

# **A NOVEL FERTILISER DRAWN FORWARD OSMOSIS DESALINATION FOR FERTIGATION**

by

**SHERUB PHUNTSHO**

A Thesis submitted in fulfilment for the degree of

**Doctoral of Philosophy**



**School of civil and Environmental Engineering  
Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology  
University of Technology, Sydney (UTS),  
New South Wales, Australia**

January 2012

## **CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP/ORIGINALITY**

I certify that this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledge within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of candidate

**Sherub Phuntsho**

---

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing this doctoral thesis and, in particular, developing data to write this thesis has been one of the greatest academic challenges and yet the most rewarding experience I have ever had in my life. However, without the love, support, patience and guidance of some special people, this thesis would not have been completed satisfactorily on time.

Firstly, I pay special tribute to my late father Pema Dorji. Education for his children was his only priority and he would have been the proudest father had he ever lived to this moment. I dedicate this thesis to my dear father for all the sacrifices he made in raising and supporting his children and his family. I also dedicate this thesis to my dear mom Mrs. Dorji Pemo, who has always been a source of love, inspiration and encouragement throughout my entire life. Although for herself education remained only a dream, she today remains a very proud mom for her son.

This research and the thesis would not have been possible without the constant guidance, support and encouragement of my principal supervisor Dr. Ho Kyong Shon and therefore, I want to offer my deepest gratitude to him. He has been highly instrumental in my newfound interest in research and the quest for new ideas and innovations. We hope to continue working together for many years to come. I want to thank my co-supervisor Prof. Saravanamuth Vigneswaran for his kind support and his wisdom during my study at UTS.

I gratefully acknowledge the support extended by Prof. Seungkwan Hong of Korea University in the form of training in the operation of a forward osmosis unit. The support extended by his students and Dr. Sangyoup Lee during my stay at KU is also highly appreciated.

I express special gratitude to Prof. Menachem Elimelech of Yale University for his advice and support in improving the manuscript of my first journal publication on forward osmosis. Attending a special lecture on membrane process by Prof. Elimelech at KU proved very useful for this thesis and I also thank Prof. Hong for allowing me to attend this lecture.

I sincerely acknowledge the help I received from my colleagues, without whose support I would not have been able to complete this thesis on time. In particular, I want to acknowledge the contribution made by Mr. Tahir Majeed, Ganesh Sharma, Soleyman Memesahebi, Fouzy Lotfi and Jung Eun Kim in my experimental works.

I also want to thank Dr. Hu Hao Ngo, Mr. David Hopper and Mr. Rami Hadad for their support in the laboratory works. I also acknowledge the administrative and logistic supports received from Mrs. Phyllis Agius, Craig Knowles, Tim and Van Lee all these years.

I want to acknowledge Mr. Amit Chanan for arranging a visit to Mildura, NSW that enhanced my understanding of issues on water scarcity, irrigation and salinity in the Murray-Darling basin. I also acknowledge the support of A/Prof. Jaya Khandaswamy during the research.

Doing research and, in particular, getting innovative research ideas is not only challenging but also most often very stressful. However, I was lucky to have my dear friends Dr. Tien Thanh Nguyen, Ibrahim El Saliby, Dr. Wen Xing, Jane Zhang, Thue Minh, Fonny Dharmawan and J.S Kim whose companionship kept my research momentum going even during the worst of times and I thank my dear friend for their constant support and encouragement.

Finally, I want to thank my family, particularly my wife Tashi Lhamo for the sacrifice she has had to make in supporting my study. We are so delighted that our lovely little son, Kuenzang Namgyal Phuntsho was born in September, even as I was preparing this Thesis and was in the last stages of submission. I also want to thank my sister-in-law Mrs. Rinzin for helping my pregnant wife while I was busy with this thesis, as well as all my family members in Bhutan: my brothers, sisters, uncles and aunties, and especially my grandfather Maymei Dawa Gyeltshen for his constant prayers.

Last but not least, I want to thank the University of Technology, Sydney for offering me IPRS and UTSPS and later UTSD scholarships for this PhD at UTS. This research was supported by the National Centre of Excellence in Desalination Australia, funded by the Australian Government through the Water for the Future initiative.

## **Journal Articles Published\*\***

1. **\*S. Phuntsho**, H. K. Shon, S. Vigneswaran, J. Kandasamy, S. K. Hong and S. Y. Lee. (2012). Influence of temperature and temperature difference in the performance of forward osmosis desalination process. *Journal of Membrane Science* 415-416 (2012): 734-744.
2. **\*S. Phuntsho**, H. K. Shon, T. Majeed, I. El Salibya, S. Vigneswarana, J. Kandasamy, S. Hong, and S. Leeb. (2012). Blended fertilisers as draw solutions for fertiliser drawn forward osmosis desalination. *Environmental Science & Technology* 46: 4567–4575.
3. **\*L. Chekli, S. Phuntsho**, H.K Shon, S. vigneswaran, J. Kandasamy and A. Chanan (2012). A review of draw solutes in forward osmosis process and their use in modern applications. *Desalination and Water Treatment* 43(2012):167-184.
4. **\*S. Phuntsho**, H. K. Shon, S. K. Hong, S. Y. Lee, S. Vigneswaran, and J. Kandasamy. (2012). Fertiliser drawn forward osmosis desalination: the concept, performance and limitations for fertigation. *Reviews in Environmental Science/Biotechnology* 11(2): 147-168.
5. G. Sharma, H. K. Shon, and **S. Phuntsho**. (2012) Electrocoagulation and crossflow microfiltration hybrid system: fouling investigation. *Desalination and Water Treatment*, 43(2012): 253-259.
6. **\*S. Phuntsho**, H. K. Shon, S. K. Hong, S. Y. Lee, and S. Vigneswaran. (2011). A novel low energy fertilizer driven forward osmosis desalination for direct fertigation: evaluating the performance of fertilizer draw solutions. *Journal of Membrane Science* 375(2011):172–181.
7. **S. Phuntsho**, A. Listowski, H. K. Shon, P. Le-Clech, and S. Vigneswaran. (2011). Membrane autopsy of a 10 year old hollow fibre membrane from Sydney Olympic Park water reclamation plant. *Desalination* 271(1-3): 241-247.
8. **S. Phuntsho**, H. K. Shon, S. Vigneswaran, and J. Cho. (2011). Assessing membrane fouling potential of humic acid using flow field-flow fractionation. *Journal of Membrane Science* 373(1-2): 64-73.

**\*\*Publications made during the PhD candidature including articles not entirely related to the Thesis. \*Articles related to the Thesis.**

9. T. T. Nguyen, H. H. Ngo, W. Guo, **S. Phuntsho**, and J. Li. (2011). A new sponge tray bioreactor in primary treated sewage effluent treatment. *Bioresource Technology* 102(9): 5444-5447.
10. G. Sharma, H. K. Shon, R. Aryal, and **S. Phuntsho**. (2011). Performance evaluation of microfiltration with electrocoagulation and chemical coagulation pretreatment. *Desalination and Water Treatment* 34(1-3):141-149.
11. G. Sharma, J. Choi, H. K. Shon, and **S. Phuntsho**. (2011), Solar-powered electrocoagulation system for water and wastewater treatment. *Desalination and Water Treatment* 32(1-3): 381-388.
12. H. K. Shon, **S. Phuntsho**, S. Vigneswaran, J. Kandasamy, L. D. Nghiem, G. J. Kim, J. B. Kim, and J. H. Kim. (2010). Preparation of Titanium Dioxide Nanoparticles from Electrocoagulated Sludge using Sacrificial Titanium Electrodes. *Environmental Science & Technology* 44(14): 5553-5557.
13. D. H. Kim, H. K. Shon, **S. Phuntsho**, and J. Cho. (2010). Determination of the apparent charge of natural organic matter. *Separation Science and Technology* 45(3): 339-345.
14. H. K. Shon, **S. Phuntsho**, S. Vigneswaran, J. K. Kandasamy, J. B. Kim, H. J. Park, and I. S. Kim. (2010). PVDF-TiO<sub>2</sub> Coated microfiltration membranes: preparation and characterization. *Membrane Water Treatment* 1(3): 193-206.
15. **S. Phuntsho**, S. Herat, H. Shon, I. Dulal, D. Yangden, U. Tenzin, and S. Vigneswaran. (2009). Studying municipal solid waste generation and composition in the urban areas of Bhutan. *Waste Management & Research* 28(6): 545-551.
16. H. K. Shon, **S. Phuntsho**, K. Chon, R. Aryal, S. Vigneswaran, I. S. Kim, and J. Cho. (2009). A study on the influence of ionic strength on the elution behaviour of membrane organic foulant using advanced separation tools. *Desalination and Water Treatment* 11(2009): 38-45.

\*\*Publications made during the PhD candidature including articles not entirely related to the Thesis. \*Articles related to the Thesis.

## Conference papers and presentations

1. **\*Sherub Phuntsho**, Fezeh Lotfi, Jung Eun Kim, Ho Kyong Shon. Osmotic equilibrium –the main process limitations of forward osmosis process. Advanced Membrane Technology V, Singapore, October 14–19 2012.
2. **\*Sherub Phuntsho** and Ho Kyong Shon. Influence of Temperature and temperature difference in the Performance of Forward Osmosis Desalination process. IWA World Water Congress and Exhibition. Busan Sep 16 – 21, 2012.
3. Laura Chekli, **Sherub Phuntsho** and Ho Kyong Shon. Assessing the aggregation behaviour of Iron Oxide Nanoparticles by Flow Field-Flow Fractionation. CESE 2012 Sep 9-13, 2012 Melbourne.
4. **\*S. Phuntsho**, H.K. Shon (Australia). Fertiliser drawn forward osmosis desalination for saline groundwater: concept and limitations. EDS Desalination for the Environment Clean Water and Energy Conference. April 22–26 April 2012, Barcelona, Spain
5. **\*Sherub Phuntsho**, Ho Kyong Shon and Tahir Majeed. Forward osmosis desalination using commonly used fertilisers as draw solution. CESE 2012. Taiwan. Eoromembrane conference. Sep 23 – 27, 2012, London, UK.
6. **\*Soleyman Mamisahebi**, Ho Kyong Shon , **Sherub Phuntsho**, Fezeh Lotfi, Jung Eun Kim. Factors affecting performances of forward osmosis desalination process.
7. **\*S. Phuntsho** and H. K. Shon. Influence of temperature gradient in the performance of forward osmosis process for desalination. IWA World Water Congress & Exhibition, Busan, Korea, 16-21 Sep 2012.
8. **\*Sherub Phuntsho**, Amit Chanan and Ho Kyong Shon. Fertilised irrigation using energy-efficient forward osmosis for saline groundwater desalination in the Murray Darling Basin. IAL 2012. Adelaide, Australia. 24-29 June 2012.
9. **\*Tahir Majeed**, Ho Kyong Shon, **Sherub Phuntsho**, and Roger Ben Aim. Fertilizer Drawn Forward Osmosis (FDFO) for Fertigation to Tomato. IWA LET 2012, Brisbane, 3-7 June 2012.
10. **\*S. Phuntsho**, H. K. Shon, I. E. Saliby. Draw Solutions made of Various Fertilizer Blends for Forward Osmosis Desalination. 6th IWA Specialist Conference on Membrane Technology. 4-7 October 2011. Eurogress Aachen, Germany
11. **\*Sherub Phuntsho**, Ho Kyong Shon, Seungkwan Hong and Sangyoup Lee. Mono/Di-ammonium phosphate fertilisers as draw solutions for forward osmosis

- desalination. World Congress/Perth Convention and Exhibition Centre (PCEC), Perth, Western Australia September 4-9, 2011. REF: IDAWC/PER11-174
12. G. Sharma, H.K. Shon, R. Aryal, **S. Phuntsho**, Profiles performance evaluation of microfiltration with electrocoagulation and chemical coagulation pretreatment, in 7th International Membrane Science and Technology Conference. 2010: November 22-26. Sydney, Australia.
  13. **S. Phuntsho**, H.K. Shon, S. Vigneswaran, J. Cho. Quantitative evaluation of membrane fouling using flow field-flow fractionation. In IWA Regional Conference and Exhibition on Membrane Technology and Water reuse (IWA-MTWR 2010). 2010. 18-22 October 2010. Istanbul - Turkey.
  14. **\*S. Phuntsho**, H. K. Shon, S. Vigneswaran, S. Lee and S. Hong. Screening of chemical fertilizers as osmotic draw solutions for forward osmosis desalination. CESE 2010, 26 Sep–1 Oct 2010, Cairns, Queensland, Australia
  15. Thanh T Nguyen, Huu Hao Ngo, Wenshan Guo, **Sherub Phuntsho**, Jianxin Li. A new sponge tray bioreactor in primary treated sewage effluent treatment. CESE 2010, 26 Sep – 1 Oct 2010, Cairns, Queensland, Australia

\*\*Publications made during the PhD candidature including articles not entirely related to the Thesis. \*Articles related to the Thesis.

### **Book Chapters**

1. **S. Phuntsho**, H. K. Shon, S. Vigneswaran, and J. Kandasamy, Wastewater Stabilization Ponds (WSP) For Wastewater Treatment, in Water and Wastewater Treatment Technologies, S. Vigneswaran, Editor. 2009, Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems (EOLSS).
2. H. K. Shon, **S. Phuntsho**, S. Vigneswaran, J. Kandasamy, J. Cho, and H. H. Kim, Physico-chemical processes for organic removal from wastewater effluent, in Water and Wastewater Treatment Technologies, S. Vigneswaran, Editor. 2009, Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems (EOLSS).
3. H.K. Shon, **S. Phuntsho**, S. Vigneswaran, J. Kandasamy, R. Aryal and V. Jegatheesan. Physical, Chemical and Biological Characterization of Membrane Fouling (Chapter 26) in Editors T.C Zhang, R.Y. Surampali, S. Vigneswaran, R.D Tyagi, S.E. Ong, C.M. Kao, American Society of Civil Engineers. 2012.



## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

FO	: Forward osmosis
FDFO	: Fertiliser drawn forward osmosis
RO	: Reverse osmosis
SWRO	: Seawater reverse osmosis
PRO	: Pressure retarded osmosis
BW	: Brackish water
BGW	: Brackish groundwater
RSF	: Reverse solute flux
SRSF	: Specific reverse solute flux
DS	: Draw solution
FS	: Feed solution
SIS	: Salt interception scheme
MDB	: Murray-Darling Basin
MDBA	: Murray-Darling Basin Authority
CP	: Concentration polarisation
ICP	: Internal concentration polarisation
ECP	: External concentration polarisation
GL	: Giga litre
CTA	: Cellulose triacetate
TFC	: Thin film composite
CA	: Cellulose acetate
PWP	: Pure water permeability
HTI	: Hydration Technology Innovations
NF	: Nanofiltration
TDS	: Total dissolved solids
DI water	: Deionised water
NPK	: Nitrogen Phosphorous Potassium
PR	: Performance ratio
EC	: Electrical conductivity
MSF	: Multi stage flash
MED	: Multi effect distillation
DAP	: Diamminium phosphate or $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{HPO}_4$
MAP	: Monoammonium phosphate or $\text{NH}_4\text{H}_2\text{PO}_4$
SOA	: Sulphate of ammonia or $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{SO}_4$
MW	: Molecular weight
PAO	: Pressure assisted osmosis

## List of Symbols

$A$	: Pure water permeability coefficient ( $\text{Lm}^{-2}\text{h}^{-1}\text{bar}^{-1}$ )
$B$	: Salt permeability coefficient ( $\text{m.s}^{-1}$ )
$C$	: Solute concentration (mg/L or Moles or M)
$D$	: Diffusion coefficient ( $\text{m}^2\text{s}^{-1}$ )
$d_h$	: Hydraulic diameter (m)
$J_s$	: Solute flux ( $\text{mmoles.m}^{-2}.\text{h}^{-1}$ or $\text{g.m}^{-2}.\text{h}^{-1}$ )
$J_w$	: Water flux ( $\text{Lm}^{-2}\text{h}^{-1}$ )
$k$	: Mass transfer coefficient
$K$	: Resistance of solute diffusion within the membrane support layer (s/m)
$L$	: Length of the channel (m)
$M$	: Molar concentration of the solution (M)
$M_w$	: Molecular weight (mol/g)
$n$	: Van't Hoff factor
$P$	: Applied hydraulic pressure (bar)
$R$	: Universal gas constant ( $0.0821\text{ L.atm.mol}^{-1}\text{K}^{-1}$ )
$Re$	: Reynolds number
$R_s$	: Salt rejection (%)
$Sc$	: Schmidt number
$Sh$	: Sherwood number
$T$	: Absolute temperature (in K)
$\pi$	: Osmotic pressure (atm or bar)
$\sigma$	: Reflection coefficient

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introduction	2
1.2 Research motivation	5
1.2.1 Science & technology as a solution to water scarcity issues	6
1.2.2 Desalination as an alternative source of water for food production – essential for supporting the world’s growing population	6
1.2.3 Need for a novel low energy desalination technology for sustainable use of brackish groundwater for food production in the Murray-Darling Basin	7
1.3 Objectives and scope of the research	8
1.4 Structure of the Study (Thesis outline)	9
CHAPTER 2	11
LITERATURE REVIEW	11
2.1 Introduction	12
2.2 Global scenario of water issues	12
2.3 Water issues in Australia	14
2.4 Water issues in the Murray-Darling Basin	15
2.4.1 The MDB, the food bowl of Australia	15
2.4.2 Hydrology of the Murray-Darling Basin	17
2.4.3 Environmental issues of the basin	19
2.4.3.1 Over-allocation of water and poor river ecosystem	19
2.4.3.2 Salinity issues	20
2.4.3.3 Salt Interception Scheme (SIS) in the MDB	21
2.4.4 The Murray-Darling Basin Plan	22
2.4.4.1 The proposed plan	22
2.4.4.2 Social and environmental benefits of the proposed basin plan	23

2.4.4.3	Social and economic impacts of the proposed basin plan	24
2.5	Roles of science and technology in water issues	24
2.5.1	Demand management strategies and water use efficiency	25
2.5.2	Water reclamation and reuse	26
2.5.3	Desalination	27
2.6	Available desalination technologies and their challenges	28
2.6.1	Thermal based desalination	28
2.6.1.1	Multi-stage Flash Distillation (MSF)	28
2.6.1.2	Multiple-Effect Distillation (MED)	29
2.6.1.3	Vapour Compression Distillation	29
2.6.2	Membrane based desalination technologies	29
2.6.2.1	Reverse Osmosis	30
2.6.2.2	Forward osmosis	31
2.6.2.3	Membrane distillation	31
2.6.2.4	Electro-dialysis (ED) and electro-dialysis reverse (EDR)	32
2.6.3	Other desalination technologies	34
2.6.3.1	Capacitive deionisation	34
2.7	Desalination for irrigation	34
2.8	Forward osmosis process	36
2.8.1	Fundamental principles of the FO process	36
2.8.1.1	Osmosis and osmotic pressure	36
2.8.1.2	Forward osmosis process	37
2.8.2	Draw solutions for FO process	41
2.8.2.1	Classification of draw solutions	41
2.8.2.1.1	Inorganic-based DS	41
2.8.2.1.2	Organic-based DS	44
2.8.2.1.3	Other Draw Solutions	45

2.8.2.2	Criterion for selection of suitable DS	47
2.8.3	Concentration polarisation phenomenon in the FO process	49
2.8.3.1	Concentrative and dilutive ECP	50
2.8.3.2	Dilutive ICP coupled with concentrative ECP	53
2.8.3.3	Concentrative ICP coupled with dilutive ECP	54
2.8.4	Solute transfer in the FO process	56
2.8.4.1	Forward diffusion of feed solutes	57
2.8.4.2	Reverse diffusion of draw solutes	58
2.8.5	Membranes for Forward Osmosis	60
2.8.6	Potential applications of the FO process	65
2.8.6.1	Desalination for potable water	65
2.8.6.2	Other potential applications of the FO process	70
2.8.6.2.1	Pre-treatment to RO desalination for potable and non-potable purposes	70
2.8.6.2.2	RO concentrate management	71
2.8.6.2.3	Wastewater and leachate treatment	72
2.8.6.2.4	Pharmaceutical industry	73
2.8.6.2.5	Food processing industry	74
2.8.7	Current challenges of the FO process for desalination	74
2.8.7.1	Lack of an ideal membranes for the FO process	74
2.8.7.2	Lack of suitable draw solutions for desalinated potable water	76
2.8.7.3	Process limitations	76
2.9	Fertilisers and food production	77
2.9.1	Fertiliser usage in the World	77
2.9.2	Fertiliser usage in Australia	79
2.9.3	Types of fertilisers used for food production	80
2.9.3.1	Nitrogen fertilisers:	81

2.9.3.2	Phosphorous fertilisers	81
2.9.3.3	Potassium fertilisers	82
2.9.3.4	Blending of fertilisers	82
2.9.4	Water and irrigation	84
2.9.4.1	Irrigation water use in the world	85
2.9.4.2	Irrigation in Australia and water trading	85
2.9.5	Fertigation	88
CHAPTER 3		91
EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATIONS		91
3.1	Introduction	92
3.2	Experimental Materials	92
3.2.1	Feed solutions for the forward osmosis and nanofiltration processes	92
3.2.1.1	Feed solutions for the forward osmosis process	92
3.2.1.2	Feed solutions for the nanofiltration process	94
3.2.2	Draw solutions for the forward osmosis experiments	95
3.2.2.1	Single or straight fertiliser solutions as DS	95
3.2.2.2	Blended fertiliser solutions as DS	96
3.2.2.3	Other inorganic draw solutes	96
3.2.3	Membranes and their characteristics	96
3.2.3.1	Determination of basic membrane properties	96
3.2.3.2	Forward osmosis membranes	97
3.2.3.3	Reverse osmosis membrane	98
3.2.3.4	Nanofiltration (NF) membrane	98
3.3	Bench-scale experimental performance testes	101
3.3.1	Bench scale crossflow forward osmosis experimental set-up	101
3.3.2	Crossflow bench-scale NF/RO experimental setup	103
3.4	Analyses of the solution samples	106

3.4.1	Calculation of the osmotic pressure and speciation of the salt solutions	106
3.4.2	Calculation of performance ratio of the water flux in the FO process	107
3.4.3	Measurement of the reverse diffusion of draw solutes	108
3.4.4	Measurement of salt rejection of the FO process	109
CHAPTER 4		110
THE NOVEL FERTILISER DRAWN FORWARD OSMOSIS DESALINATION: CONCEPT AND ITS APPLICATION IN THE MURRAY-DARLING BASIN		110
4.1	Introduction	111
4.2	The concept of the FDFO process for direct fertigation	112
4.3	Advantages of FDFO desalination	114
4.3.1	Low energy and low cost desalination process	114
4.3.2	Direct use of FDFO product water for fertigation	116
4.4	Potential application of FDFO desalination process in the context of the Murray-Darling Basin (MDB) in Australia	117
4.4.1	Water issues in the MDB and the proposed basin plan	117
4.4.2	Existing salt interception scheme	119
4.4.3	Alternative SIS using FDFO desalination process	122
4.5	Concluding Remarks	125
CHAPTER 5		126
SCREENING OF FERTILISER DRAW SOLUTES AND ESTIMATING WATER EXTRACTION CAPACITIES		126
5.1	Introduction	127
5.2	Fertiliser candidates for draw solutes	127
5.2.1	Screening of fertilisers as draw solutes	127
5.2.2	Thermodynamic properties of the fertiliser draw solutions	129
5.3	Water extraction capacity of selected fertilisers	132
5.3.1	Osmotic equilibrium in the forward osmosis process	132

5.3.2	Water extraction capacities	139
5.3.3	Expected nutrient concentrations in the final FDFO product water	142
5.4	Options for lowering nutrient concentrations in the final FDFO product water	146
5.5	Theoretical recovery rates in the FDFO process	147
5.6	Concluding remarks	151
CHAPTER 6		152
ASSESSING THE FACTORS AFFECTING THE PERFORMANCES OF THE FORWARD OSMOSIS AND ITS IMPLICATIONS ON THE DESALINATION PROCESS		152
6.1	Introduction	153
6.2	Experimental	155
6.2.1	Draw solution and feed solutions	155
6.2.2	Performance experiments using bench-scale FO unit	155
6.3	Influence of membrane properties on the performance of the FO desalination process	156
6.3.1	Basic properties of the membranes tested	156
6.3.2	Comparative performance of membranes in the FO process	157
6.3.3	Influence of membrane orientation on the performance of the FO process	159
6.3.4	Comparison of the Woongjin's new TFC-FO membrane with other recently reported TFC-FO membranes	162
6.4	Influence of draw solution properties on the performance of the FO desalination process	163
6.4.1	Influence of the types of draw solution on the performance of the FO process	164
6.4.2	Influence of the draw solution concentrations on the performance of the FO process and its implications	165
6.5	Influence of feed solution concentration in the performance of the FO desalination process	175



6.6	Influence of operating parameters on the performance of the FO desalination process	177
6.6.1	Influence of crossflow rates on the performance of the FO process	178
6.6.2	Influence of crossflow directions in the performance of the FO process	179
6.7	Concluding remarks	180
CHAPTER 7		182
INFLUENCE OF TEMPERATURE ON THE PERFORMANCE OF THE FORWARD OSMOSIS DESALINATION PROCESS		182
7.1	Introduction	183
7.2	Theoretical	184
7.3	Experimental	186
7.4	Influence of temperature on the solution properties	187
7.4.1	Influence on DS properties and its potential implications	187
7.4.2	Influence on FS properties and its potential implications	190
7.4.3	Influence of the temperature difference on the net bulk osmotic pressure	191
7.5	Influence of temperature on the performance of FO process	192
7.6	Influence of temperature difference on the performance of FO process	201
7.7	Concluding remarks	205
CHAPTER 8		207
PERFORMANCES OF SELECTED FERTILISERS AS DRAW SOLUTES IN THE FORWARD OSMOSIS DESALINATION PROCESS		207
8.1	Introduction	208
8.2	Experimental	209
8.3	Water flux generated by fertiliser draw solutions	209
8.4	Comparison of measured and predicted water fluxes based on bulk osmotic pressure	211

8.5	Comparing experimental water flux and bulk osmotic pressure of different fertilisers	213
8.6	Reverse fertiliser draw solute flux	217
8.7	Concluding remarks	220
CHAPTER 9		222
BLENDED FERTILISERS AS DRAW SOLUTES FOR FORWARD OSMOSIS DESALINATION PROCESS		222
9.1	Introduction	223
9.2	Experimental	224
9.3	Performance of single/straight fertilisers as draw solutions for FDFO desalination process	224
9.3.1	Properties of single fertiliser solutions	224
9.3.2	Water flux of single fertiliser as draw solution	225
9.3.3	Loss of nutrient by reverse movement of draw solutes using single fertilisers	226
9.3.4	Final nutrient concentration in the FDFO product water using single fertilisers as draw solute	228
9.4	FDFO desalination using fertiliser DS blended with two single fertilisers	231
9.4.1	Properties of the blended fertiliser draw solutions	231
9.4.2	Water flux of blended fertiliser draw solutions	232
9.4.3	Loss of nutrients by reverse diffusion of draw solutes during FDFO process	235
9.4.4	Nutrient concentrations in the final FDFO product water using blended fertilisers as draw solutions	236
9.5	Influence of NPK blends in different ratios using two or more single fertilisers on the final nutrient concentrations	244
9.6	Concluding remarks	247
CHAPTER 10		248

NANOFILTRATION AS AN INTEGRATED OPTION TO REDUCE NUTRIENT CONCENTRATIONS IN THE FERTILISER DRAWN FORWARD OSMOSIS DESALINATION PROCESS	248
10.1 Introduction	249
10.2 Integrated FDFO-NF desalination process	250
10.2.1 FDFO desalination alone without NF process	250
10.2.2 NF as pre-treatment to FDFO desalination process	251
10.2.3 NF as post-treatment to FDFO desalination process	252
10.3 Experimental	253
10.4 FDFO desalination of brackish groundwater without NF process	254
10.4.1 Performance of FDFO desalination alone in terms of water flux	255
10.4.2 Final nutrient concentrations from FDFO desalination alone	258
10.5 FDFO desalination of brackish groundwater with NF as pre-treatment	263
10.5.1 Performance of nanofiltration in the pre-treatment of brackish groundwater	263
10.5.2 Nutrient concentrations in the final product water from FDFO desalination after NF pre-treatment	268
10.6 FDFO desalination of brackish groundwater with NF as post-treatment	271
10.6.1 Performance of NF in the recovery of excess fertiliser solutes	271
10.6.2 Nutrient concentrations in the final FDFO product water with NF as post-treatment	277
10.6.3 Comparative performances of fertiliser solutions for NF as post recovery process	280
10.7 Comparison of NF as pre-treatment and post-treatment with FDFO process alone	282
10.8 Concluding remarks	285
CHAPTER 11	287
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	287

11.1	Conclusions	288
11.1.1	Fertiliser drawn forward osmosis desalination: concept, potential applications and limitations	289
11.1.2	Factors influencing the performance of the FO desalination process	291
11.1.3	Selected straight/single fertiliser solutions as the DS in the performance of the FDFO desalination process	294
11.1.4	Performance of blended fertiliser solutions as the DS for the FDFO desalination process	295
11.1.5	Integrated FDFO-NF desalination process for fertigation	295
11.2	Recommendations and future works	296
11.2.1	Pilot testing of the integrated FDFO-NF desalination process in the Murray-Darling Basin	297
11.2.2	FDFO desalination process using pressure assisted osmotic (PAO) process	298
11.2.3	The use of osmotic fillers with the fertiliser DS	301
11.2.3.1	Osmotic filler and fertiliser mixed as a DS	302
11.2.3.2	Osmotic filler used as a DS separately to the fertiliser DS	303
11.2.4	A self-powered FDFO desalination process for irrigation using osmotic energy	303
11.2.5	Other recommendations	307
	REFERENCES	308

## APPENDIX A

Compositions of the brackish groundwater at Burronga salt interception scheme, NSW. Source: NSW State Water

A1

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1: Murray-Darling Basin map (Source: MDBA).....	17
Figure 2.2: Use of long-term average surface-water inflows in the MDB. (Source: (MDBA, 2010b) .....	19
Figure 2.3: The Murray River salinity profile – Baseline medians for the Benchmark Period of 1975–2000 and 2005–06 medians (MDBC, 2007) .....	21
Figure 2.4: Direct Contact Membrane Distillation process. Direct Contact Membrane Distillation process. (Source: (Khayet, 2011; Alkhudhiri et al., 2012) .....	32
Figure 2.5: Charge transport in the electrodialysis stack. Cation-exchange membrane is indicated as CEM, and anion-exchange membrane as AEM. (Source: (Ortiz et al., 2005) .....	33
Figure 2.6: Schematic diagram of capacitive deionisation showing the removal of charged ions or species by two charged electrodes. (Source: (Anderson et al., 2010) ...	34
Figure 2.7: Principles of osmotic processes: forward osmosis (FO), pressure retarded osmosis (PRO) and reverse osmosis (RO). Adapted from (Cath et al., 2006).....	40
Figure 2.8: The direction and magnitude of water flux as a function of applied pressure in FO, PRO and RO (Lee et al., 1981). Adapted from (Cath et al., 2006).....	40
Figure 2.9: Flow diagram describing the criteria for selecting the DS in FO process ....	48
Figure 2.10: Concentration polarisation in a symmetric membrane, (a) before the osmotic process and (b) during the osmotic process. $C$ : refers to the solute concentrations that generate osmotic pressure. Subscripts $D$ , $F$ , $b$ and $m$ refer to the DS, FS, bulk solution and membrane boundary layer respectively. $\Delta\pi_b$ Refers to the net bulk osmotic pressure and $\Delta\pi_{eff}$ refers to the effective osmotic pressure or the effective driving force. ....	53
Figure 2.11: Concentration polarisation in an asymmetric membrane in: (a) Forward osmosis mode where an active layer faces FS and a support layer faces DS	

(concentrative ECP and dilutive ICP) and (b) pressure retarded osmosis mode where an active layer faces DS and a support layer faces FS (concentrative ICP and dilutive ECP).  $C$ : refers to the solute concentrations that generate osmotic pressure. Subscripts  $D$ ,  $F$ ,  $b$  and  $m$  refer to the DS, FS, bulk solution and membrane boundary layer respectively.  $\Delta\pi_b$  refers to the net bulk osmotic pressure and  $\Delta\pi_{eff}$  refers to the effective osmotic pressure or effective driving force.....56

Figure 2.12: Comparative SEM images of polymeric membranes (a) RO membrane, (b) CTA FO membrane, and (c) thin film composite FO membrane. Images were compiled from several sources (Yip et al., 2010; Wei et al., 2011b; Zhao and Zou, 2011; Qiu et al., 2012). .....65

Figure 2.13: Commercial application of forward osmosis nutritious drinks. Hydration bags of different sizes commercialised by HTI Inc., USA. (Source: HTI Inc., USA)....66

Figure 2.14: The concept of FO desalination for potable water (Dewolf, 2011).....68

Figure 2.15: FO desalination for potable water (a) using  $\text{NH}_3\text{-CO}_2$  solution as DS (Cath et al., 2006), (b) post-recovery of  $\text{NH}_3$  and  $\text{CO}_2$  by multiple column distillation process (McGinnis and Elimelech, 2007) and (c) energy comparison of the different desalination processes (McGinnis and Elimelech, 2007).....68

Figure 2.16: Schematic diagram of the hybrid FO–NF system configuration. Adapted from Zhao et al. ((2012b).....69

Figure 2.17: Schematic drawing of the novel hybrid FO/RO process for water augmentation. (Source: (Cath et al., 2009) .....71

Figure 2.18: An integrated forward osmosis and reverse osmosis desalination process (Shaffer et al., 2012).....71

Figure 2.19: Figure: World’s total cereal production and total fertiliser use between 1950 -2010. Adapted from World Bank Statistics (WB, 2012).....79

Figure 2.20: World NPK usage 1994-2014.....79

Figure 3.1: Digital micrometer (Model 293-330 Mitutoyo, Japan) used for measuring the total thickness of the membrane.....	96
Figure 3.2: Pure water permeability tests of all the membranes used in this study. The PWP of the CTA FO, SWRO and NE 90 are 1.02, 1.87 and 10.00 Lm <sup>-2</sup> h <sup>-1</sup> respectively .....	100
Figure 3.3: Salt rejection characteristics of all the membranes tested using 5,000 mg/L NaCl solution as feed water. ....	100
Figure 3.4: Zeta potential data of the thin CTA-FO membrane as determined using streaming potential and streaming current analyser (SurPASS electrokinetic Analyser, Anton Paar), measured at Korea University, Seoul. ....	101
Figure 3.5: Bench-scale crossflow forward osmosis experimental setup. (a) Schematic of the bench-scale crossflow FO membrane unit and (b) the bench-scale FO unit used for all FO experiments .....	103
Figure 3.6: Bench scale pressure based membrane processes experimental setup. (a) Schematic drawing of the bench scale cross-flow NF/RO unit and (b) bench scale crossflow NF/RO unit .....	105
Figure 3.7: OLI Stream Analyser 3.2, a thermodynamic modelling software (OLI Systems Inc., Morris Plains, NJ, US).....	106
Figure 3.8: Osmometer used for measuring the osmolality of the solution cryoscopic osmometer (OSMOMAT 030-D, Genotec, Germany) .....	107
Figure 4.1: The conceptual process layout diagram of fertiliser drawn forward osmosis desalination for direct fertigation .....	114
Figure 4.2: Locations of the salt interception schemes in the Murray-Darling Basin. (Source: (MDBA, 2010a)).....	120

Figure 4.3: Design and operation of the salt interception scheme in the MDB (a) without SIS and (b) with SIS. (Source: MDBA).....	121
Figure 4.4: Images of the salt interception scheme at Buronga in NSW: a) SIS borewell sites, (b) water outfalls, (c) evaporation ponds, and (d) salt harvesting.....	122
Figure 4.5: Cross sectional view of the (a) existing salt interception scheme (SIS) (18 in total) installed along the Murray and Darling Rivers and (b) the alternative SIS scheme which integrates FDFO desalination for the sustainable use of brackish groundwater for irrigation.....	124
Figure 5.1: Variation of osmotic pressures of the 11 selected fertiliser DS at 25 °C analysed using OLI Stream Analyser 3.2.....	132
Figure 5.2: Model explaining the influence of crossflow directions on the solution concentrations and the osmotic pressure during the FO desalination process. $C_{F,i}$ and $C_{F,o}$ represent the FS concentrations at inlet and outlet points respectively, while $C_{D,i}$ and $C_{D,o}$ represent the DS concentrations at inlet and outlet points respectively. ....	137
Figure 5.3: Variation of water flux in the FO process at low DS concentrations or bulk osmotic pressure. The water flux at $\pi_{D,b}=3.9$ atm was zero. ....	139
Figure 6. 1: Comparative SEM images of the cross section of the three membranes (a) Woongjin TFC-FO membrane, (b) CTA-FO membrane (Qiu et al., 2012) and (c) TFC-RO membrane (Wei et al., 2011b) .....	159
Figure 6. 2: Variation of osmotic pressure of the five different types of DS at various concentrations. Prediction made using OLI Stream Analyzer 3.2 at 25°C.....	166
Figure 6. 3: Influence of the type of DS and their concentration on the performances of FO process in terms of water flux and the PR using DI as FS. (a) Water flux and (b) performance ratio. Feed: DI water, solutions temperature: 25°C, crossflow: 8.5 cm/s, Mode: FO and counter-current, Membrane: CTA FO .....	167



Figure 6. 4 : Influence of the type of DS and their concentration on the performances of FO process in terms of water flux and the PR using BW as FS. (a) Water flux and (b) performance ratio. Feed: BW water, solutions temperature: 25°C, crossflow: 8.5 cm/s, Mode: FO and counter-current, Membrane: CTA FO. Note that the RSF of urea is plotted in a different axis since the values were too high to be plotted in the same axis with the other DS. ....	168
Figure 6. 5: Variation of the loss of solutes due to reverse diffusion of draw solutes in terms of (a) reverse solute flux (RSF) and (b) specific reverse solute flux for different types DS and their concentrations using DI water as feed. Solutions temperature: 25°C, crossflow: 8.5 cm/s, Mode: FO and counter-current, Membrane: CTA FO. Note that the SRSF of urea is plotted in a different axis since the values were too high to be plotted in the same axis with the other DS. ....	170
Figure 6. 6: Variation of the properties of the DS with its concentration (a) viscosity at different concentrations and (b) mass density at different DS concentrations.....	174
Figure 6. 7: Hypothetical correlation of water flux, feed recovery rates, membrane area and pumping duration with the initial DS concentration used in the FO desalination process.....	175
Figure 6. 8: Influence of FS TDS on the performances of the FO process using 1.0 M KCl as DS (a) in terms of water flux and the performance ratio and (b) in terms of reverse solute flux. Solutions temperature: 25°C, crossflow: 8.5 cm/s, Mode: FO and counter-current, Membrane: CTA FO.....	177
Figure 6. 9: Influence of crossflow rates on the performance of the FO process in terms of water flux using 1.0 M KCl as DS and BW5 and DI as FS. Solutions temperature: 25°C, Mode: FO and counter-current, Membrane: CTA FO .....	179
Figure 6. 10: Influence of crossflow directions on the performance of the FO process using KCl as DS. Solutions temperature: 25°C, crossflow: 8.5 cm/s, Mode: FO and counter-current, Membrane: CTA FO.....	180

Figure 7.1: Schematic layout of the lab scale FO desalination unit for performance test. FO cell had an effective membrane area of  $2.002 \times 10^{-3} \text{ m}^2$  (channel dimensions of 2.6 cm x 7.7 cm x 0.3 cm). All experiments were carried out at crossflow rate of 400 ml/min (8.5 cm/s) in counter-current mode for a minimum duration of six hours. Initial volume of DS and FS used were 2 litres in all the cases studied. Temperature of each solution was controlled independently using two different temperature control units. 187

Figure 7.2: Osmotic pressure of KCl DS at different solution temperatures and the percentage increase in osmotic pressure when the DS temperature is raised from 25°C to 35°C and 45°C. .... 188

Figure 7.3: Viscosity of the KCl DS at different temperatures and the percentage decrease in viscosity when the DS temperature is raised from 25°C to 35°C and 45°C. .... 189

Figure 7.4: Diffusion coefficient of KCl DS at different solution temperature and the percentage increase in diffusion coefficient of KCl draw solute when the DS temperature is raised from 25°C to 35°C and 45°C. .... 190

Figure 7.5: Net bulk osmotic pressure between the DS and FS at different temperatures of DS and FS. D refers to DS and F refers to FS. The data refers for DS of 2 M KCl and BW FS 5 g/L NaCl..... 192

Figure 7.6: Variation of FO water fluxes with temperature using (a) DI water as FS and (b) BW as FS. In order to check the reliability of the data, each experiment was repeated and found that the flux data was within an experimental error of 1-5% only..... 194

Figure 7.7: Percentage increase in pure water flux per unit temperature rise for each range of KCl DS concentrations using (a) DI water as FS and, (b) BW as FS. Baseline temperature at 25°C. In order to check the reliability of the data, each experiment was repeated and found that the flux data was within an experimental error of 1-5% only 197

Figure 7.8: Solute rejections of the membrane (a) RSF using DI as FS, (b) RSF with BW as FS, (c) SRSF with DI as FS and (d) SRSF with BW as FS. .... 200

Figure 7.9: Forward rejection of BW feed solutes (NaCl) for FO process operated at different concentrations and temperatures. The initial feed concentration used is 5,000 mg/L. ....	201
Figure 7.10: Influence of water fluxes in FO process operated at different temperature differences between the DS and the FS at temperature using DI water as FS (a and b) and using BW as FS (c and d). In order to check the reliability of the data, each experiment was repeated and found that the flux data was within an experimental error of 1-5% only.....	204
Figure 7.11: percentage increase in water flux when the solutions are heated at different temperatures using DI as feed water (a and b) and using BW as FS (c and d). The based temperature is 25°C for all the above four cases. ....	205
Figure 8.1: Pure water flux of the fertiliser DS as a function of molar concentrations. FS: DI water, Crossflow: 8.5 cm/s in counter-current mode, Temperature: 25°C. MAP: monoammonium phosphate, DAP: diammonium phosphate, SOA: ammonium sulphate. ....	210
Figure 8.2: Experimental water flux of each fertiliser draw solutions as a function of predicted osmotic potential at 2.0 M.....	215
Figure 8.3: Osmolality of the draw fertiliser solutions at various molar concentrations determined using OSMOAT .....	216
Figure 8.4: Theoretical osmotic pressure of the fertiliser draw solutions as determined by OLI Stream Analyser as a function of measured osmolality at 1.0 M concentration. ....	216
Figure 8.5: Experimental water flux of each fertiliser draw solutions as a function of osmolality of the 1.0 M fertiliser draw solution measured by osmometer.....	217

Figure 8. 6: Variation of pH of a DI feed during the FO process using different fertiliser draw solutions. Operating conditions: DS: 2 M, FS: DI water. Cross flows: 400 ml/min in counter current FO mode.....	220
Figure 9.1: Reverse diffusion of draw solutes measured in terms of specific reverse solute flux ( $J_s/J_w$ ) which is the ratio of reverse solute flux to the water flux of the eleven selected fertilisers.....	228
Figure 9.2: Expected final NPK nutrient concentrations of fertiliser solution after FO desalination or in the final FDFO product water using brackish water as feed water (5,000 mg/L NaCl at 3.9 atm). CAN: $\text{Ca}(\text{NO}_3)_2 \cdot 4\text{H}_2\text{O}$ .....	230
Figure 9.3: Comparison between % of N composition of N containing fertilisers and the N nutrient concentration in the final DS or desalted water with brackish water as feed water.....	230
Figure 9.4: Final NPK nutrient concentrations of: (a) MAP and KCl blended, and (b) MAP, KCl and $\text{NH}_4\text{NO}_3$ blended in different ratios .....	246
Figure 10.1: Conceptual process diagram for FDFO desalination alone without integrating NF process .....	251
Figure 10.2: Conceptual process layout diagram for integrated FDFO-NF desalination process with NF as pre-treatment.....	252
Figure 10.3: Conceptual process layout diagram for integrated FDFO-NF desalination process with NF as post-treatment .....	253
Figure 10. 4: Performances of the FDFO desalination process using fertilisers as DS (a) in terms of FO water flux and (b) performance ratio using 1.0 M fertiliser solutions as DS and BGW5 and BGW35 as FS.....	258

Figure 10. 5: Performance of nanofiltration for the pre-treatment of BGW feed (a) NF permeate water flux and (b) specific water flux at different applied pressure. PWP: pure water permeability.....	267
Figure 10. 6 : Variation of specific water fluxes with applied pressure for all fertiliser DS used as DS for NF post-treatment. BGW5 and BGW35 in the legend represent the concentrations of diluted fertiliser DS from a FDFO desalination process, using BGW5 and BGW35 as FS (solution temperature at 25 °C and crossflow rate at 400 ml/min or 8.5 cm/s). PWP: pure water permeability. ....	275
Figure 10. 7: Rejection of fertiliser draw solutes by NF membrane (NE90) (a) at different applied pressure using diluted fertiliser DS which has osmotic pressure equal to BGW5 and (b) at different FS concentrations using diluted fertiliser DS which has osmotic pressure equal to BGW5 and BGW35 at an applied pressure of 10 bar. Solution temperature at 25 °C and crossflow rate at 400 ml/min (8.5 cm/s). ....	276
Figure 10. 8: Correlation between the performances of fertiliser salts in terms of (a) water flux in the NF process compared to the FO process and (b) NF fluxes with the NF rejection for all fertilisers together. The SWF for NF is obtained at an applied pressure of 10 bars, a temperature of 25 °C, and crossflow rates of 500 ml/min and uses FS that represents diluted fertiliser DS from the FDFO desalination process using BGW5 as FS. FO flux is obtained using 1.0 M fertilisers as DS with BGW5 as FS at a solution temperature of 25 °C and counter current crossflow rates of 400 ml/min in a system operated in FO mode.....	281
Figure 11.1: FDFO desalination process using pressure assisted osmosis (a) two-stage FDFO desalination process using PAO and (b) model explaining the net driving force in PAO.....	301
Figure 11.2: Concept of osmotic energy from a salinity gradient by fertiliser drawn - pressure retarded osmosis .....	304
Figure 11.3: Schematic of the FDFO desalination process showing the various potential points for the generation of osmotic power.....	305

Figure 11.4: Osmotic energy from the FD-PRO desalination process can be directly used to drive the NF/RO post treatment process.....	306
--	-----

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Physicochemical properties and experimental water fluxes of inorganic compounds tested as DS. Adapted from Zhao et al. (2012c).....	43
Table 2.2: Physico-chemical properties and experimental water fluxes of some organic compounds tested as DS. ....	45
Table 2. 3: Developments in FO membranes. Adapted from the table by Zhao et al. (2012c) .....	64
Table 2.4: Major imported and domestic fertiliser products used in Australia 2008 (FIFA, 2009) .....	80
Table 2.5: The essential elements, their form for uptake, and functions in the plant. (Source: (Mengel and Kirkby, 1987). Adapted from (Kafkafi and Kant, 2005). ....	83
Table 2.6: List of principal chemical fertilisers used worldwide.....	84
Table 2.7: Australian agricultural water use by State and Territory in 2010–11. Source: (ABS, 2012b) .....	88
Table 3.1: Compositions of FS used for all FO studies. Osmotic pressure of the FS was determined by OLI Stream Analyser 3.2 (OLI Systems Inc., Morris Plains, NJ, US). ..	94
Table 3.2: Detailed composition of synthetic BGW feed for various TDS concentrations. This composition simulates the BGW usually found at Buronga SIS in the MDB. Osmotic pressure was calculated using OLI Stream Analyser 3.2 (OLI Systems Inc., Morris Plains, NJ, US).....	94
Table 3.3: List of chemicals used as draw solutes for the bench-scale crossflow FDFO desalination process. ....	95

Table 3.4: Basic properties of the four different types of membrane used in this study. PWP: Pure water permeability coefficient (A). The material composition is as provided by the manufacturer..... 99

Table 4.1: Comparison of energy requirements for seawater desalination with existing desalination technologies. Adapted from <sup>a</sup>(Semiat, 2008), <sup>b</sup>(McGinnis and Elimelech, 2007) and <sup>c</sup>(Elimelech and Phillip, 2011; Subramani et al., 2011). The figure for FO for direct fertigation has been adopted from McGinnis and Elimelech<sup>b</sup> by removing the energy required for DS separation by the distillation process. .... 116

Table 5.1: List of selected fertilisers for FO DS testing with their physical and chemical properties. \*pH values as measured at 2.0 M. Solubility and speciation data were adapted from OLI Stream Analyser speciation results. HS: Highly soluble..... 129

Table 5.2: List of chemical fertilisers screened for investigation as draw solutes for the FDFO desalination process ..... 131

Table 5.3: Final concentration of fertiliser DS at osmotic equilibrium with feed water after desalination. BW1, BW2, BW5, BW10, BW20 and BW35 all represent simulated brackish water with a TDS of 1000, 2000, 5000, 10,000 20,000 and 35,000 mg/L of NaCl respectively. .... 141

Table 5.4: Estimated nutrient concentrations (in mg/L) in the final FDFO desalination product water evaluated in terms of the three major nutrients..... 145

Table 5.5: Recommended maximum nutrient concentrations (in ppm) in the fertigation water for various types of crops. (Source: (Phocaides, 2007))...... 146

Table 5.6: Theoretical recovery rates of the FDFO process using selected fertilisers as the DS. Calculations were made based on the maximum osmotic pressure a fertiliser DS can generate at its highest solubility. The solubility and the osmotic pressure was predicted using OLI Stream Analyser 3.2..... 150



Table 6. 1: Influence of the types of membranes and their orientation on the performance of FO process compared in terms of water flux and reverse solute fluxes. Solutions temperature: 25°C, crossflow: 8.5 cm/s, Mode: FO and PRO mode and in counter-current crossflow direction ..... 162

Table 7.1: Thermodynamic properties of BW FS at various temperatures. The average diffusion coefficient of NaCl was calculated using equation 7.9 by taking the individual diffusion coefficients of  $\text{Na}^+$  and  $\text{Cl}^-$  ions (from OLI Stream Analyser 3.2). All parameters determined using OLI Stream Analyser 3.2 except for \*(Korson et al., 1969). Mass transfer coefficient was calculated using equation (7.5). ..... 191

Table 7.2: Average increase in water flux due to rise to increase temperature from 25 to 35°C and 45°C for DS or FS or both. .... 205

Table 8.1: Details of the chemical fertilisers used for the draw solution assessment... 209

Table 8.2: Performance ratio calculated using estimated theoretical flux and experimental flux using 1 M fertiliser DS and DI as feed water. Membrane permeability coefficient  $A = 1.48 \pm 0.108 \text{ Lm}^{-2}\text{h}^{-1}\text{atm}^{-1}$ . SOA:  $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{SO}_4$ , MAP:  $\text{NH}_4\text{H}_2\text{PO}_4$ , DAP:  $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{HPO}_4$ . PR: performance ration ( $J_w/J_t$ )..... 212

Table 8. 3: Water fluxes and the performance ratio of fertiliser draw solutions (2 M) using 0.3 M NaCl as feed water. Membrane permeability coefficient  $A = 1.48 \pm 0.108 \text{ Lm}^{-2}\text{h}^{-1}\text{atm}^{-1}$  ..... 213

Table 8.4: Reverse diffusion of fertiliser draw solutes during the FDFO process. RSF: reverse solute flux and SRSF: specific reverse solute flux is the ratio of the RSF to water flux or  $J_s/J_v$ . Operating conditions: DS: 2 M, FS: DI water. Cross flows: 400 ml/min in counter current FO mode..... 219

Table 9.1: Performances of single fertilisers as DS in the FO process using DI water and BW as feed.  $J_{wt}$ : theoretical water flux calculated using equation (1): experimental water flux; Performance ratio or PR ( $J_w/J_{wt}$ ). A: pure water permeability coefficient of the FO membrane ( $A = 0.28194 \pm 0.008 \mu\text{m s}^{-1}\text{atm}^{-1}$ ). Bulk osmotic pressure of the BW feed (5,000 mg/L NaCl) taken is 3.9 atm. RSF data is obtained from the DI water as feed. FO Membrane: CTA. ....226

Table 9.2: Performance of the selected fertiliser blend as DS in the FO process using DI water and BW as feed.  $J_{wt}$ : theoretical water flux calculated using equation (1),  $J_w$ : experimental water flux; PR: performance ratio ( $J_w/J_{wt}$ ). Pure water permeability coefficient of the FO membrane ( $A = 1.015 \pm 0.029 (\text{L.m}^{-2} \text{h}^{-1} \text{atm}^{-1})$ ). Bulk osmotic pressure of the BW feed (5,000 mg/L NaCl) taken is 3.9 atm. RSF data is obtained from the DI water as feed. MAP: monoammonium phosphate -  $\text{NH}_4\text{H}_2\text{PO}_4$ , DAP: diammonium phosphate  $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{HPO}_4$ , SOA: sulphate of ammonia  $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{SO}_4$ . CAN:  $\text{Ca}(\text{NO}_3)_2.4\text{H}_2\text{O}$ . RSF: Revers solute flux.....238

Table 9.3: Details of different fertilisers blended as draw solution for FDFO desalination using brackish water feed. MAP: Monoammonium phosphate -  $\text{NH}_4\text{H}_2\text{PO}_4$ , DAP: Diammonium phosphate  $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{HPO}_4$ , SOA: sulphate of ammonia  $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{SO}_4$ . A: Membrane permeability coefficient of the CTA FO membrane determined in RO mode at different pressure using DI water ( $A = 1.015 \pm 0.029 (\text{L.m}^{-2} \text{h}^{-1} \text{atm}^{-1})$ ). \*Theoretical water flux of the blended fertiliser DS.....239

Table 9.4: Comparative properties of  $\text{KNO}_3$ , DAP and  $\text{KNO}_3$ +DAP fertiliser solutions .....244

Table 9.5: Estimated N/P/K nutrient concentrations in the final FDFO product water using blended fertiliser as DS and BW (5,000 mg/L NaCl with an osmotic pressure of 3.9 atm, assigned as BW5 in this table for clarity) as feed. DS consisted of blended fertiliser solution prepared in specific N:P:K ratios suitable for three selected plants using four different types of fertilisers [ $\text{NaNO}_3$ ,  $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{SO}_4$ , KCl and  $\text{KH}_2\text{PO}_4$ ] that yielded the minimum nutrient concentration in the final product water. BW2, BW3, BW4 and BW5 refer to brackish water feed of TDS 2,000, 3000, 4,000 and 5,000 mg/L of NaCl, respectively.....247

Table 10. 1: Acceptable nutrient concentrations for direct fertigation of tomato plants (Imas, 1999). .....	255
Table 10. 2: Total volume of water a kilogram of fertiliser can extract (calculated using equation 10.2) and the expected nutrient concentrations in the final FDFO product water using BGW as feed. Blend 1 was prepared using SOA, MAP, and KNO <sub>3</sub> in an NPK ratio of 15:4:23 (in %), while Blend 2 was prepared using SOA, KH <sub>2</sub> PO <sub>4</sub> , NaNO <sub>3</sub> , and KCl in an NPK ratio of 12:4:17 (in %). .....	262
Table 10. 3 : Quality of the BGW following NF pre-treatment. The data is presented only for the optimum applied pressure for each feed (15 bar for BGW5 and BGW10 and 20 bar for BGW20 and BGW35). The osmotic pressure ( $\pi$ ) in bar of the NF permeate was calculated using the equation: $\pi = 1.12 (273+T) \sum m_j$ , where T is the temperature (25 °C) and $\sum m_j$ is the sum of molality concentration of all constituents in a solution (moles of solute/kg of solvent).....	268
Table 10. 4: Performance of the FDFO desalination process using NF as pre-treatment, measured in terms of the total volume of water extracted per kg of fertiliser and the expected nutrient concentration in the final FDFO product water. The estimation was performed based on the osmotic equilibrium between the fertiliser DS and the pre-treated BGW presented in Table 10.3. The equivalent concentration of the fertiliser solution was determined using OLI Stream Analyser 3.2. ....	270
Table 10. 5: Final nutrient concentrations (N/P/K in mg/L) in the NF permeate after post-treatment of diluted fertiliser DS by NF following FDFO desalination. The data relates only to NF operated at an applied pressure of 10 bar and at a temperature of 25 °C. Acceptable N/P/K concentrations are 120-200/40-50/180-300 mg/L. ....	279
Table 10. 6: Comparative performances of FDFO and integrated FDFO-NF processes in terms of nutrient concentrations in the final product water. Data are compiled from Tables 2, 5, and 10. NF+FDFO: FDFO desalination with NF as the pre-treatment process. FDFO+NF: FDFO desalination with NF as the post-treatment process.	

Operating pressure for NF pre-treatment (15 bar for BGW5 and BGW10 and, 20 bar for BGW20 and BGW35) and NF post-treatment (10 bar for all concentrations). .....284

## ABSTRACT

Agriculture consumes maximum water of up to 70% of the total fresh water withdrawn in the world for consumptive purposes. Rapid population growth is further driving fresh water demand and putting tremendous stress on limited fresh water resources. This increasing demand can only be met by improving the current water use efficiency and by creating new water sources. Desalination could therefore play a significant role in creating a new water source by using unlimited saline water sources. However, current desalination technologies are energy intensive and energy has a significant impact on climate change. If low cost desalination technologies were made available, their impact on agriculture sector would be significant for many water stressed regions of the world.

Recently, forward osmosis (FO) has been recognised as one of the most promising low energy processes for desalination. The FO process is based on the principle of natural osmotic process driven by the concentration gradient and not by hydraulic pressure like the reverse osmosis (RO) process and hence requires significantly lower energy. In the FO process, a concentrated draw solution (DS) extracts fresh water from the saline water using special membranes. The issue of membrane fouling in FO process is less challenging than the RO process where fouling constitutes a major operating issue. However, the lack of a suitable DS has limited the application of FO desalination for potable water. The separation of draw solutes from the diluted DS after desalination requires additional post-treatment processes that still consume energy, making FO uncompetitive with the already established RO desalination technology.

The FO process offers novelty for those applications where the complete separation of draw solutes is not necessary and where the final diluted DS can be used directly if the presence of draw solutes adds value to the end use. Fertiliser drawn forward osmosis (FDFO) desalination for fertigation is therefore proposed based on this concept. When fertilisers are used as the draw solutes in the FDFO desalination process, the diluted fertiliser solution after desalination can be directly applied for fertigation because fertilisers are essential for plants. This concept avoids the need for an additional post-treatment process for the separation and recovery of draw solutes. The objective of this study is therefore to investigate the performance of the FDFO desalination process for fertigation, identify its limitations and investigate options to overcome these limitations. The study has been presented in eleven chapters that include a definition of the detailed

concept and an assessment of the performance of eleven selected fertilisers as the DS under various conditions, through both simulation and bench-scale experiments.

The energy required for FDFO for direct fertigation was estimated to be less than 0.24 kW/m<sup>3</sup> of fertigation water, which is comparatively lower than the most efficient current desalination technologies. As such, FDFO can also be easily powered using renewable energy sources, such as solar and wind. Since fertilisers are extensively used for agriculture, FDFO desalination does not create additional environmental issues related to fertiliser usage. In fact, FDFO desalination could add more value to irrigation water, thereby providing opportunities for improving the efficiency of water and fertiliser uses. FDFO desalination can be operated at very high feed recovery rates: higher than 80% using a feed of seawater quality. However, FDFO desalination has its own process limitation. Based on the principles of natural osmosis, the net movement of water across the membrane towards the DS cannot theoretically extend beyond osmotic equilibrium, which in turn is limited by the total dissolved solids (TDS) content of the feed solution (FS). Therefore, it is not possible to achieve a concentration of the diluted DS that is lower than the equivalent concentration of the FS without external influence.

Based on the models for osmotic equilibrium, the water extraction capacities of eleven selected fertiliser DS were calculated for FS, simulated for different ranges of TDS. The water extraction capacities of the fertilisers were observed to depend on the molecular weight and osmotic pressure of the draw solutes, as well as on feed concentration. Based on the water extraction capacity, the expected fertiliser nutrient concentrations in the final FDFO product water was estimated in terms of nitrogen phosphorous potassium (NPK) concentrations. The expected final nutrient concentrations for simulated brackish water (BW) feed (TDS 5,000–35,000 mg/L) failed to meet acceptable NPK concentrations for direct fertigation of crops. Hence, achieving acceptable nutrient concentrations for direct fertigation will be a major challenge for the FDFO desalination process. The rest of the study therefore focussed on investigating processes and options that would help reduce the nutrient concentrations in the final FDFO product so that the final FDFO product water could be used for direct fertigation.

Before the experimental investigation on the FDFO desalination, the influence of major parameters on the performance of FO desalination process was investigated. The

thermodynamic properties of the DS play a more influential role on water flux than the thermodynamic properties of the FS at higher temperature. Although water flux comparable to the RO desalination process was obtained by increasing the fertiliser DS concentrations, the internal concentration polarisation effects played a significant role in the performance of the FDFO desalination process. It was observed that any soluble fertilisers with osmotic pressure in excess of the FS can draw water in FO process; however, only eleven different chemical fertilisers commonly used for agriculture worldwide were selected and their performances studied. The performance of the fertiliser solutions as DS were assessed in terms of water flux, reverse draw solute flux, water extraction capacity and nutrient concentrations in the final product water.

Blended fertilisers as the DS were able to achieved significantly lower NPK concentrations by FDFO desalination than the straight/single fertiliser as DS. However, it was observed that blending fertilisers generally resulted in a slightly reduced bulk osmotic pressure and water flux compared to the sum of the osmotic pressures and water fluxes of the two individual fertilisers when used as DS alone. An integrated FDFO-NF desalination process was investigated to reduce the nutrient concentrations in the final product water. Nanofiltration (NF) as pre-treatment or post-treatment was found to be effective in reducing the final NPK concentrations to acceptable limits for direct fertigation although it required second NF pass, especially when monovalent fertiliser was used as the DS or when a high TDS feed was used. NF as post-treatment was more advantageous in terms of both nutrient reduction and energy consumption because high quality, diluted DS was used as feed.

Finally, this study has recommended a pilot test of the integrated FDFO-NF desalination process in the Murray-Darling basin. Recommendations for further investigations on reducing nutrient concentrations include pressure assisted FDFO desalination and the concept of using osmotic fillers as the DS with fertilisers. The study also recommended evaluating the potential for fertiliser drawn pressure retarded osmosis (FD-PRO) desalination for simultaneous desalination and power generation, and for self-powering the FO desalination process. The other recommendations include a study on membrane fouling and scaling issues for FDFO desalination operated at high recovery rates, boron rejection and, finally, a life cycle analysis of the FDFO desalination process.