Bhave A, Taylor RHS, Fennell P, Livingston WR, Shah N, Mac Dowell N, Dennis J, Kraft M, Pourkashanian M, Insa M, Jones J, Burdett N, Bauen A, Beal C, Smallbone A, Akroyd J.

Screening and techno-economic assessment of biomass-based power generation with CCS technologies to meet 2050 CO₂ targets.

***Applied Energy* 2017, 190, 481-489.**

Copyright:

© 2017. This manuscript version is made available under the [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license](#)

DOI link to article:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.12.120>

Date deposited:

02/02/2017

Embargo release date:

07 January 2019

This work is licensed under a
[Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International licence](#)

1 Screening and techno-economic assessment of
2 biomass-based power generation with CCS technologies
3 to meet 2050 CO₂ targets

4 Amit Bhav^a, Richard H.S. Taylor^b, Paul Fennell^c, William R. Livingston^d,
5 Nilay Shah^c, Niall Mac Dowell^c, John Dennis^e, Markus Kraft^{*e,j},
6 Mohammed Pourkashanian^f, Mathieu Insa^g, Jenny Jones^f, Nigel Burdett^h,
7 Ausilio Bauen^b, Corinne Bealⁱ, Andrew Smallbone^a, Jethro Akroyd^a

8 ^aCMCL Innovations, UK

9 ^bE4tech, UK

10 ^cImperial College London, UK

11 ^dDoosan Power Systems, UK

12 ^eDepartment of Chemical Engineering and Biotechnology, University of Cambridge, UK

13 ^fFaculty of Engineering, University of Leeds, UK

14 ^gEDF Energy, France

15 ^hDrax Power, UK

16 ⁱAlstom Boiler France, France

17 ^jNanyang Technological University, Singapore

18 corresponding author*

19 E-mail: mk306@cam.ac.uk

20 **Abstract**

Biomass-based power generation combined with CO₂ capture and storage (Biopower CCS) currently represents one of the few practical and economic means of removing large quantities of CO₂ from the atmosphere, and the only approach that involves the generation of electricity at the same time. Despite its attractiveness, there exists a dearth of comprehensive data and analyses of the numerous Biopower CCS technology options available. We present the results of a first-of-a-kind analysis, the *Techno-Economic Study of Biomass to Power with CO₂ capture (TESBiC)* study, that entailed desk-based review and analysis, process engineering, optimisation as well as pri-

mary data collection from some of the leading pilot demonstration plants in Europe. From the perspective of being able to deploy Biopower CCS by 2050, twenty eight Biopower CCS technology combinations involving combustion or gasification of biomass (either dedicated or co-fired with coal) together with pre-, oxy- or post-combustion CO₂ capture were identified and assessed. In addition to the capital and operating costs, techno-economic characteristics such as electrical efficiencies (LHV% basis), Levelised Cost of Electricity (LCOE), costs of CO₂ captured and CO₂ avoided were modelled over time assuming technology improvements from today to 2050. For technologies that allow a direct comparison between "with-" and "without-CCS" plants, it was observed that the net efficiency penalty due to carbon capture varied in the range of 6 to 15 percentage points, whereas the specific investment costs (CAPEX) increased significantly in the range 45% to 130%, with annual operating and maintenance costs growing by 4% to 60%. Many of the Biopower CCS technologies gave relatively similar techno-economic results when analysed at the same scale, with the plant scale (MW_e) observed to be the principal driver of CAPEX (£/MW_e) and the cofiring % (i.e. the weighted feedstock cost) a key driver of LCOE. The data collected during the TESBiC project highlighted the lack of financial incentives for generation of electricity with negative CO₂ emissions, and also indicated that the most significant barriers to the deployment of Biopower CCS technologies will be economic and regulatory in nature, rather than technical, assuming fossil CCS technologies are successfully proven at commercial scale.

- ₁ *Keywords:* Biomass, biopower, bioenergy, power generation, carbon
₂ capture and storage (CCS), scenarios and forecasting, techno-economics
-

1. Introduction

The International Energy Agency (IEA) has warned that the door to limiting global average temperature rises to only 2°C (over pre-industrial levels) is closing, and the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has highlighted the urgency of taking immediate mitigation actions in terms of technological changes [1, 2]. This means that technologies that can rapidly remove vast amounts of CO₂ from the atmosphere may therefore need to be deployed, if other mitigation measures fail to rapidly reduce global emissions - a fact emphasised in the recent IPCC report which also placed an unprecedented emphasis explicitly on Bio-energy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS) [3].

BECCS or BioCCS as a concept can be achieved via multiple applications, i.e. through power generation (Biopower), biofuels production, hydrogen plants, bio-synthetic natural gas, heating, and industrial processes (steel, cement and paper) [4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. In case of BECCS, the emissions reduction potential is largely dependent on the scale of the installation and the upstream biomass emissions, which is in turn dictated by the available scale of the component technologies and the availability of biomass feedstock. Despite potential risks of over-reliance of as yet unproven technology, due to its large-scale negative emissions potential, BECCS presents a high value option that persistently features in majority of recent cost-effective scenarios or pathways aimed at decarbonising global energy use and achieving climate change targets [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. Recently, linear programming was applied to conduct global modelling of various renewable technologies, including BECCS over the period 2010 to 2050 [16]. For the zero emissions

1 scenario, BECCS was concluded to play a vital role in satisfying the demand
2 in the heat sector. Elsewhere, the global technical potential of negative CO₂
3 emissions from BECCS, if deployed, has been estimated to be in the range
4 of 3.2 to 10.4 Gt CO₂e/yr [17, 18]. BECCS has been reviewed at a systems-
5 level in order to assess its role in stabilising CO₂ concentrations [19]. Based
6 on an assumption of a global biomass potential of 100 EJ/yr, the review
7 [19] stated a technical potential for BECCS at 10 GtCO₂/yr in 2050, with
8 an economic potential of around 3.5 GtCO₂/yr. In another study, an en-
9 ergy system optimisation approach has been adopted to analyse the role of
10 BECCS in meeting various global mean temperature limits [20]. Given its
11 negative carbon emissions potential, BECCS allowed for lower temperature
12 targets to become attainable and also at lower costs. At the same time, the
13 uncertainties and knowledge gaps with respect to BECCS as a mitigation
14 technology have also been highlighted. Some of the uncertainties include the
15 sustainability of large scale deployment relative to other land and biomass
16 needs (with significant concerns over land-use implications), the availabil-
17 ity of suitable and secure CO₂ sequestration sites globally, the response of
18 natural land and ocean carbon sinks to negative emissions, plus the costs,
19 financing, legal liabilities and public acceptance [20, 19, 21, 22].

20 Currently, four BioCCS projects are in operation around the world -
21 mostly focused on CO₂ capture from ethanol production, and three of the
22 projects use the CO₂ for enhanced oil recovery [19]. Recently, a spatially
23 explicit optimisation framework was developed to characterise the optimal
24 sizing (scale) for potential BECCS facilities located in Illinois, USA [23]. It
25 was assessed that the biomass supply, technology cost and cost scaling have

1 a strong effect on the optimal capacity, however the levelised cost and the
2 cost of avoided CO₂ were observed to be relatively insensitive to deviations
3 from the scaled size.

4 The present paper focuses on the assessment of the application of BECCS
5 specifically in the biopower generation industry. For a biopower application,
6 coupling CCS technology with a co-fired (biomass and coal) power plant
7 offers a practical option with moderate investment costs to evaluate these
8 technology combinations. The significant research, development and inno-
9 vation efforts in the field of CCS have already been reviewed in detail else-
10 where [24, 25, 26, 27, 28]. The strong potential of *Biopower CCS* for carbon
11 abatement has also been recognised in several studies, while highlighting the
12 dearth of comprehensive data and techno-economic uncertainties associated
13 with Biopower CCS [29, 14, 17, 18, 19, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34]. In the context of
14 UK, the significance of including Biopower CCS within the energy mix in or-
15 der to achieve the UK target of a 80% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions
16 by 2050 in a cost-effective manner, has been emphasised by the Committee
17 on Climate Change and the Energy Technologies Institute [35, 36].

18 In this paper, we discuss some of the key results from a study that was
19 commissioned by the Energy Technologies Institute (ETI) in the UK, to
20 assess the techno-economics of a wide range of technology combinations in-
21 volving biomass fuelled power generation combined with CO₂ capture. This
22 *Techno-Economic Study of Biomass to Power with CO₂ capture (TESBiC)*
23 study entailed desk-based review and analysis, numerical modelling, optimi-
24 sation as well as data collection at some of the leading pilot demonstration
25 plants in Europe. Twenty eight Biopower CCS technology combinations

1 were identified and assessed as part of the TESBiC study. The paper is
2 organised as follows: First, a short overview of the work performed in the
3 field of Biopower CCS is given. Then the technical approach adopted in the
4 TESBiC project is presented, followed by one workflow example of a specific
5 Biopower CCS technology. The results of the techno-economic analysis of the
6 eight short-listed Biopower CCS technology combinations are then discussed
7 before drawing final conclusions.

8 **2. Overview of Biopower CCS**

9 From the perspective of deployment of Biopower CCS by 2050, numer-
10 ous technology combinations involving combustion or gasification of biomass
11 (either dedicated or co-fired with coal) together with pre-, oxy- or post-
12 combustion CO₂ capture currently exist. In a life cycle assessment (LCA)
13 study of biomass co-firing power plants with CCS, a supercritical pulverised
14 coal (PC) with post-combustion CO₂ capture and an integrated gasification
15 plant with pre-combustion capture were analysed at a common capacity of
16 550 MWe and the gains made in terms of reduction of CO₂ and SO₂ emis-
17 sions were weighed against the efficiency drop and increased infrastructure
18 demand [33]. For a fixed co-firing of 30% (energy basis) and the extent of
19 CO₂ capture set at 90%, net negative emissions in the range of 67-85 g/kWh
20 were reported. In a separate techno-economic analysis conducted [37], the
21 potential of dedicated biomass with integrated gasification combined cycle
22 (IGCC) coupled with CCS was proposed as the main bionergy conversion
23 technology for the long term, representing 33% of the global mitigation po-
24 tential by 2100. An integrated gasification facility that combined electricity

1 generation (combined cycle) and an option to produce Fischer Tropsch Diesel,
2 with and without CCS has also been assessed in another study [38]. Torrefied
3 biomass was proposed as a feedstock for the facility and specific direct CO₂
4 emissions were estimated to be -0.93 kg CO₂/kWh. A cofired (80% coal and
5 20 biomass) IGCC based on entrained-flow gasifier designs combined with
6 oxy-, pre- and post-combustion CO₂ capture at a fixed rate of 90% has also
7 been modelled [39]. It was concluded that the iron-based chemical looping
8 was significantly more energy efficient than the post- and pre-combustion
9 capture systems. Furthermore, the study also indicated that pre-combustion
10 capture using either physical or chemical solvents was more energy efficient
11 than post-combustion capture using chemical solvents.

12 Elsewhere, a mixed integer nonlinear programming (MINLP) approach
13 was adopted to emphasise the need for operating biomass co-fired power
14 plants at a high load factor and at high levels of the extent of CO₂ capture
15 to ensure commercial feasibility [40]. Under the conditions of constrained
16 supply of indigenous biomass, a price range threshold of 120-175 £/t of CO₂
17 was reported to incentivise the generation of carbon negative electricity. Re-
18 cently, biomass conversion has also been considered in large scale (660 MWe)
19 co-fired biomass plants retrofitted with post-combustion CO₂ capture and
20 relatively smaller scale (100 MWe) dedicated biomass plants equipped with
21 CO₂ capture [41]. For a 90% CO₂ capture, the power generation efficiency
22 drop with CCS was estimated to be 10% points. For such efficiency penalty
23 with CCS, the importance of ensuring a sufficiently high initial net efficiency
24 of the basic biopower plant was highlighted and the advantages offered by
25 the large scale co-fired power plant with super critical steam power cycles

1 were also emphasised.

2 **3. Approach**

3 Twenty eight Biopower CCS technology combinations were examined
4 based on the following assessment criteria over the period 2010 to 2050:

- 5 • Techno-economic characteristics such as nameplate capacities, capacity
6 factors, LHV% electrical efficiencies, extent of co-firing and of CO₂
7 capture;
- 8 • CO₂, SO₂ and NO_x emissions;
- 9 • capital and operating costs (CAPEX and OPEX);
- 10 • Levelised costs of electricity (LCOE), costs of CO₂ captured and avoided;
- 11 • Flexibility and load-following capabilities;
- 12 • Technology Readiness Level (TRL) progressions;
- 13 • Feedstock characteristics;
- 14 • Gaps in the current understanding, resulting technical and commercial
15 risks and corresponding potential mitigation strategies;
- 16 • UK development prospects; and
- 17 • Intellectual property and UK deployment potentials.

18 Bearing in mind the challenges arising from the lack of Biopower CCS
19 data in the public domain and the large variances in the technology readiness

1 levels (TRLs) of the various CO₂ capture technologies (Figure 1), significant
 2 consideration was given to the approach adopted in terms of the technology
 3 landscape review, screening, model development and the ensuing analysis
 4 phases.

Figure 1: *Current technology readiness levels (TRL) for CCS technologies.*

5 Furthermore, to help ensure that the overall economic parameters could
 6 be compared across the technology combinations, harmonised estimates for
 7 a number of the more common cost items of equipment and utilities were
 8 prepared for use in this work. For example, the additional capital costs in
 9 terms of operations and utilities were assumed to be 5% of the total installed
 10 CAPEX, with civils and land set at 10%, project development at 5% and
 11 contingency at 10%. Several pieces of common equipment (compressors, air

1 separation, turbines) also had their costs harmonised. Feedstock prices (2010
2 basis) were set throughout at 7 £/MWh for bituminous coal, 27 £/MWh for
3 traded wood pellets and 10 £/MWh for domestic wood chip, with plant
4 utilisation factors all set to 85%. Note that it was assumed that Biopower
5 CCS will take the role of providing baseload power and will not play a role
6 in balancing UK power grid with high penetration of renewables. The fixed
7 operating costs were assumed to be 5% of the total installed CAPEX (based
8 on 4% labour and maintenance and 1% for insurance). Most importantly, all
9 costs are presented as "Nth-of-a-kind" (as if the technology were already at
10 TRL 9), and not prototype costs (e.g. current lower TRLs).

11 A schematic of the approach used within the TESBiC project is presented
12 in Figure 2. A landscape review of twenty eight technology combinations was
13 performed based on data from the project partners and from literature, plus
14 a review of existing roadmaps in the energy and CCS fields. Note that only
15 those options able to reach TRL 5 (pilot scale) by 2020 were considered
16 likely to be advanced enough to be able to contribute to mass deployment
17 in the UK by 2050. This screening criterion was based on typical industry
18 lead times and assuming that no major concerted focused effort in terms
19 of research, development and deployment was made in advancing specific
20 technology. Note that waste-to-energy plants were not considered, given
21 their significantly lower efficiency and limited future deployment potential
22 as compared to dedicated or cofiring biomass plants, thus weakening the
23 case for adding efficiency-penalising capture [41, 42]. Fuel cells offer another
24 power generation option compared to combined cycle hydrogen turbines, but
25 as they would use the same biomass gasification and pre-combustion capture

1 technologies as a dedicated biomass integration gasification combined cycle
2 (bio IGCC) plant, these were not focused upon within the TESBiC study.
3 Biomass integrated gasification fuel cell (BIGFC) technology is currently
4 around TRL 4-5, but combined with CCS the whole system TRL is below
5 TRL4 [43, 44].

6 As a consequence of the landscape review and screening, the following
7 eight technology combinations were selected for further more detailed anal-
8 ysis:

- 9 1. Biomass-coal co-firing combustion, with post-combustion amine scrub-
10 bing (*cofire amine*)
- 11 2. Dedicated biomass combustion with post-combustion amine scrubbing
12 (*bio amine*)
- 13 3. Biomass-coal co-firing combustion, with post-combustion carbonate loop-
14 ing (*cofire carb loop*)
- 15 4. Biomass-coal co-firing oxy-combustion, with cryogenic O₂ separation
16 (*cofire oxy*)
- 17 5. Dedicated biomass oxy-combustion, with cryogenic O₂ separation (*bio*
18 *oxy*)
- 19 6. Dedicated biomass chemical-looping-combustion using solid oxygen car-
20 riers (*bio chem loop*)
- 21 7. Biomass-coal co-firing IGCC (Integrated Gasification Combined Cy-
22 cle), with physical absorption (*cofire IGCC*)
- 23 8. Dedicated biomass IGCC, with physical absorption (*bio IGCC*).

24 The eight technology combinations represented a wide range of current
25 TRLs i.e. from TRL4 (bench-scale test rig) to TRL6-7 (demonstration).

Figure 2: *TESBiC work-flow.*

1 Base case process flowsheet models were developed for each of the eight
 2 technology combinations by employing a high-level process flow description
 3 and the associated mass and energy balances. Process efficiencies based on
 4 low heating values (LHV), the CAPEX and OPEX estimates, the costs for
 5 CO₂ captured and avoided and the LCOE were calculated for each of the
 6 base case models.

7 As plant performance and cost are known to be highly sensitive to plant
 8 scale, fast-response meta models were formulated on the basis of the base
 9 case values provided by the flowsheet models. In particular, output variables
 10 such as CAPEX, non-fuel OPEX, generation efficiency, CO₂, SO₂ and NO_x

1 emissions were developed as functions of the four input parameters, namely,
2 co-firing levels, extent of carbon capture, nameplate and operating capacities.
3 Lastly, the main performance parameters for the eight TESBiC technologies
4 were benchmarked at common plant scales (a small scale of 50 MW_e and
5 an intermediate scale of 250 MW_e). The aforementioned techno-economic
6 estimates based on the current state-of-the-art were then evolved for the years
7 2020, 2030, 2040 and 2050 for all eight technology combinations. Significant
8 increases in the electricity generation efficiencies and reductions in the capital
9 costs of all of the technologies were projected for the period 2010 to 2050. By
10 their nature, these projections have large uncertainties attached, although the
11 level of optimism assumed within the TESBiC project was consistent with
12 that in other industry data sources used.

13 **4. A work-flow example**

14 In this section, the technical work-flow employed during the assessment of
15 the Biopower CCS technologies is described with the help of a specific tech-
16 nology combination, chosen as an example. Given the paucity of published
17 data on low TRL (TRL4) technology options, dedicated biomass chemical
18 looping (bio chem loop) has been considered here.

19 Figure 3 shows a high-level process flow description for bio chem loop at
20 a base capacity of 268.3 MW_e. Mass and energy balance calculations were
21 used to evaluate the techno-economic output metrics (e.g. LHV efficiency,
22 CAPEX, OPEX, etc.) at a number of operating points, termed as base cases.

23 The base case models were then used to populate data for the formulation
24 of computational surrogates or meta models. The meta-model utilised was

uations obtained from the detailed models. The MoDS software has been previously applied for various digital engineering tasks that include parameter estimation and uncertainty quantification [46], Design of Experiments (DoE) [47], surrogates or meta model generation [48] and global sensitivity analysis [49, 50].

5. Results and discussion

Biopower CCS technologies currently represent one of the very few practical and economic means of removing large quantities of CO₂ from the atmosphere, and uniquely involves the generation of electricity at the same time. This would appear to make this approach to power generation very attractive given that many industrialised countries have stringent targets for the reduction of CO₂ emissions. It is clear, however that the available Biopower CCS technologies are relatively expensive in terms of both capital and operating costs (thus requiring financial incentives) as compared to fossil fuel based or other renewable power generation. Presently, there are no specific financial incentives anywhere in the world for the generation of electricity specifically with negative CO₂ emissions. Overall, the data collected during the TES-BiC project indicated that the most significant barriers to the deployment of Biopower CCS technologies will be economic and regulatory in nature, rather than technical, provided that fossil CCS technology is deployed at commercial scale.

Key performance parameters in terms of the generation efficiency (LHV% basis) and the specific investment costs (CAPEX) for the eight Biopower CCS technology combinations were benchmarked at common plant scales (of 50

1 MW_e and 250 MW_e). Figure 4 gives the efficiency and CAPEX results at 50
2 MW_e plant capacity.

Figure 4: *LHV efficiency vs. “Nth-of-a-kind” specific investment costs for eight Biopower CCS technology options (dots indicate 2010 values and arrow heads indicate estimates for 2050).*

3 Bio amine and bio oxy technologies were the least efficient options, whereas
4 cofire and bio IGCC showed the potential to reach the highest efficiencies
5 by 2050. Although the efficiency of cofire carb loop remained competitive,
6 the CAPEX was relatively high. Alongside the cofire amine and cofire oxy
7 options, bio chem loop yielded the relatively lowest CAPEX range at a mod-
8 erately high efficiency.

9 Wherever a direct comparison was feasible (for plants with an unabated

equivalent), it was observed that the net efficiency penalty due to carbon capture varied in the range of 6 to 15 percentage points, whereas the specific investment costs (CAPEX) increased significantly in the range 45% to 130%, with annual operating and maintenance costs growing by 4% to 60%. In case of dedicated bio chem loop, however, there is no efficiency loss or comparator given that both power generation and CO₂ capture are intrinsic to the operation of the technology. At 250 MW_e, the technologies were observed to be tightly grouped, almost lying completely within each other's uncertainty bounds. These observations confirm that within the current uncertainty bounds of the available data, the plant scale (MW_e) is the principal driver of CAPEX (£/MW_e), rather than the choice of technology, with larger plants having lower specific capital costs.

The LCOE was calculated using a discounted cost of capital (at 10% discount rate, and a plant technical/economic lifetime of 30 years), adding the annual fixed and variable operating costs, and finally adding the feedstock costs divided by the plant electricity generation efficiency. Figure 5 presents the potential evolution of the LCOE at a 50 MW_e scale for the eight technologies covering the period up to 2050. Three distinct groupings can be observed, with low efficiency bio amine and bio oxy with the highest LCOE, then the higher efficiency bio IGCC, bio chem loop and cofire carb loop options in the middle, and lastly, the cofire amine, cofire oxy and cofire IGCC with the lowest LCOE (attributed to cheap coal prices). Since this is a small-scale plant, either biomass pellets or chips could realistically be used, however Figure 5 shows the LCOE results when the biomass feedstock used is in the form of imported pellets. The switch to using chips instead of

Figure 5: *LCOE for the eight Biopower CCS technology options up to 2050, at 50 MW_e.*

1 pellets dramatically lowers the LCOE, with many options having very simi-
2 lar LCOE (80-100 £/MWh_e) in 2050, since the price of UK locally sourced
3 biomass chips (10 £/MWh) is much closer to the price of coal (7 £/MWh).

4 The cost of CO₂ captured was calculated by multiplying the LCOE (£/MWh_e)
5 by the annual electricity output (MWh_e/yr), then dividing by the annual
6 CO₂ emissions captured (tCO₂/yr). However, this varied very little over
7 time, since improved capital costs and plant efficiencies meant that both the
8 LCOE and the amount of CO₂ captured per year decreased in step, if it is
9 assumed that the plant power output remains constant. Alternatively, if the
10 plant feedstock input remains constant, then the amount of CO₂ captured

Figure 6: *Cost of CO₂ captured for the eight Biopower CCS technology options at 50 MWe.*

1 will be fixed, but the LCOE will fall as the annual electricity output rises
2 again, giving little change in the cost of CO₂ captured. As the cost of CO₂
3 captured varied only slightly over time; average 2010-2050 values have been
4 presented in Figure 6.

5 Given the dependency between LCOE and the cost of CO₂ captured,
6 Figure 6 shows several similarities to the trends in LCOE across the eight
7 technology combinations. The co-firing options exhibited the cheapest cost
8 of CO₂ captured (due to coal vs. pellet prices), with the switch between
9 biomass pellets and chips noticeably reducing the cost of CO₂ captured for

1 the other options. Interestingly, the 50 MW_e case with chips yielded very
2 similar cost of CO₂ captured across the board (range of 100-130 £/tCO₂),
3 since the slight differences in LCOE were balanced by the different amounts
4 of CO₂ captured (with lower efficiency plants capturing more CO₂ whilst
5 they generated the target 50 MW_e).

Figure 7: *Cost of CO₂ avoided for the eight Biopower CCS technology options at 50 MW_e.*

6 In order to evaluate the cost of CO₂ avoided, the comparator technology
7 was chosen to be an unabated coal power plant (from the relevant decade)
8 for the benchmarking exercise. The cost, efficiency and emissions data for
9 unabated coal combustion power plants were used from previous published

1 data [51]. The choice of a different comparator technology such as a coal
2 power plant with CCS or a dedicated biomass power plant (without CCS),
3 both more expensive options, would further reduce the cost of CO₂ avoided
4 reported in the TESBiC study.

5 The cost of CO₂ avoided only dropped slightly over time; hence again only
6 average 2010-2050 values were presented. Figure 7 shows a tight grouping
7 when using a common scale of 50MWe, with costs of avoided CO₂ between
8 60-90 £/tCO₂ when using pellets (30-65 £/tCO₂ were obtained when using
9 chips). The feedstock costs dominate, so those technologies that maximise
10 the use of low-cost chips (i.e. the dedicated biomass technologies) were able to
11 achieve the lowest costs of CO₂ avoided. Bio chem loop appears to potentially
12 be the most attractive technology in both cases (by quite some distance),
13 although the uncertainty bars are large for this earlier stage technology.

14 From a TRL perspective, the eight shortlisted Biopower CCS technologies
15 (out of twenty eight in total) represent a wide range of current TRLs (Tech-
16 nology Readiness Levels) i.e. from TRL4 (bench-scale test rig) to TRL6-7
17 (demonstration). *Second generation* capture technologies such as cofire carb
18 loop and bio chem loop currently have low TRLs (4 to 5), as is evident from
19 the limited (fewer than 10) number of bench scale and pilot scale plants,
20 with a maximum plant capacity of 3 MW_{th}. These technologies (a majority
21 of which are operated with coal feedstocks at present) yielded higher uncer-
22 tainties in their techno-economic estimates as compared to the *first genera-*
23 *tion* capture technologies such as amine scrubbing and oxyfuel combustion
24 with higher TRLs of 6 to 7. For lower current TRL technology options,
25 the TESBiC data from existing pilot plants and demonstrations helped in

1 identifying the key technical and commercial gaps and challenges that ex-
2 ist for the selected Biopower CCS technologies. To present an example, for
3 dedicated biomass chemical looping combustion (bio chem loop), some of
4 the unknowns associated with the identification of an optimal oxygen carrier
5 material suited for biomass feedstocks, the stability and lifetime of the car-
6 rier, the attrition rates at large scales and achieving higher gas conversion
7 efficiency were highlighted. These factors were classified as having ‘high un-
8 certainty’, whereas factors such as incompleteness of the flowsheet at large
9 scales and high temperature solid circulation rates were identified as having
10 ‘medium uncertainty’.

11 An outline development roadmap for each of the technologies were also
12 prepared as part of the TESBiC study. In the case of the more developed
13 Biopower CCS technologies, the route to further development after demon-
14 stration of the capture technology on a coal-fired plant would involve de-
15 ployment of the capture technology at a commercial scale on a coal plant co-
16 firing biomass, or demonstration on a dedicatd biomass plant. The roadmaps
17 for many of the Biopower CCS technologies are closely tied to the develop-
18 ment of fossil CCS technology. For the less well developed capture tech-
19 nologies (chemical and carbonate looping), fairly conventional development
20 roadmaps, involving component testing, small and large pilot scale testing,
21 and larger scale demonstration activities have been defined.

22 **6. Conclusions**

23 The TESBiC study focused on assessing twenty eight technology combi-
24 nations involving biomass fuelled power generation combined with CO₂ cap-

1 ture (Biopower CCS). Based on their deployment potential by 2050 and the
2 system-level TRL (Technology Readiness Level) progression criteria, tech-
3 nologies were short-listed for further analysis. These eight options repre-
4 sented a wide range of current TRLs i.e. from TRL4 (bench-scale test rig) to
5 TRL6-7 (demonstration). Base case process flowsheet models (mass and en-
6 ergy balances) were developed for each of the eight technology combinations
7 by employing a high-level process description for Nth-of-a-kind plants. The
8 base case models were then utilised to generate fast-response surrogates or
9 meta models for techno-economic outputs (CAPEX, non-fuel OPEX, genera-
10 tion efficiency, LCOE, cost of CO₂ captured and avoided) as functions of the
11 four input parameters (co-firing levels, extent of carbon capture, nameplate
12 and operating capacities).

13 Wherever a direct comparison was feasible (for plants with an unabated
14 equivalent), it was observed that the net efficiency penalty due to carbon
15 capture varied in the range of 6 to 15 percentage points, whereas the specific
16 investment costs (CAPEX) increased in the range 45% to 130%, with annual
17 operating and maintenance costs growing by 4% to 60%. At 250 MW_e, the
18 technology combinations were observed to be tightly grouped, almost lying
19 completely within each other’s uncertainty bounds. In general terms, the
20 plant scale (MW_e), rather than the choice of technology is the principal driver
21 of CAPEX (£/MW_e). The co-firing %, i.e. the weighted feedstock cost, is one
22 of the key drivers of LCOE, with dedicated biomass options using expensive
23 pellets always having significantly higher LCOE than co-firing with cheap
24 coal. At 50 MW_e, the LCOE results over the period 2010 to 2050 exhibited
25 three distinct groupings: the first with low efficiency bio amine and bio oxy

1 with the highest LCOE, then the higher efficiency bio IGCC, bio chem loop
2 and cofire carb loop options with a moderate LCOE, and the cofiring options
3 with amine, oxy and IGCC with the lowest LCOE on account of the cheap
4 coal prices. Although the dedicated biomass technologies yield higher LCOE
5 values and costs per tonne of CO₂ captured, the major advantages of these
6 technology combinations, however, are that they do not involve fossil fuel
7 utilisation and that they offer very significant negative CO₂ emissions per
8 kWh generated at relatively modest scales. Using biomass pellets for the
9 cofiring and dedicated technology options at 50 MW_e capacity, the average
10 values over the period 2010 to 2050 for the costs of CO₂ captured were
11 observed to be in the range of 100-190 £/tCO₂ and for the costs of CO₂
12 avoided to be in the range of 60-90 £/tCO₂.

13 Presently, there are also no financial incentives available (anywhere in the
14 world) specifically for the generation of electricity with negative CO₂ emis-
15 sions - current policies either only penalise positive emissions, or incentivise
16 zero emissions. The data collected during the TESBiC project indicates that
17 the most significant barriers to the deployment of Biopower CCS technologies
18 will be economic and regulatory in nature, rather than technical, assuming
19 fossil CCS technologies are successfully proven at scale. Furthermore, estab-
20 lishing sustainable biomass supply chains with low upstream emissions (and
21 few indirect impacts on existing land use and carbon stocks) and availabil-
22 ity and suitability of CO₂ sequestration sites are important issues that would
23 need to be considered for the development and deployment of Biopower CCS.
24 More detailed engineering studies are recommended to help reduce the uncer-
25 tainties in the cost estimates across the eight technology combinations. Such

1 studies followed by pilot and demonstration activities involving BioPower
2 CCS technologies naturally form the next step towards rapidly reducing CO₂
3 emissions from the power sector, whilst keeping open the option of developing
4 low-cost, scalable negative emissions technologies in case of lack of mitigation
5 action and climate change overshoot.

6 **Acknowledgements**

7 The authors acknowledge the financial support provided by the Energy
8 Technologies Institute (ETI), UK for the work performed during the course
9 of the TESBiC project.

- 10 [1] International Energy Agency, Model Energy Outlook (2011).
- 11 [2] IPCC, Climate Change 2007: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribu-
12 tion of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Inter-
13 governmental Panel on Climate Change, Cambridge University Press,
14 Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, 2007.
- 15 [3] IPCC, Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribu-
16 tion of Working Group III to the 5th Assessment Report of the Inter-
17 governmental Panel on Climate Change, Cambridge, United Kingdom
18 and New York, 2014.
- 19 [4] A. Arasto, K. Onarheim, E. Tsupari, J. Kaerki, Bio-CCS: feasibility
20 comparison of large scale carbon-negative solutions, Energy Procedia 63
21 (2014) 6756–6769.

- 1 [5] M. C. Carbo, R. Smit, B. van der Drift, D. Jansen, Bio energy with
2 CCS (BECCS): Large potential for bioSNG at low CO₂ avoidance cost,
3 Energy Procedia 4 (2011) 2950–2954.
- 4 [6] Q. Chen, A. Rao, S. Samuelsen, Coproduction of transportation fuels
5 in advanced IGCC via coal and biomass mixtures, Applied Energy 157
6 (2015) 851–860.
- 7 [7] J. R. Moreira, V. Romeiro, S. Fuss, F. Kraxner, S. A. Pacca, A mixed
8 integer nonlinear programming (MINLP) supply chain optimisation fr-
9 maework for carbon negative electricity egenration using biomass to en-
10 ergy with ccs BECCS in the UK, Applied Energy 179 (2016) 55–63.
- 11 [8] J. S. Rhodes, D. W. Keith, Engineering economic analysis of biomass
12 IGCC with carbon capture and storage, Biomass and Bioenergy 29
13 (2005) 440–450.
- 14 [9] D. Klein, G. Luderer, E. Kriegler, J. Strefler, N. Bauer, M. Leimbach,
15 A. Popp, J. P. Dietrich, F. Humpenoeder, H. Lotze-Campen, O. Eden-
16 hofer, The value of bioenergy in low stabilization scenarios: an assess-
17 ment using REMIND-MAGPIE, Climate Change 123 (2014) 705–718.
- 18 [10] D. P. van Vuuren, S. Deetman, J. van Vliet, M. van den Berg, B. J.
19 van Ruijven, B. Koelbl, The role of negative CO₂ emissions for reaching
20 2°C - insights from integrated assessment modelling, Climate Change
21 118 (2013) 15–27.
- 22 [11] O. Dessens, G. Anandrajan, A. Gambhir, Avoid2 wpc1 report: Review

- 1 of existing emissions pathways and evaluation of decarbonisation rates
2 (2014).
- 3 [12] S. Selosse, O. Ricci, Achieving negative emissions with BECCS (bioen-
4 ergy with carbon capture and storage) in the power sector: New insights
5 from the TIAM-FR (times integrated assessment model france) model,
6 Energy 76 (2014) 967–975.
- 7 [13] N. McGlashan, N. Shah, B. Caldecott, M. Workman, High-level techno-
8 economic assessment of negative emissions technologies, Process Safety
9 and Environmental Protection 90 (2012) 501–510.
- 10 [14] European Biofuels Technology Platform for Zero Emission Fossil
11 Fuel Power Plants, Biomass with CO₂ capture and storage (Bio-CCS):
12 The way forward for Europe (2012).
- 13 [15] C. Gough, P. Upham, Biomass energy with carbon capture and storage
14 (BECCS): a review (2010).
- 15 [16] K. Tokimatsu, S. Konishi, T. Tezuka, R. Yasuka, M. Nishio, Role of in-
16 novative technologies under the global zero emissions scenarios, Applied
17 Energy 162 (2016) 1483–1493.
- 18 [17] IEAGHG, Potential for biomass and carbon dioxide capture and storage
19 (2011).
- 20 [18] J. Koornneef, P. van Breevoort, C. Hamelinck, C. Hendriks, M. Hoog-
21 wijk, K. Koop, M. Kopel, A. Camps, Global potential for biomass and
22 carbon dioxide capture, transport and storage up to 2050, Int. J. Green-
23 house Gas Control 11 (2012) 117–132.

- 1 [19] J. Kemper, Biomass and carbon dioxide capture and storage: A review,
2 Int. J. Greenhouse Gas Control 40 (2016) 401–430.
- 3 [20] C. Azar, K. Lindgren, M. Obersteiner, K. Riahi, D. P. van Vuuren,
4 K. M. G. J. den Elzen, K. Moellersten, E. D. Larson, The feasibility of
5 low CO₂ concentration targets and the role of bio-energy with carbon
6 capture and storage (BECCS), Climatic Change 100 (2010) 195–202.
- 7 [21] S. Fuss, J. G. Canadell, G. P. Peters, M. Tavoni, R. M. Andrew, P. C.
8 abd R. B. Jackson, C. D. Jones, F. Kraxner, N. Nakicenovic, C. L.
9 Quere, M. R. Raupach, A. Sharifi, P. Smith, Y. Yamagata, Betting on
10 negative emissions, Nature Climate Change 4 (2014) 850–853.
- 11 [22] E. Kato, Y. Yamagata, BECCS capability of dedicated bioenergy crops
12 under a future land-use scenario targeting negative carbon emissions,
13 Earth’s Future 2 (2014) 421–439.
- 14 [23] D. L. Sanchez, D. S. Callaway, Optimal scale of carbon-negative energy
15 facilities, Applied Energy 170 (2016) 437–444.
- 16 [24] N. MacDowell, N. Florin, A. Buchard, J. Jallett, A. Galindo, G. Jackson,
17 C. S. Adjiman, C. K. Williams, N. Shah, P. Fennell, An overview of CO₂
18 capture technologies, Energy and Environmental Science 3 (11) (2010)
19 1645–1669.
- 20 [25] J. Yan, Carbon capture and storage, Applied Energy 148 (2015) A1–A6.
- 21 [26] D. Y. C. Leung, G. Caramanna, M. M. Maroto-Valer, An overview of
22 current status of carbon dioxide capture and storage technologies, Re-
23 newable and Sustainable Energy Reviews 39 (2014) 426–443.

- 1 [27] J. Gibbins, H. Chalmers, Carbon capture and storage, *Energy Policy* 36
2 (2008) 4317–4322.
- 3 [28] M. Kanniche, R. Gros-Bonnivard, P. Jaud, J. Valle-Marcos, J.-
4 M. Amann, C. Bouallou, Pre-combustion, post-combustion and oxy-
5 combustion in thermal power plant for CO₂ capture, *Applied Thermal*
6 *Engineering* 30 (2010) 53–62.
- 7 [29] IEAGHG, Biomass CCS study 2009/9 (2009).
- 8 [30] D. McLaren, A comparative global assessment of potential negative
9 emissions technologies, *Process Safety and Environmental Protection*
10 90 (2012) 489–500.
- 11 [31] G. Lomax, T. M. Lenton, A. Adeosun, M. Workman, Investing in neg-
12 ative emissions, *Nature Climate Change* 5 (2015) 498–500.
- 13 [32] J. Laude, C. Jonen, Biomass and CCS: The influence of technical change,
14 *Energy Policy* 60 (2013) 916–924.
- 15 [33] W. Schakel, H. Meerman, A. Talaei, A. Ramirez, A. Faaji, Comparative
16 life cycle assessment of biomass co-firing plants with carbon capture and
17 storage, *Applied Energy* 131 (2014) 441–467.
- 18 [34] P. J. Vrugt, N. Markusson, H. Karlsson, Carbon capture and storage,
19 bio-energy with carbon capture and stoprage, and the escape from the
20 fossil-fuel lock-in, *Global Environmental Change* 21 (2011) 282–292.
- 21 [35] Committee on Climate Change, Bioenergy review (2011).

- 1 [36] C. Heaton, Modelling low-carbon energy system designs with the ETI
2 ESME model, ETI Paper.
3 URL www.eti.co.uk
- 4 [37] D. Klein, N. Bauer, B. Bodirsky, J. P. Dietrich, A. Popp, Bio-IGCC
5 with CCS as a long term mitigation option in a coupled energy system
6 and land use model, *Energy Procedia* 4 (2011) 2933–2940.
- 7 [38] J. C. Meerman, M. M. J. Knoope, A. Ramirez, W. C. Turkenburg,
8 A. P. C. Faaij, Technical and economic prospects of coal- and biomass-
9 fired integrated gasification facilities equipped with CCS over time, *Int.*
10 *J. Greenhouse Gas Control* 16 (2013) 311–323.
- 11 [39] C.-C. Cormos, A. Padurean, P. S. Agachi, Technical evaluations of car-
12 bon capture options for power generation from coal and biomass based
13 on integrated gasification combined cycle scheme, *Energy Procedia* 2
14 (2011) 1861–1868.
- 15 [40] O. Akgul, N. M. Dowell, L. G. Papageorgious, N. Shah, A mixed integer
16 nonlinear programming (MINLP) supply chain optimisation framework
17 for carbon negative electricity generation using biomass to energy with
18 ccs BECCS in the UK, *Int. J. Greenhouse Gas Control* 28 (2014) 189–
19 202.
- 20 [41] J. Hetland, P. Yowargana, S. Leduc, F. Kraxner, Carbon negative emis-
21 sions: Systemic impacts of biomass conversion - a case study on CO₂
22 capture and storage options, *Int. J. Greenhouse Gas Control* 49 (2016)
23 330–342.

- 1 [42] IEA-ETE03, Biomass for power generation and CHP (2007).
- 2 [43] J. Sadhukhan, Y. Zhao, N. Shah, N. P. Brandon, Performance analysis
3 of integrated biomass gasification fuel cell (BGFC) and biomass gasi-
4 fication combined cycle (BGCC) systems, Chem. Eng. Sci 65 (2010)
5 1942–1954.
- 6 [44] F. P. Nagel, S. Ghosh, C. Pitta, T. J. Schildhauer, S. Biollaz, Biomass
7 integrated gasification fuel cell systems - concept development and ex-
8 perimental results, Biomass and Bioenergy 35 (2011) 354–362.
- 9 [45] Model Development Suite (MoDS) software user’s manual, CMCL In-
10 novations, Cambridge, UK (2011).
- 11 [46] S. Mosbach, J. H. Hong, G. P. E. Brownbridge, M. Kraft, S. Gudiyaella,
12 K. Brezinsky, Bayesian error propagation for a kinetic model of n-
13 propylbenzene oxidation in a shock tube, Int. J. Chemical Kinetics 46 (7)
14 (2014) 389–404.
- 15 [47] S. Mosbach, A. Braumann, P. L. W. Man, C. Kastner, G. P. E. Brown-
16 bridge, M. Kraft, Iterative improvement of bayesian parameter estimates
17 for an engine model by means of experimental design, Combustion and
18 Flame 159 (3) (2012) 1303–1313.
- 19 [48] G. P. E. Brownbridge, P. Azadi, A. Smallbone, A. Bhawe, B. Taylor,
20 M. Kraft, The future viability of algae-derived biodiesel under economic
21 and technical uncertainties, Journal of Aerosol Science 151 (2014) 166–
22 173.

- 1 [49] P. Azadi, G. P. E. Brownbridge, S. Mosbach, A. Smallbone, A. Bhave,
2 O. Inderwildi, M. Kraft, The carbon footprint and non-renewable energy
3 demand of algae-derived biodiesel, *Applied Energy* 113 (2014) 1632–
4 1644.
- 5 [50] W. Menz, G. P. E. Brownbridge, M. Kraft, Bayesian error propagation
6 for a kinetic model of n-propylbenzene oxidation in a shock tube, *Journal*
7 *of Aerosol Science* 76 (2014) 188–199.
- 8 [51] M. Finkenrath, Cost and performance of carbon dioxide capture from
9 power generation, IEA.