UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

ANAEROBIC FLUIDIZED BED TREATMENT OF PALM OIL MILL EFFLUENT

ABDULLAH-AL-MAMUN

FK 1997 6

ANAEROBIC FLUIDIZED BED TREATMENT OF PALM OIL MILL EFFLUENT

By

ABDULLAH-AL-MAMUN

Thesis Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements for Degree of Master of Science in the Faculty of Engineering, Universiti Putra Malaysia.

October, 1997.

UPM

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

With due respect to the Almighty, the author expresses his profound and sincerest gratitude to the chairman, Dr. Azni bin Idris, and members of the supervisory committee, Dr. Fakhru'l Razi Ahmadun and Mr. Megat Johari Megat Mohd. Noor for their guidance and co-operation which were beyond any limit. Without the affectionate guidance, prompt decisions, constructive comments and untiring encouragement provided by them, this work could never have materialized. Special gratitude to Mr. Megat Johari for his generosity in giving freedom to choose the research area.

The author is particularly in debt to Mr. Haji Ghazali, Sulaiman, Halim, Baharudin, Kamal, Ismail and Raja and to other members of the laboratories for their technical support and guidance. Thanks are also due to my friends who helped to fabricate the reactor, to concrete the foundation and to perform other field works. It is a great pleasure indeed to acknowledge the computer support provided by Sazzad, Jahan and Qamrul. Heartfelt appreciation is due to Khor for translating the abstract. Ever best service from the Graduate School are greatly acknowledged.

Finally the author acknowledges the assistance rendered by the respective teachers and staff of the University, too numerous to mention individually, in many direct and indirect ways.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		ii
LIST OF TABLES		vi
LIST OF FIGURES		vii
LIST OF PLATES		xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS		xii
ABSTRACT		xvi
ABSTRAK		xix
CHAPTER		
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Objective of the Study	2
	Characteristics of the Substrate	3
	Significance of the Study	4
	Present Practices	5
	Application of the Study	5
II	LITERATURE REVIEW	9
	Introduction	9
	Anaerobic Process	10
	Classification of Reactors	10
	Present Treatment Practice	17
	Ponding System	17
	Tank Digestion and Aeration Pond	19
	Tank Digestion and Facultative Pond	19
	Decanter and Facultative Pond	20
	Combined System	20
	Digester with Biogas Utilisation	21
	Anaerobic Fluidized Bed Reactor (AFBR)	22
	Filter Media	23

Merits and Demerits of AFBR 25
Microbiology of AFBR..... 28
Process Controlling Factors 32
Start-up of AFBR 41
Hydrodynamics of AFBR 44
Development of Biofilm 47
Estimation of Biomass Concentration 53
Biological Kinetics of AFBR 56
Biogas 61

III EXPERIMENTAL APPROACH 65
Introduction 65
Design of AFBR 65
Construction of AFBR 66
Filter Media 70
Pre-seeding of Media 72
Start-up 73
Operating Conditions 73
Sampling Approach 74
Parameters Considered 75
Testing Methods 76
Control of Governing Factors 77

IV RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS 78
Reactor Properties 78
Media Properties 79
Hydrodynamic Properties of Media 83
Start-up of AFBR 84
Substrate Utilisation 87
BOD 87

COD 92
Solids Removal 97
Nutrient Removal 110
Biogas 110
pH and Alkalinity 114
Temperature 117
Biomass Growth 117
Substrate Profile along Reactor Height 120
Sludge Characteristics 126
Kinetic Study 137
Response to Shock Load 141
Comparative Study 147
Comparison with Other Studies 150
Cost Benefit Analysis of AFBR 152

V CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 156
Conclusions 156
Recommendations 158

REFERENCES 160

APPENDICES 172
Appendix A Additional Tables 173
Appendix B Additional Figures 189

VITA 193

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	: General characteristics of POME.	4
2	: Summary of AFBR performance for industrial wastewater treatment.	7
3	: Some recent studies on different scale AFBR.	8
4	: Carrier classification depending on biofilm formation.	52
5	: Constituents of biogas derived from different sources.	62
6	: List of parameters considered and their test frequency.	75
7	: Testing methods used for different parameters.	76
8	: Characteristics of filter media	81
9	: AFBR performance at different steady states.....	90
10	: Kinetic coefficients for different models.	141
11	: Reactor performance at pH shock load.	145
12	: Performance comparison of different scale AFBR.	149
13	: Sieve analysis of filter media.	173
14	: Details data of weekly experiments.	173
15	: Details data of daily experiments.	174
16	: Substrate profile along reactor height.	182
17	: Variation of settled sludge volume during SVI test.	183
18	: Parameters of the kinetic models.	184
19	: Process performance of different systems in treating POME.	185
20	: Overall negative aspects of existing systems.	186
21	: Efficiency of other systems in treating POME.	187
22	: Prediction of full scale performance of AFBR based on kinetic equation.	188

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	: Anaerobic reactor with mixing facilities. (a) Mechanical mixing, (b) Mechanical mixing with recycle, (c) Unconfined gas mixing, (d) Confined gas mixing, (e) External draft tube, (f) Internal draft tube.	11
2	: Anaerobic contact process. (a) Continuously stirred tank reactor (CSTR) with biomass recycle, (b) Biomass accumulation by microfiltration.	12
3	: Fixed-film anaerobic reactors. (a) Up-flow anaerobic fixed bed reactor, (b) Down-flow anaerobic fixed bed reactor, (c) Anaerobic expanded bed reactor, (d) Anaerobic fluidized bed reactor.	13
4	: UASB and Clarigester type anaerobic reactors. (a) Up-flow anaerobic sludge blanket (UASB), (b) Imhoff tank, (c) Clarigester process, (d) Modified clarigester process.	15
5	: Modified anaerobic biological process. (a) Rotating biological contactor (RBC), (b) Anaerobic baffled reactor, (c) Two phase reactor, (d) Hybrid reactor.	16
6	: Effect of particle size on superficial velocity and specific surface area.	24
7	: Metabolic stages in the anaerobic digestion.	29
8	: Effect of temperature on anaerobic digestion.	33
9	: Controlling factors of successful AFBR start-up.	42
10	: Different stages of biofilm development.	43

Figure

11 : Effect of upflow velocity on fixed film reactor pressure drop and bed porosity. 45

12 : Substrate concentration profile within a biofilm. 49

13 : Schematic diagram of the AFBR pilot plant. 67

14 : Sieve analysis of filter media. 80

15 : Variation of COD during start-up period. 85

16 : COD removal rate during start-up period. 85

17 : Variation of BOD with time. 88

18 : Variation of BOD removal rate with time. 88

19 : Specific BOD removal in terms of BLR. 89

20 : Variation of BOD removal rate with OLR. 91

21 : Variation of BOD removal rate with HRT. 91

22 : Variation of COD with time. 93

23 : Variation of COD removal rate with time. 93

24 : Specific COD removal in terms of BLR. 94

25 : Variation of COD removal rate with OLR. 95

26 : Variation of COD removal rate with HRT. 95

27 : Variation of TSS with time. 98

28 : Variation of TSS removal rate with time. 98

29 : Specific TSS removal in terms of BLR. 99

30 : Variation of TSS removal rate with OLR. 100

31 : Variation of removal rate with HRT. 100

32 : Variation of VSS with time. 101

33 : Variation of VSS removal rate with time. 101

34 : Specific VSS removal in terms of BLR. 102

35 : Variation of VSS removal rate with OLR 102

36 : Variation of TDS with time. 103

Figure

37 : Variation of TDS removal rate with time. 103

38 : Specific TDS removal in terms of BLR. 104

39 : Variation of TDS removal rate with HRT. 104

40 : Variation of TS with time. 105

41 : Variation of TS removal rate with time. 105

42 : Specific TS removal in terms of BLR. 106

43 : Variation of TS removal rate with OLR. 106

44 : Variation of TN with time. 108

45 : Variation of TN removal rate with time. 108

46 : Variation of TN removal rate with HRT. 109

47 : Biogas generation with time. 111

48 : Biogas generation with OLR. 111

49 : Variation of pH with time. 115

50 : Variation of alkalinity with time. 115

51 : Variation of temperature with time. 116

52 : Variation of biomass hold-up with loading rate. 118

53 : Variation of COD along height of the AFBR. 121

54 : Variation of TSS along height of the AFBR. 121

55 : Variation of VSS along height of the AFBR. 122

56 : Variation of TDS along height of the AFBR. 122

57 : Variation of COD along height of the AFBR. 123

58 : Variation of TSS along height of the AFBR. 123

59 : Variation of VSS along height of the AFBR. 124

60 : Variation of TDS along height of the AFBR. 124

61 : Variation of sludge volume with time at 2050 mm. 127

62 : Variation of sludge volume with time at 2650 mm. 127

63 : Variation of sludge volume with time at 3905 mm. 128

Figure

64 : Variation of SVI along height of the AFBR. 128

65 : Variation of sludge volume with time at 2050 mm. 129

66 : Variation of sludge volume with time at 2650 mm. 129

67 : Variation of sludge volume with time at 3905 mm. 130

68 : Variation of SVI along height of the AFBR. 130

69 : Determination of K_d and Y. 138

70 : Determination of k and K_s. 138

71 : Determination of u_m and B. 139

72 : Determination of u_m and K. 139

75 : Variation of pH at shock load of pH 5. 142

76 : Variation of alkalinity at shock load of pH 5. 142

77 : Variation of COD at shock load of pH 5. 143

78 : Variation of COD removal rate at shock load of pH 5. 143

79 : Variation of TSS at shock load of pH 5. 144

80 : Variation of TSS removal rate at shock load of pH 5. 144

81 : BOD removal rate of different-scale AFBR. 148

82 : COD removal rate of different-scale AFBR. 148

83 : TSS removal rate of different-scale AFBR. 148

84 : VSS removal rate of different-scale AFBR. 148

85 : Schematic diagram of tank digestion and aeration pond system. 189

86 : Schematic diagram of tank digestion and facultative pond system. 190

87 : Schematic diagram of ponding system. 191

88 : Schematic diagram of combined system. 192

LIST OF PLATES

Plate		Page
1	: Full scale installation of anaerobic fluidized bed reactor.	6
2	: AFBR under fabrication.	68
3	: Inside view of the welded AFBR.	69
4	: Pump set-up of the pilot plant AFBR.	70
5	: Feeding tank.	71
6	: A full view of the pilot plant.	72
7	: Fast bubbling through the gas outlet.	113
8	: No gas bubble when the outlet was inserted more into the water.	113
9	: Blank and bioparticle filled sampling bottle.	119
10	: Biomass coated sand media.	119
11	: Colour and settling properties of raw POME, neutralised feed and effluent (from left to right), before settlement.	132
12	: Colour and settling properties of raw POME, neutralised feed and effluent (from left to right), after settlement.	132
13	: SVI test (Mixed liquor).	133
14	: SVI test (close view of the settling interface).	134
15	: SVI test (settled sludge).	135
16	: Unsettled effluent.	136
17	: Settled but coloured effluent.	136

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AFBR : Anaerobic fluidized bed reactor.

b : Bacterial decay rate.

BOD : Biochemical oxygen demand.

BBLR : Biological loading rate in terms of BOD.

BOLR : Organic loading rate in terms of BOD.

C : Carbon.

cc : Cubic Centimetre.

CBLR : Biological loading rate in terms of COD.

C_c : Coefficient of gradation.

C_d : Drag coefficient.

C_u : Uniformity coefficient.

COD : Chemical Oxygen Demand.

COLR : Organic loading rate in terms of COD.

D : Diameter of any reactor.

d : Average film thickness.

D_{10} : Sieve aperture through which 10% of the material passes.

D_{30} : Sieve aperture through which 30% of the material passes.

D_{60} : Sieve aperture through which 60% of the material passes.

DBLR : Biological loading rate in terms of TDS.

D_m : Diameter of the model AFBR.

DOLR : Organic loading rate in terms of TDS.

D_p : Diameter of the pilot plant AFBR.

d_p : Average particle diameter.

d_t : Diameter of the fluidized bed.

E : Effluent.

e : Bed porosity with biofilm.

e_0 : Bed porosity without biofilm.

Efflu. : Effluent.

Eqn. : Equation.

η : Efficiency (%).

Fig. : Figure.

G : Biogas.

Ga : Galileo number.

g/l : Gram per litre.

H : Height of any reactor.

h : Height of media with biofilm.

H_{bp} : Static bed height of the pilot plant AFBR.

H_{mp} : Static bed height of the model AFBR.

h_0 : Height of media without biofilm.

HRT : Hydraulic retention time.

I : Influent.

Influ. : Influent.

k : Maximum substrate utilization rate.

K_d : Microbial decay coefficient.

KPa : KiloPascal.

K_s : Half velocity constant.

l : Litre.

L_e : Effective depth of biofilm.

MJ : MegaJoul.

MPa : MegaPascal.

μ : Microbial growth rate

mg/l : Milligram per litre.

N : Nitrogen.

n : Bed expansion.

O&G : Oil and Gas.

OLR : Organic loading rate.

P : Phosphorus.

POME : Palm oil mill effluent.

R : Recycle.

R1, R2, ...: Operation numbers or steady states.

Re_t : Reynolds number based on u_t.

Re_m : Minimum fluidization Reynolds number.

r^2 : Coefficient of correlation.

RR : Removal rate.

ρ_{bd} : Biomass dry density.

ρ_{bw} : Biomass wet density.

ρ_f : Fluid density.

ρ_p : Particle density.

SBLR : Biological loading rate in terms of total solids.

S_e : Effluent substrate concentration.

S_{eC} : Predicted effluent COD by Contois model.

S_{eCH} : Predicted effluent COD by Chen and Hashimoto model.

S_{eM} : Predicted effluent COD by Monod model.

S_i : Influent substrate concentration.

SL : Sludge wastage.

S_m : Minimum substrate concentration for microbial survival.

S_o : Substrate concentration in bulk fluid.

SOLR : Organic loading rate in terms of total solids.

S_s : Substrate concentration in the biofilm surface.

SRT : Solid retention time.

STP : Standard temperature nad pressure.

SVI : Sludge volume index.

t : Time.

TBLR : Biological loading rate in terms of TSS.

TDS : Total dissolved solids.

θ : Hydraulic retention time (HRT).

θ_c : Solids retention time (SRT).

θ_{cm} : Minimum cell retention time.

TN : Total Nitrogen.

TOLR : Organic loading rate in terms of TSS.

TP : Total Phosphorus.

TS : Total solids.

TSS : Total suspended solids.

u : Superficial velocity.

U : Substrate utilization rate.

u_t : Terminal velocity of any particle.

U_m : Minimum fluidization velocity.

V_a : Applied upflow velocity.

V_b : Volume of biofilm.

VBLR : Biological loading rate in terms of VSS.

V_{bu} : Biomass volume per unit volume of expanded bed.

VFA : Volatile fatty acid.

VOLR : Organic loading rate in terms of VSS.

VSS : Volatile suspended solids.

V_m : Volume of unseeded media.

V_s : Volume of seeded media.

X : Reactor biomass concentration.

x : Reactor biomass concentration in terms of VSSper unit volume of expanded bed.

w_{bu} : Reactor biomass weight in terms of VSS per unit volume of expanded bed.

Y : Yield coefficient.

Abstract of thesis submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science.

ANAEROBIC FLUIDIZED BED TREATMENT OF PALM OIL MILL EFFLUENT

By

ABDULLAH-AL-MAMUN

October 1997

Chairman: Dr. Azni bin Idris

Faculty: Engineering

A 2 m^3 pilot scale anaerobic fluidized bed reactor (AFBR) was designed, constructed and operated to study its ability to treat high-strength industrial wastewater, at ambient temperature. Besides performance evaluation, kinetic coefficients of three models were determined. Reactor response to pH shock load was also carried out.

An early start-up of 17 days was experienced with diluted palm oil mill effluent (POME) of 2000 mg/l COD. The hydraulic retention time (HRT) was reduced step wise from 24 hr to 4 hr which resulted in volumetric loading rates of 4.0 kgCOD/m^3.d to 13.8 kgCOD/m^3.d respectively. Maximum COD removal efficiencies achieved at those loading rates were between 65% and 85%. BOD and TSS removal rates were varied in the range of 64% - 91% and 68% - 89% respectively. The raw substrate was rich in nitrogen nutrients and 17% to 55% of total nitrogen could be removed. Optimum HRT for the

COD removal was found to be 12 hour, which was much less than that of conventional tank digester system. Reactor performance was found to be a function of loading rate, which decreased steadily with the increased loading rates.

The AFBR exhibited low sludge production with sludge volume indices (SVI) of between 11 l/mg and 35 l/mg. General kinetic coefficients for Monod, Contois and Chen & Hashimoto's models were b = 0.23, Y = 0.79, μ_m = 4.63 and K = 2.47. Specific coefficients for Monod's model were k = 1.22 and K_s = 577, and for Contois' model, B = 0.05 and u_m = 0.86. The pilot plant exhibited good buffering ability when pH shock load of 5.0 was imposed on the AFBR.

Performance comparison with two other smaller AFBRs revealed that, plant efficiency decreases by 10% - 20%, perhaps due to poor control over the system, with the increase in reactor size. Superiority and suitability of AFBR over other systems were justified by comparing with existing treatment facilities. Promising performance at ambient temperature and at HRT shorter than the conventional practice supported the feasibility of AFBR to treat high strength palm oil mill effluent.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk Ijazah Master Sains.

PERAWATAN EFLUEN KILANG KELAPA SAWIT DENGAN REAKTOR LAPISAN TERBENDALIR (FLUIDIZED BED) ANAEROBIK

Oleh

ABDULLAH-AL-MAMUN

Oktober 1997

Pengerusi: Dr. Azni bin Idris

Fakulti: Kejuruteraan

Reaktor lapisan terbendalir (fluidized bed) anaerobik (AFBR) 2 m^3 berskala perintis telah direka, dibina and digunakan untuk mengkaji kemampuannya merawat air sisa industri yang berkepekatan tinggi, pada suhu persekitaran. Selain daripada menilai kemampuannya, koefisien-koefisien kinetik bagi tiga model telah ditentukan. Tindakbalas reaktor terhadap beban kejutan pH turut dikaji.

Kajian permulaan (start-up) dalam tempoh 17 hari telah diperolehi dengan efluen kilang kelapa sawit (POME) yang dicairkan kepada 2000 mg/l COD. Masa tahanan hidraul (HRT) telah dikurangkan secara berperingkat (step wise) dari 24 jam hingga 4 jam dan masing-masing menyebabkan kadar beban organik di antara 4.0 kgCOD/m^3.d dan 13.8 kgCOD/m^3.d. Kecekapan pengurangan COD maksimum yang didapati pada kadar-kadar tersebut adalah di antara 65% dan 85%. Kadar pengurangan BOD dan TSS

masing-masing merangkumi julat di antara 64% - 91% dan 68% - 89%. Substrat mentah adalah kaya dengan nutrien nitrogen dan 17% hingga 55% daripada jumlah nitrogen ini telah dapat dikurangkan. HRT optimum untuk pengurangan COD didapati dalam masa 12 jam yakni lebih rendah daripada sistem tangki penghadaman biasa. Kecekapan reaktor merupakan fungsi kadar beban, iaitu penurunannya secara beransur-ansur dengan pertambahan kadar beban.

AFBR menghasilkan enapcemar dan skum yang sedikit dengan indeks isipadu enapcemar yang rendah, pada 11 l/g hingga 35 l/g. koefisien-koefisien kinetik am bagi model Monod, Contois, serta Chen & Hashimoto adalah b=0.23 day^{-1}, Y=0.79 VSS/COD, μ_m=4.63 day^{-1} and K=2.47. Koefisien spesifik untuk model Monod adalah k=1.22 COD/VSS dan K_s=577 mg/l, dan untuk model Contois, B=0.05 dan u_m=0.86 day^{-1} Kebolehan penampan yang baik didapati pada loji perintis bila AFBR menerima beban kejutan pH 5.0.

Perbandingan skala dengan dua buah AFBR yang lain yang kecil mendapati bahawa kecekapan proses berkurangan sebanyak 10% - 20%, kemungkinan disebabkan oleh kelemahan kawalan ke atas system, dengan pertambahan saiz reactor. Kebolehan dan kesesuaian AFBR mengatasi sistem-sistem yang lain dapat dijustifikasikan melalui bandingan dengan cara rawatan sediaada. Kemampuannya yang begitu menyakinkan pada suhu persekitaran serta HRT yang lebih singkat daripada amalan biasa kebanyakan kilang, menyokong alasan mengguna AFBR dalam rawatan efluen berkepekatan tinggi secara besar-besaran.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Treatment of wastewater (domestic and industrial) can be performed by primary, secondary and tertiary methods. Over the past three decades, a wide variety of treatment technologies have been studied, developed and applied for pollutant removal from the concerned wastewater. Although not all processes are applicable to handle each type of wastewater, biological unit processes are being widely applied to abate the pollution concentration from them. Anaerobic treatment of industrial wastewater is, by now, a well established technology, and has been proven to be the cheapest and versatile method for a wide range of applications (Borghans et al., 1986). New process innovations like high-rate filtration, fluidized bed (Heijnen et al., 1991), up-flow sludge blanket (Lettinga et al., 1979) and hybrid reactors (Reynolds and Colleran, 1988) have already emerged as today's most viable anaerobic treatment technologies.

Anaerobic fluidized bed reactors (AFBRs) have been used for wastewater treatment since early 1970s. Promising features of the AFBRs are the capability of treating low and high strength wastewater at both ambient and elevated temperatures (Bull et al., 1983; Jewell et al., 1981) for a minimum energy, with minimum sludge production and

ability to tolerate shock loads in terms of organic loading rates (OLRs), pH and temperature without any substantial long term detrimental effects. Most of the studies on fluidized beds are performed in aerobic conditions and for nutrient removals (Hermanowicz and Cheng, 1989). Therefore, an improved and better understanding of the kinetics, response to shock load, process efficiency of an AFBR for different substrates is still required. Overall performance of an anaerobic fluidized bed reactor in treating palm oil mill effluent (POME) was evaluated in this study.

Objective of the Study

In order to understand the process performance of an anaerobic fluidized bed reactor (AFBR), palm oil mill effluent (POME) was used as the substrate. Easy availability, established study of waste constituents, appreciable biodegradability with no potential toxicity, together with the strength of POME were the key features for selecting this agro-industrial effluent as a substrate for the AFBR pilot plant. The overall objective of this research project was to study the performance of an AFBR pilot plant for a better understanding of the process itself for a new substrate - POME. More specifically:

- to study the start-up of the AFBR treating POME;
- to evaluate the influence of loading rate (OLR) on reactor performance;
- to evaluate nutrient content in POME before and after treatment;
- to determine kinetic coefficients for biological modelling of the AFBR;

- to study the effect of reactor size on reactor performance;
- to comment on the feasibility of full scale AFBR to treat palm oil mill effluent in ambient temperature.

Characteristics of the Substrate

As far as high strength wastewater is concerned, palm oil mill effluent is termed to be highly concentrated in terms of generated organic loading or volume. Its high solid content makes the treatment method costly and relatively complex. Various types of solids, semisolids and liquid wastes are generated from different steps of oil processing. In practice, all these wastes are bulked, a situation which gives a yellowish liquor containing both dissolved and fine suspended matter and residual oil with very high BOD and COD. The slightly acidic wastewater consists of about 90-95% water, 5-10% solids (roughly half in solution and the rest in suspension) and 0.5-1% residual oil and grease (Ma et al., 1993). The major contributor to this effluent is 10% protein, 12% fibre, 20% fatty materials, 11% ash and 47% nitrogen-free extract (Ma et al., 1993).

General characteristics of raw POME necessary for any biological treatment are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1

General characteristics of POME

Parameter	Hwang, 1978	Chin, 1981	Ma, 1992	Kam, 1995	This study
BOD	20000	26222	25000	34000	31240
COD	47500	62934	50000	62000	59700
TSS	10000	26456	18000	37000	30230
VSS	30000	22149	34000	26000	25300
O & G	-	-	6000	-	8000
TN	-	1000	750	-	1940
TP	300	294	-	-	268
pH	-	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.5

(Note: Except pH all units are in mg/l.)

Significance of the Study

High energy requirement for aerobic treatment, together with huge sludge and CO_2 generation, helped researchers pay attention to anaerobic digestion. Anaerobic digestion has played a significant role in high strength wastewater treatment technology for almost a century. To make this process more effective, new approaches are being designed to improve conventional anaerobic digestion. Among the latest unit processes, Anaerobic Fluidized Bed Reactor (AFBR) is being treated as a prospective researchable treatment method. This recent innovation is already accepted as an efficient method to handle high strength wastewater in many parts of the world (Wheatly, 1990). However, still there is lack of enough study conducted in order to draw conclusion on the commissioning of AFBR to treat POME more

efficiently. Naturally, the significance of this type of research project is very obvious as long as the palm oil mill effluent remains as one of the most polluting source, not only in Malaysia, but also in other palm oil producing countries.

Present Practices

Wastewater treatment methods can be broadly categorised as physical, chemical, biological and thermal. There are several techniques that can be used to accomplish these latter methods; some are old, others are modern. Most of the time, combinations of treatment methods are implied to take care of the wastewater. In Malaysia, more than 85% of palm oil mills are practising ponding system as a method of their wastewater treatment (Ma and Ong, 1987). Most of the ponds are anaerobic; others are facultative or aerobic. Starting from recently, many industries have began upgrading their present treatment facilities with the introduction and combination of digesters or reactors.

Application of the Study

Like the up-flow anaerobic sludge blanket reactor (UASBR), AFBR is also accepted as an efficient high-rate wastewater treatment process. Different sizes and shapes of AFBRs are in vogue in the UK, Germany, Holland, Spain, France, Italy, Belgium, USA and in other countries around the world (Frankin et al., 1992; Coombs, 1990; Wheatley, 1990; Jewell et al., 1981; Switzenbaum and Jewell, 1980). Since full