

Biomass and CCS

Global potential and GHG accounting

Jasmin Kemper
Project Officer

IEA Greenhouse Gas R&D Programme

14th Annual APGTF Workshop:
'1VS' Conference Centre, Westminster, London
12th - 13th March 2014

Carbon balance of different energy systems




Positive

Less positive

Neutral to slightly positive

Neutral to slightly positive

Neutral to negative



Fossil fuels


Fossil fuels with CCS

Renewable energy

Bio-energy

Bio-energy with CCS

Bioenergy pathways & sources of CO₂




Recent work



- IEAGHG studies:

- „Potential for biomass and carbon dioxide capture and storage“ (Ecofys, July 2011)
- „Potential for biomethane production with carbon dioxide capture and storage“ (Ecofys, September 2013)
- „Biomass and CCS – guidance for accounting for negative emissions“ (Carbon Counts, publication in progress)



<http://www.ieaghg.org/publications/technical-reports>

- Joint Taskforce on Bio-CCS

- „Biomass and CO₂ Capture and Storage“ (EBTP & ZEP, 2012)



<http://www.zeroemissionsplatform.eu/news/news/1407-biomass-with-co2-capture-and-storage-bio-ccs-the-way-forward-for-europe.html>



Potential for Bio-CCS: Study methodology




- First order assessment of potential for Bio-CCS in 2030 & 2050
- Considering various levels of potential:
 - Technical Potential: Potential that is technically feasible and not restricted by economic limitations
 - Realisable Potential: Technically feasible and takes future energy demand and scenarios for capital stock turnover into account.
 - Economic Potential: Potential at competitive cost compared to alternatives.
- Six technology options selected for detailed analysis:
 - 1) PC-CCS co-firing
 - 2) CFB-CCS dedicated
 - 3) IGCC-CCS co-firing
 - 4) BIGCC-CCS dedicated
 - 5) Bio-ethanol advanced generation
 - 6) FT biodiesel

Sustainability criteria




- Sustainability **criteria 'strict'**
- Factors include:
 - Labour conditions
 - Protection of areas with high ecological, historical or cultural value
 - Food prices and security
 - Avoidance of direct and indirect land use change (dLUC & iLUC)
 - Water supply and quality
 - Land rights of local communities
- Competition for land (and food prices) as well as dLUC/iLUC are key areas of debate.




Adapted from Dehue 2006


Energy potential for Bio-CCS



Energy potential for biomethane routes



Negative emissions potential for Bio-CCS




- TP up to 10 GtCO₂eq/yr, significant cp. to IEA scenarios
- EP up to 3.5 GtCO₂eq/yr (~1/3 of TP)
- IGCC, BIGCC and FT biodiesel most promising
- CO₂ price 50 €/t
- Co-firing shares 30% in 2030, 50% in 2050
- Numbers not additive, assessment route-by-route

- Technical potential (CO₂ stored when exploiting the full biomass potential)
- Technical potential (negative GHG emissions)
- Realisable potential (negative GHG emissions)
- Economic potential (negative GHG emissions)

Negative emissions potential for biomethane routes



- TP up to 3.5 GtCO₂eq/yr, smaller than previous routes
- Significant potential only for gasification & AD (EC & AR)
- EP up to 0.4 GtCO₂eq/yr, only fraction of TP
- Gasification & AD (MSW & S/M) most promising
- Only economically viable at natural gas prices over 11 €/GJ and CO₂ prices of at least 20 €/t (except AD MSW & S/M @ 6.7 €/GJ)



Drivers & barriers for Bio-CCS



- CO₂ price
- Level of maturity of some Bio-CCS technologies
- Reliable supply of low-cost, sustainable biomass
- More positive public perception than Fossil-CCS
- Existence of suitable infrastructure
- Presence of CCUS options



Accounting for negative emissions from Bio-CCS



GHG schemes & accounting rules reviewed:

- 2006 IPCC Guidelines
- Kyoto Protocol CDM
- Kyoto Protocol JI
- **EU ETS**
- EU RED
- EU FQD
- US GHGRP
- California ETS
- California LCFS
- Australia CPM

Recognising & attributing negative emissions



Scheme	CCS	Biomass growth/ harvesting/ combustion/ processing	dLUC/iLUC	Life cycle emissions	Negative emissions
2006 IPCC Guidelines	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
EU ETS	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗
EU RED/FOD	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
GHGRP	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓
California ETS	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓
California LCFS	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Australia CPM	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
CDM/JI	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Recognising & attributing negative emissions



Almost all reviewed schemes allow for negative emissions, except the EU ETS and the Australia CPM.

■ EU ETS

- Only „fossil carbon“ emissions can be deducted from GHG inventory
- Installations exclusively using biomass are exempted
- Options to address these shortfalls:
 - Amending the EU ETS MMR to include biogenic CO₂
 - Proposing new monitoring & reporting guidelines for Bio-CCS

■ California ETS

- Does not allow for negative emissions as an appropriate quantification methodology for CCS does not exist yet within the scheme

Rewarding negative emissions



Benefits of negative emission technologies:

- Offsetting the more difficult to abate emission sources
- Reducing the overall cost of mitigation
- Offsetting legacy or historical emissions
- Putting a price ceiling on CO₂ emissions reductions

Considerations for rewarding appropriately:

- Level of reward for negative emission technologies
 - Potential dLUC/iLUC and sustainability impacts of bioenergy
 - Potential for carbon leakage

The term „negative emission“ elicits the idea of a „double dividend“:

- 1) Zero emission from the biomass part
- 2) Negative emission from the CCS part

Rewarding negative emissions



Challenges for incentivising Bio-CCS:

- Debate whether negative emissions should be given additional subsidies or a double credit per tCO₂ captured and stored
- Benefit from biomass is typically forgone under certain schemes, as it is inherently included in the baseline
- Bio-CCS competes on a per tCO₂ reduction basis with other options

Approaches for rewarding appropriately:

- Pooling
- Crediting system
 - Domestic or community offset projects (DOP/COP) under EU ETS
 - Scope for the use of JI under EU Effort Sharing Decision

Land use change effects



Concerns related to C stock changes caused by LUC:

- EU ETS, California ETS & EU RED/FQD are believed to accelerate the clearing of forests in developing countries
- Assymmetry between GHG and AFOLU accounting rules

Two core challenges for measuring dLUC/iLUC:

- Lack of data
- Reporting requirements

Two approaches exist to address these issues:

- Quantitative approaches
- Qualitative approaches

Land use change effects



Significant controversy has arisen regarding the promotion of biofuels in jurisdictions such as the US and EU.

- **Bioenergy can be imported into regulated jurisdictions and GHG benefits accrued without consideration of upstream emissions and dLUC/iLUC effects (e.g. under EU ETS)**
- Effect of energy crop cultivation on:
 - Land degradation
 - Loss of C stocks as a result of related LUCs
- Robust monitoring system for LULUCF and REDD needed
- At present these are patchy and poorly implemented
- LCFs and California ETS are exceptions



Conclusions & recommendations

- Bio-CCS has significant potential for negative emissions
- Challenges for Bio-CCS accounting & rewarding:
 - Sustainability of biomass
 - Emissions along the value chain
 - Direct and indirect land use change
- Discussions regarding support measures for Bio-CCS should address dLUC/iLUC and other sustainability issues
 - Creditability of negative emissions and GHG accounting schemes
 - Be mindful of the parity of treatment: biomass vs. fossil fuels
- Assessment and amendment of GHG accounting rules with regards to Bio-CCS is needed
 - Might result in complex political process
- Competitive environment for Bio-CCS
- Further research & development of policy recommendations



GHGT-12 October 5 - 9, 2014
12th International Conference on Greenhouse Gas Control Technologies
Austin, Texas, USA • www.GHGT.info



Thank you, any questions?

Contact me at: jasmin.kemper@ieaghg.org



Website: www.ieaghg.org



LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/groups/IEAGHG-4841998



Twitter: <https://twitter.com/IEAGHG>



Facebook: www.facebook.com/pages/IEA-Greenhouse-Gas-RD-Programme/112541615461568?ref=hl