 486 Muller et al. (2016). Parameter uncertainty can be reduced using on-site data, as it has been 487 done here in the 'Semi-specific' scenario. However, if the parameter uncertainty is expressed for 488 the datasets available in the ecoinvent database ('Generic' and 'Generic, Cu' scenarios), it was not 489 quantified for on-site parameters leading to no quantification of the uncertainty reduction 490 potential associated with the use of more reliable data. Even if parameter uncertainty remains in 491 on-site data (due to the data acquisition method for example, see next paragraph), one may 492 consider such data as less uncertain compared to data coming from average mining sites drawn 493 from literature.

494 Despite reactive transport modelling provides sound bases for understanding coupled processes 495 and thus improve predictions (Glassley et al., 2003; Steefel and Maher, 2009; Steefel et al., 2015, 496 2005), uncertainties must also be reported for more mechanistic and site specific models for the 497 following reasons. i) The whole set of site-specific data required for a fully comprehensive 498 reactive transport model may never be available at the scale of the mining site and over 499 sufficient time frames to calibrate unequivocally the model. However, one can expect that the 500 site-specific information about the mineralogical data will be more systematically acquired, and 501 thus made available for numerical simulations, thanks to the development of on-site 502 characterization tools aimed at optimizing the exploitation of the mines (Dold, 2017). *ii*) 503 Measured data are inherently error-prone. In particular, chemical data are measured at the lab, 504 on samples taken on site. More specifically, aqueous solutions properties may have evolved in 505 the meantime because of their extraction from the field. *iii*) Simplifying assumptions are made in 506 order to help the numerical convergence, speed-up the calculations, or because not all of the 507 numerous ongoing processes are fully understood or identified. iv) Property values reported in 508 thermodynamic and kinetic databases are also characterized by uncertainty or could be missing. 509 For all these reasons, even if reactive transport modelling improves the estimation of the release of chemical elements from tailings ponds compared to more generic approaches, its results mustalso be considered with caution.

512 The timeframe considered for estimating long term releases, namely 10,000 years, is also a 513 matter of discussion since there is no such model capable of predicting the evolution of climate 514 and its consequences on surficial facilities over such long time durations. Such a timeframe can 515 possibly be considered for contexts where only geological times apply, as in the case of nuclear 516 waste storage in deep geological sedimentary layers that are known to not have evolved for 517 million years. For shallow or surficial facilities, as here, a shorter timeframe should lead to more 518 reliable results. Limits of current impact characterization methods with respect to tailings 519 releases

520 In the context of LCA, specific limits are identified when quantifying impacts of metals releases, 521 especially on ecotoxicity and toxicity. A first limit is the consideration of metals fate in 522 characterization mechanisms. Ecotoxicity characterization models, and especially terrestrial 523 ecotoxicity models, do not take into consideration metal speciation and the soil and water 524 properties that can affect this speciation, and so the potential toxicity of the metals (Aziz et al., 525 2018; Plouffe et al., 2016). A second limit is the completeness of characterization methods 526 regarding metals. Not all metals are characterized in each method. In the ecotoxicity and toxicity 527 impacts considered here, in average almost 60% of the released substances (of the total 528 considered for the 'Generic' and the 'Generic, Cu' scenarios) are not characterized. This is the 529 case for substances such as aluminum and iron for the EF characterization model for example; 530 despite their TKs value, characterization factors for these substances are not available in EF. 531 This percentage varies both per characterization method and impact category. Given these 532 limits, in USEtox, the characterization method recommended by the Product Environmental 533 Footprint program of the European Commission for the ecotoxicity and toxicity impacts, 534 characterization factors applied to metals are considered as interim ones. Moreover, the 535 European Commission recommends to discard long-term releases for the three impact categories assessed using USEtox characterization model: 'Human toxicity, cancer effect', 536 537 'Human toxicity, non-cancer effect' and 'Ecotoxicity' (Fazio et al., 2018). This recommendation 538 has been followed in this work meaning that long-term releases (i.e. beyond 100 years) are not 539 characterized in the EF method in Table 4 and Figure 3. This fact has to be kept in mind when 540 interpreting results using this method.

541 **4.** Conclusions and perspectives

542 This work presents different approaches to quantify releases resulting from tailings in the 543 mining sector. Using these approaches allow assessing the effect of using more representative 544 data and model sophistication when quantifying the tailings releases and their associated 545 impacts. In this specific case study, large differences in the results are observed when comparing 546 a simplified model coupled with generic data and a more complex model coupled with site-547 specific data. The latter being associated with much smaller calculated impacts. More 548 specifically, the more complex model considers on-site information to define the tailings 549 characteristics and the environmental parameters in combination with both the system 550 hydrodynamics and the geochemical interactions occurring in the system (see Table 5). Results 551 differ by two to eight orders of magnitude depending on the considered characterization model 552 and impacts categories. Each of the approaches have pros and cons. While more reliable results 553 may be brought by reactive transport models, their accuracy depend on the access to specific 554 data from the mine site and on the required time and competencies to run the model. While 555 generic data and models used in LCI database are less representative of a certain reality, they 556 give nonetheless an idea of potential impacts induced by mining. In fact, no matter the value 557 chain assessed in a LCA study, there is a good chance that production of metals and so the 558 mining and the beneficiation of the associated ores are part of this value chain somewhere in the 559 background system. In this case, the practitioner or the study sponsor have no access to the 560 specific mine site and to the specific value chain of the metals present in the system. In this 561 absence of specific knowledge of the background, using generic data allows quantifying these 562 impacts rather than ignoring the potential significant impacts in the life cycle of the system 563 under study. Finally, this coupling allows to generate more robust and reliable data regarding 564 releases from tailings and thus to generate more reliable and complete mining LCI datasets.

565 One common assumption to the different approaches is the time duration used for the long-term 566 perspective. In each approach, the model was applied in a 10,000 year time perspective without 567 considering changes such as climatic variations that can possibly occur in this time frame. 568 Results expressed in this long term time perspective must therefore be seen as a tendency rather 569 than a reliable quantification of long-term releases associated with tailings.

570 Thus, the use of the 'appropriate' model and/or the 'appropriate' data is a consensus to find 571 between the quality of the study to reach and as defined in the goal and scope, the data 572 availability and the availability of the 'right' competency to mobilize. The availability of the 573 'right' competency also underlines the necessity of an interdisciplinary approach when 574 modelling complex systems in LCA and especially for dealing with data gaps. For example, 575 hydrogeologists can help the practitioner having a better model to consider specific emissions to 576 the environment, while process simulations can help closing data gaps regarding specific 577 exchanges at the level of the unit operations (Segura-Salazar et al., 2019).

578 The conclusion of this study was drawn on a single case-study in a specific climatic context. 579 Therefore the considerations on the reliability associated with the use of a simplified model and 580 generic data cannot directly be generalized. In order to draw some generalizations, the same 581 study should be conducted on various mine sites having differences in the treated ores and in 582 the operating climatic conditions, especially regarding precipitations and evapotranspiration).

583 A more precise evaluation of tailings releases over time is crucial, not only to assess their 584 potential environmental impacts but also to have a better estimate of what remains in the 585 tailings. Knowing the characteristics of tailings in terms of mineral composition can bring arguments against or in favor of tailings reprocessing. In fact, during the exploitation, some 586 587 elements are not recovered because of the absence of economic viability of their exploitation 588 (processing costs might be too important compared to the market prices). Because of metals 589 market prices fluctuations and processes costs reduction through process amelioration for 590 example, these substances present in the tailings could be seen as secondary raw materials 591 resources in a short to long timeframe depending on their concentration in the tailings dam.

592 These considerations on metals releases to the environment versus the fact that they potentially 593 remain in the technosphere in a tailings dam are in line with discussions occurring today in LCA 594 around the area of protection "Resources" and in particular regarding resources dissipation. The 595 quantification of resources dissipation, in other words resources losses, is still subject to 596 methodological discussions today in LCA. Being able to quantify long-term metals behavior in 597 tailings, as done here, is a result that can be used in the quantification of resources dissipation in 598 the mining stage of a metal life cycle.

599

600 Acknowledgements:

Funding sources: This research has received funding from the European Union H2020 program
 under grant agreement no 730480, ITERAMS project.

A special thanks to the two anonymous reviewers that helped the paper gain in clarity.

604 **References**

- Althaus, H.-J., Doka, G., 2018. Treatment of sulfidic tailing, off-site. Allocation, cut-off by
 classification econvent database version 3.5.
- Azapagic, A., 2004. Developing a framework for sustainable development indicators for the
 mining and minerals industry. J. Clean. Prod. 12, 639–662. https://doi.org/10.1016/S09596526(03)00075-1
- Aziz, L., Deschênes, L., Karim, R.-A., Patouillard, L., Bulle, C., 2018. Including metal atmospheric
 fate and speciation in soils for terrestrial ecotoxicity in life cycle impact assessment. Int. J.
 Life Cycle Assess. 23, 2178–2188. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-018-1438-8
- Bellenfant, G., Guezennec, A.G., Bodénan, F., D'Hugues, P., Cassard, D., 2013. Re-processing of
 mining waste: Combining environmental management and metal recovery?, in: Mine
 ClosureMine Closure. Cornwall, United Kingdom, pp. 571–582.
- 616Bes, C.M., Pardo, T., Bernal, M.P., Clemente, R., 2014. Assessment of the environmental risks617associated with two mine tailing soils from the La Unión-Cartagena (Spain) mining district.618J.Geochemical619https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gexplo.2014.05.020
- Beylot, A., Villeneuve, J., 2017. Accounting for the environmental impacts of sul fi dic tailings
 storage in the Life Cycle Assessment of copper production : A case study. J. Clean. Prod. 153,
 139–145. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.03.129
- Broadhurst, J.L., Kunene, M.C., von Blottnitz, H., Franzidis, J.-P., 2015. Life cycle assessment of the
 desulfurisation flotation process to prevent acid rock drainage: A base metal case study.
 Miner. Eng. 76, 126–134. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mineng.2014.10.013
- 626Broadhurst, J.L., Petrie, J.G., 2010. Ranking and scoring potential environmental risks from solid627mineralwastes.Miner.Eng.23,182–191.628https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mineng.2009.09.008
- Brookfield, A.E., Blowes, D.W., Mayer, K.U., 2006. Integration of field measurements and reactive
 transport modelling to evaluate contaminant transport at a sulfide mine tailings
 impoundment. J. Contam. Hydrol. 88, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconhyd.2006.05.007
- Butler, B.A., Ranville, J.F., Ross, P.E., 2008. Observed and modeled seasonal trends in dissolved
 and particulate Cu, Fe, Mn, and Zn in a mining-impacted stream. Water Res. 42, 3135–3145.
 https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2008.03.004
- 635 Cuesta-Lopez, S., Barros, R., Ulla-Maija, M., Willersinn, S., Sheng, Y., 2016. Mapping the secondary
 636 resources in the EU (mine tailings, industrial waste) Project REFRAM, delivrable 3.1.
- 637 Doka, G., 2020. Tailings Impoundment Excel file.
- Doka, G., 2017. A model for waste-specific and climate-specific lige cycle inventories of tailings
 impoudments. Zürich, Switzerland.
- Doka, G., 2009. Life cycle inventories of waste treatment services. Dübendorf, Switzerland.
- 641 Doka, G., 2008. Life cycle inventory data of mining waste: Emissions from sulfidic tailings
 642 disposal. Zürich, Switzerland.
- Dold, B., 2017. Acid rock drainage prediction: A critical review. J. Geochemical Explor.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gexplo.2016.09.014
- Durucan, S., Korre, A., Munoz-Melendez, G., 2006. Mining life cycle modelling: a cradle-to-gate

- 646approach to environmental management in the minerals industry. J. Clean. Prod. 14, 1057–6471070. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2004.12.021
- Edraki, M., Baumgartl, T., Manlapig, E., Bradshaw, D., Franks, D.M., Moran, C.J., 2014. Designing
 mine tailings for better environmental, social and economic outcomes: a review of
 alternative approaches. J. Clean. Prod. 84, 411–420.
 https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.04.079
- Elberling, B., Nicholson, R. V., Scharer, J.M., 1994. A combined kinetic and diffusion model for
 pyrite oxidation in tailings: a change in controls with time. J. Hydrol. 157, 47–60.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1694(94)90098-1
- European Commission, 2006. Directice 2006/21/EC of the European Parliament and of the
 council of 15 March 2006 on the management of waste from extractve industries. European
 Union.
- Fazio, S., Castellani, V., Sala, S., Schau, E., Secchi, M., Zampori, L., 2018. Supporting information to
 the characterization factors of recommended EF Life Cycle Impact Assessment methods.
 EUR 28888 EN. Ispra, Italy. https://doi.org/10.2760/671368
- Ferreira, H., Leite, M.G.P., 2015. A Life Cycle Assessment study of iron ore mining. J. Clean. Prod.
 108, 1081–1091. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.05.140
- Glassley, W.E., Nitao, J.J., Grant, C.W., Johnson, J.W., Steefel, C.I., Kercher, J.R., 2003. The impact of
 climate change on vadose zone pore waters and its implication for long-term monitoring.
 Comput. Geosci. 29, 399–411. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0098-3004(03)00014-1
- Hauschild, M.Z., Potting, J., 2005. Spatial differentiation in life cycle impact assessment The
 EDIP2003 methodology. Environ. News 80, 195.
- Huijbregts, M.A.J., Steinmann, Z.J.N., Elshout, P., Stam, G., Verones, F., Vieira, M., Hollander, A.,
 Zijp, M., van Zelm, R., 2017. ReCiPe 2016 v1.1 A harmonized life cycle impact assessment
 method at midpoint and endpoint level Report I: characterization.
- 671 ILCD European Commission Joint Research Centre Institute for Environment and
- 672 Sustainability (2010) International Reference Life Cycle Data System (ILCD) Handbook
 673 General guide for Life Cycle Assessment Detailed guidance. Luxembourg
- ISO/TC 207/ SC 5, 2006. ISO 14040:2006 Environmental management Life cycle assessment Principles and framework. Switzerland.
- Jacques, D., Šimůnek, J., Mallants, D., van Genuchten, M.T., 2008. Modelling coupled water flow,
 solute transport and geochemical reactions affecting heavy metal migration in a podzol soil.
 Geoderma 145, 449–461. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2008.01.009
- Kossoff, D., Dubbin, W.E., Alfredsson, M., Edwards, S.J., Macklin, M.G., Hudson-Edwards, K.A.,
 2014. Mine tailings dams: Characteristics, failure, environmental impacts, and remediation.
 Appl. Geochemistry 51, 229-245.
 https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeochem.2014.09.010
- Lassin, A., Thiéry, D., Blanc, P., Guignot, S., 2021. Estimating potential releases from mine tailings:
 insights from reactive transport modelling. Final Report. BRGM/RP-70601-FR, 81pp. Under
 publication, will be available on http://infoterre.brgm.fr/rechercher/switch.htm?scope=9
- Lèbre, É., Corder, G., 2015. Integrating Industrial Ecology Thinking into the Management of
 Mining Waste. Resources 4, 765–786. https://doi.org/10.3390/resources4040765
- 688 Lèbre, É., Corder, G.D., Golev, A., 2017. Sustainable practices in the management of mining waste:

- 689A focus on the mineral resource.Miner.Eng.107,34-42.690https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mineng.2016.12.004
- 691 Lichtner, P., 2007. FLOTRAN Users Manual: Two-phase non-isothermal coupled thermal 692 hydrologic-chemical (THC) reactive flow and transport code, Version 2. Los Alamos, New
 693 Mexico.
- 694Mayer, K.U., Frind, E.O., Blowes, D.W., 2002. Multicomponent reactive transport modeling in695variably saturated porous media using a generalized formulation for kinetically controlled696reactions.WaterResour.Res.38,13-21.697https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1029/2001WR000862
- 698Memary, R., Giurco, D., Mudd, G., Mason, L., 2012. Life cycle assessment: a time-series analysis of699copper.J.Clean.Prod.33,97–108.700https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.04.025
- Moran, C.J., Lodhia, S., Kunz, N.C., Huisingh, D., 2014. Sustainability in mining, minerals and energy: new processes, pathways and human interactions for a cautiously optimistic future.
 J. Clean. Prod. 84, 1–15. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.09.016
- Mudd, G., 2007. Sustainability and mine waste management A snapshot of mining waste issues,
 in: IIR Conferences. Melbourne, Australia.
- Muller, S., Lesage, P., Ciroth, A., Mutel, C., Weidema, B.P., Samson, R., 2016. The application of the
 pedigree approach to the distributions foreseen in ecoinvent v3. Int. J. Life Cycle Assess. 21,
 1327–1337. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-014-0759-5
- Muniruzzaman, M., Karlsson, T., Ahmadi, N., Rolle, M., 2020. Multiphase and multicomponent
 simulation of acid mine drainage in unsaturated mine waste: Modeling approach,
 benchmarks and application examples. Appl. Geochemistry 120, 104677.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeochem.2020.104677
- Nordstrom, D., Nicholson, A., 2018. Geochemical Modeling for Mine Site Characterization and
 Remediation, vol. 4, Management Technologies for Metal Mining Influenced Water.
- 715Norgate, T., Haque, N., 2010. Energy and greenhouse gas impacts of mining and mineral716processing operations.J.Clean.Prod.18,266-274.717https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2009.09.020
- Nuss, P., Eckelman, M.J., 2014. Life Cycle Assessment of Metals: A Scientific Synthesis. PLoS One
 9, e101298.
- Parkhurst, D.L., Appelo, C.A.J., 2013. Description of input and examples for PHREEQC version 3: a
 computer program for speciation, batch-reaction, one-dimensional transport, and inverse
 geochemical calculations, Techniques and Methods. Reston, VA.
- Parkhurst, D.L., Wissmeier, L., 2015. PhreeqcRM: A reaction module for transport simulators
 based on the geochemical model PHREEQC. Adv. Water Resour. 83, 176–189.
 https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2015.06.001
- Plouffe, G., Bulle, C., Deschênes, L., 2016. Characterization factors for zinc terrestrial ecotoxicity
 including speciation. Int. J. Life Cycle Assess. 21, 523–535.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-016-1037-5
- Rader, K., Dwyer, R., Turner, D., Drielsma, J.A., Dumaresq, C., Barabash, S., Skruch, D., Landfield
 Greig, A., Assem, L., Bayliss, C., Albersmmer, C., 2019. Workshop on Improving Estimates of
 Releases from Mine Tailings in Life Cycle Assessment. Vancouver, Canada.
- Reid, C., Bécaert, V., Aubertin, M., Rosenbaum, R.K., Deschênes, L., 2009. Life cycle assessment of

- 733mine tailings management in Canada. J. Clean. Prod. 17, 471-479.734https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2008.08.014
- Rico, M., Benito, G., Salgueiro, A.R., Díez-Herrero, A., Pereira, H.G., 2008. Reported tailings dam
 failures: A review of the European incidents in the worldwide context. J. Hazard. Mater.
 152, 846–852. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2007.07.050
- Santero, N., Hendry, J., 2016. Harmonization of LCA methodologies for the metal and mining
 industry. Int. J. Life Cycle Assess. 21, 1543–1553. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-0151022-4
- Segura-Salazar, J., Lima, F.M., Tavares, L.M., 2019. Life Cycle Assessment in the minerals industry:
 Current practice, harmonization efforts, and potential improvement through the
 integration with process simulation. J. Clean. Prod.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.05.318
- Song, X., Pettersen, J.B., Pedersen, K.B., Røberg, S., 2017. Comparative life cycle assessment of
 tailings management and energy scenarios for a copper ore mine: A case study in Northern
 Norway. J. Clean. Prod. 164, 892–904.
 https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.07.021
- Steefel, C., 2009. CrunchFlow. Software for Modeling Multicomponent Reactive Flow and
 Transport. User's Manual. Berkeley, California.
- 751Steefel, C., Maher, K., 2009. Fluid-Rock Interaction: A Reactive Transport Approach. Rev. Mineral.752Geochemistry REV Miner.GEOCHEM 70, 485-532.753https://doi.org/10.2138/rmg.2009.70.11
- Steefel, C.I., Appelo, C.A.J., Arora, B., Jacques, D., Kalbacher, T., Kolditz, O., Lagneau, V., Lichtner,
 P.C., Mayer, K.U., Meeussen, J.C.L., Molins, S., Moulton, D., Shao, H., Šimůnek, J., Spycher, N.,
 Yabusaki, S.B., Yeh, G.T., 2015. Reactive transport codes for subsurface environmental
 simulation. Comput. Geosci. 19, 445–478. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10596-014-9443-x
- Steefel, C.I., DePaolo, D.J., Lichtner, P.C., 2005. Reactive transport modeling: An essential tool and
 a new research approach for the Earth sciences. Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 240, 539–558.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2005.09.017
- Strömberg, B., Banwart, S., 1994. Kinetic modelling of geochemical processes at the Aitik mining
 waste rock site in northern Sweden. Appl. Geochemistry 9, 583–595.
 https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-2927(94)90020-5
- Tao, M., Zhang, X., Wang, S., Cao, W., Jiang, Y., 2019. Life cycle assessment on lead-zinc ore
 mining and beneficiation in China. J. Clean. Prod. 237, 117833.
 https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.117833
- Thiéry, D., 2015. Modélisation 3D du transport réactif avec le code de calcul MARTHE v7.5
 couplé aux modules géochimiques de PHREEQC. Orléans, France. https://doi.org/Rapport
 BRGM/RP-64554-FR
- 770 Thiéry, D., 2013. Groundwater Flow Modeling in Porous Media Using MARTHE, in: Modeling 771 Software. Iohn Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ USA, pp. 45-62. 772 https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118557891.ch4
- Thiéry, D., Picot-Colbeaux, G., 2020. Guidelines for MARTHE v7.8 computer code for hydrosystems modelling. Orléans, France.
- Tost, M., Hitch, M., Chandurkar, V., Moser, P., Feiel, S., 2018. The state of environmental
 sustainability considerations in mining. J. Clean. Prod. 182, 969–977.
 https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.02.051

- Turner, D., Hischier, R., Doka, G., 2019. Life cycle inventories of sulfidic tailings disposal.
 Switzerland.
- Wernet, G., Bauer, C., Steubing, B., Reinhard, J., Moreno-Ruiz, E., Weidema, B., 2016. The
 ecoinvent database version 3 (part I): overview and methodology. Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.
 21, 1218–1230. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-016-1087-8
- Worrall, R., Neil, D., Brereton, D., Mulligan, D., 2009. Towards a sustainability criteria and
 indicators framework for legacy mine land. J. Clean. Prod. 17, 1426–1434.
 https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2009.04.013
- Xie, X.-D., Min, X.-B., Chai, L.-Y., Tang, C.-J., Liang, Y.-J., Li, M., Ke, Y., Chen, J., Wang, Y., 2013.
 Quantitative evaluation of environmental risks of flotation tailings from hydrothermal sulfidation-flotation process. Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. 20, 6050–6058.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-013-1643-8
- Zhu, C., Hu, F.Q., Burden, D.S., 2001. Multi-component reactive transport modeling of natural attenuation of an acid groundwater plume at a uranium mill tailings site. J. Contam. Hydrol.
 52, 95, 109, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160.7722(01)00154.1
- 792 52, 85–108. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-7722(01)00154-1