

Conveying technologies comparison chart

Conveying method	Pros	Cons	Suitability	CAPEX	ESG rating
Pneumatic Lean/Dilute Phase	 » Flexible option for long and complex routes » Accommodates multiple inlets and outlets » Small footprint compared to Dense Phase 	 » High velocity causes excess product degradation » Very high energy OPEX » Highest levels of CO₂ pollution due to energy consumption » Exposes materials to high volumes of air » Unworkable for the fines 		\$\$\$\$	00000
Pneumatic Dense Phase	 » Gentle transfer » Moves materials over long, complex routes 	 » Very high CAPEX, OPEX and energy consumption » Highest levels of CO₂ pollution due to energy consumption » Requires larger footprint » Extremely difficult to clear blockages or failures » Complex to commission and install correctly » Fluidised fine powders can cause blockages within the dust reclaim 		\$\$\$\$\$	00000
Bucket Elevator	 » High availability in the correct applications » Gentle transfer » Suitable for long-distance elevation 	 » Better suited to larger particles » Lower availability and higher equipment breakdown rates experienced with powders » High levels of spillage and material residue tend to ingress into the chain/belt mechanism » Difficult to bring back online after a breakdown » Difficult to seal from atmospheric exposure 		\$\$\$\$	
Tubular Drag Conveying Chain	 » High availability in the correct applications » Gentle transfer » Suitable for long complex routes » Sealed from atmospheric exposure » Can be purged with inert gases 	 » High volume throughputs require very large pipe diameter » High safety risk and difficulty when clearing blockages » Contamination due to the chain-on-chain friction 		\$\$\$\$	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bigcirc$
Tubular Drag Conveying Cable	 Will not degrade the crystalline structure Sealed from atmospheric exposure Can be purged with inert gases Total batch transfers with no product loss Manages complex routes Quick maintenance turnaround Very limited product exposure Minimal number of moving parts Small structural footprint Extremely low ESG impact of CO. pollution 	 » Suitable for low to medium throughputs only » Lower availability for high throughput applications » Polymer-coated conveying cable required to reduce ferrous contact with LiOH.H₂0 		\$\$\$	





- » Will not degrade the crystalline structure
- » Very high throughputs
- » Can be purged with inert gases
- » Sealed from atmospheric exposure
- » Total batch transfers
- » Minimal spillage or product waste
- » Quick maintenance turnaround
- » Very limited product exposure
- » Minimal number of moving parts
- » Small structural footprint
- » Extremely low environmental impact, lowest level of CO₂ pollution

- » Length limitations may require multiple conveyors for long or complex routes
- » Not suited to running dry for extended periods of time
- » Not suited to running with very low volumes of material within the conveyor



\$\$\$

Source: floveyor.com