

Identifying breakthrough technologies for the production of basic chemicals

A long term view on the sustainable
production of ammonia, olefins and
aromatics in the European region

Report

Delft, November 2011

Author(s):

Jos Benner
Marit van Lieshout
Harry Croezen



Publication Data

Bibliographical data:

Jos Benner, Marit van Lieshout, Harry Croezen

Identifying breakthrough technologies for the production of basic chemicals

A long term view on the sustainable production of ammonia, olefins and aromatics in the European region

Delft, CE Delft, November 2011

Chemical industry / Production / Emissions / Carbon dioxide / Reduction / Technology / Ammonia / Propene / Butadiene / Aromatic compounds

Publication code: 11.3581.74

CE publications are available from www.cedelft.eu.

Commissioned by: Climate Action Network Europe

Further information on this study can be obtained from the contact person, Marit van Lieshout.

© copyright, CE Delft, Delft

CE Delft
Committed to the Environment

CE Delft is an independent research and consultancy organisation specialised in developing structural and innovative solutions to environmental problems.
CE Delft's solutions are characterised in being politically feasible, technologically sound, economically prudent and socially equitable.



Contents

	Summary	5
1	Introduction	7
1.1	Background	7
1.2	Objective and Scope	8
1.3	Selection of chemical processes to be studied	9
1.4	Data availability	12
1.5	Structure of the report	12
2	Carbon capture	13
2.1	Availability of CCS	13
2.2	Suitability of CCS	15
2.3	Economics of CCS	15
2.4	Commercial use of carbon dioxide instead of storage	15
2.5	Conclusions	17
3	Battle for biomass	19
3.1	Availability and demand	19
3.2	Technical and policy options to mitigate sustainability risks	22
3.3	Conclusions on side effects of biobased chemistry	23
4	Conventional ammonia production	25
4.1	Current production volumes and applications	25
4.2	Future demand	26
4.3	Production process	30
5	Low carbon ammonia	35
5.1	European efforts	35
5.2	Non-EU efforts	36
5.3	Breakthrough technologies selection	37
5.4	Water electrolysis	37
5.5	Biomass gasification and ammonia production from syngas	43
5.6	Conclusions on ammonia	47
6	Conventional olefins production	49
6.1	Introduction to the sector and market	49
6.2	Production process	49
6.3	Current level of energy requirement and greenhouse gas emissions	50
7	Low carbon olefins	53
7.1	Bioethanol as the key to low carbon olefins	53
7.2	Ethylene from bioethanol	53
7.3	Bio-based alternative: Propylene and butylene from bioethanol	62
7.4	Conclusions on olefins	66



8	Conventional aromatics (BTX) production	69
8.1	Introduction to the sector and market	69
8.2	Process	70
8.3	Current level of energy requirement and greenhouse gas emissions	72
9	Low carbon aromatics	73
9.1	Introduction	73
9.2	Lignin based production routes	73
9.3	Ethanol to aromatics	77
10	Conclusions and recommendations	81
10.1	Outcomes of inventory of breakthrough technologies	81
10.2	Economic assessment of breakthrough technologies	83
10.3	Requirement for additional integrated policies?	84
	References	85



Summary

Background of the report

The objective of this study is to explore breakthrough technologies in three processes in the European chemical industry that may lead to significant reduction in greenhouse gas emissions for these processes in Europe. This is in line with the 83-87% reduction in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions as deemed necessary by the European commission in the communications on “A roadmap for moving to a competitive low carbon economy in 2050” (COM(2011) 112 final). This is one aspect of the broad range that has to be taken into account, when aiming for a sustainable future.

In addition we were asked to evaluate the feasibility of the use of carbon dioxide (CO₂) as a basic chemical.

Specific processes studied

In this context we have described the processes for the production of:

- ammonia;
- olefins;
- aromatics (BTX).

These chemicals are expected to remain an important part of the mixtures of chemicals that may be produced in 2050, since these chemicals are so-called basic chemicals and as such the building blocks of a wide variety of chemical compounds.

Furthermore, these three processes currently account for 20% of the greenhouse gas (GHG) emission of the European chemical industry. The current best available technology references (BAT refs) allow for maximally 30% reduction in GHG emissions, i.e. breakthrough technology is necessary to meet the reduction targets without CCS.

Applied method

Of each process an introduction to the current technology is made, including the current market situation, the expected future demand, a description of the current production process and the current GHG emissions.

For each production process breakthrough technologies were identified. Each of these alternative production methods are currently tested on pilot scale or are already offered on a commercial basis.

Per breakthrough technology a factsheet on the technology has been drawn up comprising a description of the applied technology the related GHG emissions and an estimate of investments and operational costs.

Economic assessment of breakthrough technologies

When assessing the economic feasibility of the presented break-through technologies one should bare the following in mind:

- Prices for alternatives are consequently overestimated while the prices for the conventional technologies are underestimated.
- This study focuses on the requirements within the current way of organising production. When a decentralised small scale production integrated with other functions the outcomes may be different.
- The effect of the price of basic chemicals on the price of a consumer product is typically below 1%. This implies that a product can obtain ‘Green’ branding at a very small cost impact to the end customer.



In other words the estimates of the feasibility of the presented alternatives are rather conservative.

Outcomes of inventory of breakthrough technologies

For all three processes alternatives were found allowing for reductions in GHG emissions varying between 50 and 100%. Key to green house gas reduction are the use of biomass as a raw material or alternative processes powered by renewable power.

Projected CO₂ reduction costs for 2050 are estimated to range between 28 and 70 €/tonne CO₂ eq. in 2050 (UMWE (2011) table 2-3). This seems sufficient to make all biobased options economically feasible.

We found that under some specific circumstances CO₂ can effectively be used as a chemical building block. However, before 2050 it is not realistic to view CO₂ chemistry as a significant alternative to the limited CCS storage capacity.

Importance of sustainability of applied biomass

Apart from the options mentioned in this study there are several other functions that increasingly depend on the use of sustainably grown biomass when the use of fossil fuels is phased out. Since the amount of sustainable biomass is limited this requires clear policies to prevent unsustainable land use. The latter would overshadow the positive effects biomass based alternatives may have on GHG emissions.

Policy measures to encourage the transition to a low carbon chemical industry

This study on the chemical industry and the previous study on the steel, cement and pulp, paper and print industries shows that there are breakthrough technologies available. However, the implementation requires an integrated industry and energy policy. In this policy choices have to be made in order to prevent unsustainable mechanisms.

One could think of the following instruments to realise these choices:

- The EU-ETS as a mechanism to provide a reward on GHG emission reduction. The range of reduction costs for CO₂ as projected in a number of scenario studies allows breakeven for most biobased alternatives.
- To prevent a high stress on biomass policy measures could aim to reduce use, and demand minimum sustainability standards on sourcing of biomass. In addition alternatives for biomass use like renewable power based ammonia production could be favoured over biomass intensive processes.
- To prevent lock-in effects policy makers may consider to secure access to the limited CCS storage capacity to those industries that do not have an alternative to comply with the targets for 83-87% reduction in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.




1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Recent modelling estimates of climate change show that both baseline and reference scenarios for the EU's own domestic emissions are not compatible with the 2°C trajectory (see Figure 1).

Figure 1 Short-term EU emission profile compared to 2°C compatible long-term internal reduction trajectory (PRIMES/GAINS modelling)



Source: EC, 2010.

Note: Reference scenario is 20% reduction of internal emissions in 2020.

Additional efforts will be needed in all sectors, not only in the energy sector but in industrial sectors as well. Based on a scenario study the European Commission has set post-2020 goals for the industry (EC, 2011a), see Table 1.

Table 1 Sectoral reductions in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions

GHG reductions compared to 1990	2005	2030	2050
Total	-7%	-40% to 44%	-79% to -82%
Sectors			
Power (CO ₂)	-7%	-54% to -68%	-93% to -99%
Industry (CO ₂)	-20%	-34% to -54%	-83% to -87%
Transport (incl. CO ₂ aviation excl. maritime)	+30%	+20% to -9%	-54% to -67%
Residential and services (CO ₂)	-12%	-37% to -53%	-88% to -91%
Agriculture (non-CO ₂)	-20%	-36% to -37%	-42% to -49%
Power (CO ₂)	-30%	-72% to -73%	-70% to -78%

Source: EC, 2011a.




The challenge is, therefore, to move towards a low carbon and sustainable industry.

In an earlier study by CE Delft (CE, 2010) an inventory of breakthrough technologies for reduction of GHG emissions was made for the following three industrial sectors: Iron and Steel, Cement and Pulp, Paper and Print.

Because of the relative importance of the chemical industry (cf. Figure 2) Climate Action Network Europe (CAN Europe) commissioned CE Delft to study the feasibility of the required CO₂ reduction in these chemical processes, identify breakthrough technologies in three major chemical processes, regarding CO₂/GHG efficiency and explore the feasibility of these processes. In this way CAN Europe wants to get an indication of the reduction potential of these industries. CAN Europe wants to use this study as an input to the Roadmap for moving to a competitive low carbon economy in 2050 (EC, 2011a).

Figure 2 Greenhouse gas emissions by the European industry as reported in 2007



1.2 Objective and Scope

The objective of this study is to explore breakthrough technologies in three processes in the European chemical industry that allow for significant reduction in greenhouse gas emissions for these processes in Europe.

Definition breakthrough technologies

Breakthrough technologies are, in the context of this study:

'Technologies that reduce CO₂/GHG emission by at least 25% compared to the benchmark, will be widely commercially available in 2020-2030 at the latest and are economically competitive compared to reference and alternative technologies.'

The question is whether this reduction is possible for the chemical industry within the sustainable framework described by the Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe (EC, 2011b). Resource efficient development is the route to this vision. The aim is to create more welfare using less resources, while managing these resources in a sustainable way and minimising their impacts on the environment. This will not only require highly efficient use of sources



within their maximal sustainable yields, but also preventing waste streams by reuse and recycling and restoration of ecosystems. A new wave of innovation will be required to realise all these aspects in a coherent manner.

This study focuses on the reduction of GHG emissions within the industry by using breakthrough technology. This is one aspect of the broad range that has to be taken into account, when aiming for a sustainable future.

However, this report is meant as an input to the debate on the Roadmap to a low carbon economy in 2050.

Therefore CCS and the feasibility of other large scale applications of captured CO₂ are discussed in Chapter 3, since the best available technology references (BAT refs) do not provide sufficient emission reduction to allow for a sustainable future. A lock-in of the current technology would require large scale use of CCS to reach the required emission reduction (ECOF, 2009).

In this framework we also refer to the recent special report by the German Advisory Council on the Environment on the sustainable electrification of Europe for an overview of the studies carried out on the subject (UMWE, 2011).

In addition we summarise the aspects of large scale biomass use in relation to sustainable use of these sources in relation to the presented technologies. For a more in-depth discussion on the topic of biomass use, we refer to the background report to the position paper by IEA BioEnergy: Better use of Biomass (BUBE, 2010).

1.3 Selection of chemical processes to be studied

Using the criteria mentioned below the following chemical processes were selected. The production methods of (in alphabetic order):

- ammonia;
- aromatics or so-called BTX (benzene, toluene and xylene);
- olefins (ethylene, propylene, butadiene).

1.3.1 Relevance for 2050

For this study the selected processes have to be relevant in 2050.

This does not mean that these processes are regarded as a part of a sustainable future, it only implies that we expect that in 2050 not all production of chemicals is completely abolished and that the selected processes still make up a significant part of the remaining production in 2050.

In the production of chemicals one can discriminate between final products and basic chemicals. Basic chemicals are those chemicals that are used as precursors or building blocks for other chemical components. To understand the difference one could compare basic chemicals with ingredients like milk, sugar, eggs and flour, and final products with pastry. You do not know what pastry will be eaten in 2050 but it is not a wild guess that sugar or flour will be used. Since it is hard to foresee which final products will be used in 2050, basic chemicals seem the safest choice.



Well known basic chemicals are olefins like ethylene or aromatics like benzene. APPE, Association of Petrochemical Producers in Europe, has developed a virtual tour explaining the relation between different olefins and aromatics and the many different type of plastic materials that are made of them (<http://www.petrochemistry.net/flowchart/flowchart.htm>). In 2004, basic petrochemicals accounted worldwide for more process energy use (about 3 million TJ fuels combusted) and CO₂ emissions (about 200 million tons) in total than any other type of chemical.

Another basic chemical is ammonia, which has a number of applications as such but is also widely used as a precursor for a wide variety of nitrogenous products of which the best known are fertilizer and dynamite.

Both examples show basic chemicals produced in highly energy intensive processes on the basis of fossil fuels (naphta for the petrochemicals and methane for the ammonia production). Like all other highly energy intensive industries both the petrochemical industry and the ammonia industry are facing the dual challenge of climate change and security of energy supply. Therefore, it is of interest for policymakers as well as chemical engineers to gain a greater understanding of both the potential of energy efficiency improvement and the options of using alternative primary sources like biomass for the production of these chemicals.

1.3.2 Potential for significant reduction of CO₂/GHG emissions

Ecofys and partners gave in their sector report for the chemical industry an overview of the most emission intensive activities in the chemical industry. This overview is reproduced in Table 1.

Breakthrough technologies that allow for a significant reduction of emissions related to production of the chemicals listed in this table potentially have a significant effect on the reduction of the chemical industry as a whole. Thus the products of the chemical processes to be selected have to be mentioned in Table 2.



Table 2 Ranking of the most emission intensive activities in the chemical industry

No.	Product/process ¹	Process <i>and</i> steam emissions (Mt CO ₂ equivalents)	Share	Cumulative share
1	Nitric Acid	41 ⁴	21.6%	21.6%
2	Cracker products (HVC)	35	18.4%	40.0%
3	Ammonia	30	15.8%	55.8%
4	Adipic acid	13 ⁴	6.8%	62.6%
5	Hydrogen/Syngas (incl. Methanol) ²	12.6	6.6%	69.3%
6	Soda ash	10	5.3%	74.5%
7	Aromatics (BTX)	6.6	3.5%	78.0%
8	Carbon black	4.6	2.4%	80.4%
9	Ethylene dichloride/Vinyl chloride/PVC	4	2.1%	82.5%
10	Ethylbenzene/Styrene	3.6	1.9%	84.4%
11	Ethylene oxide/Monoethylene glycol	3.6	1.9%	86.3%
12	Cumene/phenol/acetone	1.2	0.6%	86.9%
13	Glyoxal/glyoxylic acid ³	0.4 ⁴	0.2%	87.2%
14	<i>Polyolefins (PE/PP/PS)</i>	1.1	0.6%	87.7%
15	<i>Butadiene</i>	0.6	0.3%	88.1%
16	<i>Dimethyl terephthalate/Terephthalic acid/Polyethylene terephthalate</i>	0.6	0.3%	88.4%
17	<i>Propylene oxide</i>	0.5	0.3%	88.6%
18	Others		11.4%	100.0%
Total upper processes (1-18)		168.4	88.6%	
Total chemical industry ⁵		190	100.0%	

¹ In Italics, production processes with steam consumption only. Other emissions have direct emission from the process and emissions from steam consumption.

² This figure includes 3.8 Mt CO₂ from gas producers, who supply refineries. Hydrogen production in refineries accounts for 44 Mt CO₂.

³ This figure is based on the Registre Français des Emissions Polluantes (IREP), year 2005.

⁴ Carbon dioxide and nitrous oxide.

⁵ This figure includes N₂O and CO₂ emissions phrased as Mt CO₂ equivalents and is based on the greenhouse gas inventory, see Table 4 in source document.

Source: http://ec.europa.eu/clima/studies/ets/docs/bm_study_-_chemicals_en.pdf.

The cracker products or High Value Chemicals (HVC) in this overview are a mix of varying composition of olefins, aromatics and syngas (a gas mixture of hydrogen and carbon monoxide) of which the olefin ethylene is a major component (the size of production locations is expressed in tonne ethylene/year).

1.3.3 Breakthrough technologies are required to reach the climate goals

Based on absolute emission levels the processes producing nitric acid and adipic acid do classify as relevant. However, based on the existing best available technology references these emissions can be reduced with over 80%. Technology is not the bottle-neck in this situation. Therefore we expect that other processes will be more relevant to the 2050 low carbon roadmap.



1.4 Data availability

The execution of this project has been conditional on the availability and reliability of data on the evaluated technologies that are at different stages of development. Some published information on energy consumption, CO₂ emissions and costs consist of early results stemming from pilot phases whereas other technologies are already on the market and figures are less uncertain. Besides, strategic behaviour in the provision of data might play a role. Companies might have an incentive to be optimistic on CO₂ efficiency, as they want to present themselves as frontrunners. On the other hand, stakeholders might be more negative on attainable CO₂ efficiency in the sector in the light of the broader political context (for example, debates on benchmarks). The figures in this report are based on the best information available at the moment of writing.

1.5 Structure of the report

In this report, breakthrough technologies are discussed of production processes of the following three categories of chemicals:

- ammonia;
- olefins;
- aromatics.

These processes are described in the above mentioned order, using two chapters per process:

The first chapter is dedicated to the description of the current production method(s), the current emission levels CO₂ and GHG, and the benchmark for emissions suggested for the post-2012 EU ETS.

The second chapter describes alternative processes and the emission reductions possible when replacing the existing processes by the alternative processes and compares the current production costs with (expected) production costs of the alternative route.

Chapter 2 discusses the potential of capturing of CO₂ combined with storage (CCS) or use in other processes.

Biomass based chemistry appears to play a key role for all three processes. The limited availability and some indications for policymakers are discussed in Chapter 3

The last chapter is dedicated to conclusions and recommendations.



2 Carbon capture

2.1 Availability of CCS

Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) alternatively referred to as carbon capture and sequestration, is a technology to prevent large quantities of CO₂ from being released into the atmosphere from the use of fossil fuel in power generation and other industries. It is often regarded as a means of mitigating the contribution of fossil fuel emissions to global warming. The process is based on capturing carbon dioxide (CO₂) from large point sources, such as fossil fuel power plants, and storing it in such a way that it does not enter the atmosphere.

The concept of Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) still has to be proven to a certain extent.

The individual steps have all been applied in commercial activities, often for a long time¹ and partly in combination with each other. However, perpetual storage of CO₂ is new and has not been demonstrated in practice before.

There is some uncertainty if and how it can be guaranteed that CO₂ injected in deep geological gas fields and aquifers will actually stay there for thousands of years. This can only be estimated using model simulations, and the chance maximised by the application of a stringent set of storage site selection criteria and storage reservoir closure and abandonment criteria. The probability is more predictable and the criteria can more easily be met for geologically intensively explored, intrinsically gas-tight natural gas fields than for aquifers.

Criteria and protocols for reservoir behaviour modelling, injection, abandonment and monitoring are currently being developed and embedded in legislation. Initiators will have to prove that the probability of CO₂ escaping is similar to the probability of accidents at industrial facilities².

This lack of solid proof of the viability, reliability and safety of the concept has resulted in public concern and hesitation by environmental NGOs to rely on such a technology. Besides, the potential of CCS is probably not sufficient enough to reach an economy-wide reduction of 80-95% in industrial CO₂ emissions as required in the period up to 2050. The latter is due to:

- the limited capacity of sufficiently safe deep geological storage reservoirs;
- competition with the power sector to acquire storage capacity.

¹ The capture of CO₂ has been commercially applied for decades in hydrogen production, ammonia production, beer brewing, ethanol production and coal fired power plants (e.g.). Transports by pipeline, by road and by rail have been applied commercially as part of respectively CO₂ utilisation in enhanced oil recovery and use of CO₂ in for example beverage industries and horticulture. CO₂ injection has been applied commercially as part of enhanced oil recovery in numerous projects in the USA, Venezuela and Algeria.

² Both IPCC report and Australian legislation demand a probability of 20% or less that a maximum of 1% of the stored CO₂ escapes within a 1,000 year period. This is equivalent to a possibility of approximately $1 \cdot 10^{-6}$ that CO₂ escapes.



Estimations by the EU financed GESTCO and Geocapacity projects of deep geological storage capacity for CO₂ in the EU amount to a capacity of approximately 120 Gtonne CO₂: 96 Gtonne CO₂ capacity in deep saline aquifers, 20 Gtonne in oil and gas fields and 1 Gtonne in unmineable coal fields. This estimate is said to be conservative. Total EU CO₂ emissions from large point sources (>0.1 Mtonne/year) are estimated at 2 Gtonne/year, approximately 50% of which is emitted by power plants. This would imply that the storage capacity in the EU corresponds to 60 years of current annual CO₂ production from large point sources.

It should be noted, however, that these estimates are shrouded in some uncertainty as they are based on a limited amount of data. In addition, it is not possible to estimate which part of these storage sites meet the safety and geology related site selection criteria such as:

- cap rock thickness;
- physical characteristics of the cap rock (plasticity and response to pressure changes);
- chemical characteristics of the cap rock, e.g. resistance of cap rock to chemical reaction with CO₂;
- faults in or just above the cap rock.

Additionally, for gas and oil fields there is no indication concerning:

- the number of existing or abandoned wells;
- the accessibility of the wells for monitoring;
- the suitability of well casings and well plugs for long-term storage of chemically reactive and corrosive high pressure CO₂;
- use for evaluation of field suitability for storage.

As a consequence no indication can be given about the actual suitability of the identified potential reservoirs.

Finally, there is also some discussion about the attractiveness of storage in aquifers. In general, storage in depleted and abandoned gas fields seems more attractive compared to storage in aquifers (Amesco, 2007):

- Available information:
Storage in depleted gas fields can make use of a long track record of site characterisation with the main focus on the static and dynamic properties of the reservoir. It has been shown that the behaviour of the reservoir during CO₂ injection can be well predicted from the gas production history. These data and information are mostly missing for aquifers.
- Proof of containment:
The very presence of gas trapped in reservoirs for geological time periods indicates that these structures can contain CO₂ as well, provided that the sealing properties of the cap rock and bounding faults have not changed due to gas production, the cap rock entry pressure for CO₂ is not exceeded, and the sealing properties are not affected by chemical reactions with CO₂ loaded fluids. The containment of CO₂ in aquifers would have to be proven with the help of additional field and laboratory measurements.
- Reservoir conditions:
In most abandoned gas reservoirs in the Netherlands, for example, the pressure has dropped to very low levels, 30 to 50 bar, which is 100 to 300 bar below the initial reservoir pressure. This pressure window can be used for injecting CO₂ until the initial reservoir pressure is reached, preventing any negative effect on the seal, e.g. fracturing will be prevented. Injection in aquifers starts at the initial (hydrostatic) pressure and builds up pressure well above it, with potential adverse consequences for the seals.



- Reservoir properties:
In general, the porosity and permeability of gas reservoirs is higher than those of the water-saturated alternatives. This will result in a larger capacity and better injectivity for CO₂ storage than in aquifers. In gas reservoirs there is less free water than in aquifers, which will limit the corrosion of well casing and degradation of the well cement. On the other hand, the high water saturation of aquifers promotes the dissolution of CO₂ in water, making the CO₂ less mobile.

2.2 Suitability of CCS

Given the uncertainties about actual suitability of the identified reservoirs and the question whether storage in aquifers is desirable, as described in the previous paragraph, the estimated storage potential of 120 Gtonne in the EU seems optimistic.

This implies that the available capacity should be reserved for processes that currently have no alternative like the steel industry (CE, 2010).

From the point of view of both a company manager and a policy maker, a scenario in which dependence on CCS can be avoided by applying a breakthrough technology may be attractive. Even more policy makers may want to consider whether industries in which breakthrough technologies are available are entitled to use this limited storage potential.

2.3 Economics of CCS

Costs related to CCS for chemical processes are estimated to range between US\$ 50-60/tonne CO₂ (IPPC, 2005). Future forecasts on CCS are based on the following aspects influencing price:

1. The initial cost of the installation capturing the CO₂ from the flue gas. Experience with flue gas desulfurisation learns that this type of large scale end of line solutions tend to decrease with ca. 12% every time that the installed capacity doubles.
 2. The operational costs related to the required electricity use. In most situation this is 50% of the costs related to CCS.
 3. The availability of storage capacity which is limited as explained above.
- Because of the above mentioned aspects no significant decrease in the cost of CCS are expected for the period after 2020.

2.4 Commercial use of carbon dioxide instead of storage

Carbon dioxide (CO₂) is the product of two types of processes;

1. Burning fossil fuels or biomass or in more general terms: full oxidation of carbon hydrates. And
2. Fermentation like occurs during brewing of beer.



2.4.1 Direct use at the production location

Most of the commercial use of CO₂ occurs at the location where it is generated.

- About a third of the carbon dioxide produced as by-product of the hydrogen generation required for the ammonia process is used to produce ureum (a fertilizer) from ammonia.
- Carbon dioxide produced during the brewing of beer is used to carbonise the beer.
- Carbon dioxide produced in combined power heat generation units of glass houses and softdrink plants is used to respectively feed the plants and carbonise the drinks³. In the first application generating carbon dioxide is so important that these units are said to be fired up in summer for the purpose of the carbon dioxide alone.

Apart from the urea production the CO₂ is not chemically bound and therefore is known to be emitted later to the air (in case of glass houses 5% of the added CO₂ is absorbed by the plants (chemically bound) the rest will be directly emitted. The high concentrations are necessary to push the plants to take up more than under normal conditions and thus grow faster).

2.4.2 Merchants market

CO₂ is used in many consumer products that require pressurised gas because it is inexpensive and non-flammable, and because it undergoes a phase transition from gas to liquid at room temperature at an attainable pressure of approximately 60 bar (870 psi, 59 atm), allowing far more carbon dioxide to fit in a given container than otherwise would. Life jackets often contain canisters of pressured carbon dioxide for quick inflation. Aluminium capsules of CO₂ are also sold as supplies of compressed gas for airguns, paintball markers, inflating bicycle tires, and for making carbonated water and soft drinks. Rapid vaporisation of liquid carbon dioxide is used for blasting in coal mines. High concentrations of carbon dioxide can also be used to kill pests. As mentioned before, plants need CO₂ in order to grow.

The captured CO₂ commercially offered on the market is typically captured during hydrogen production by means of the Haber-Bosch process (gasification of methane) in which CO₂ is produced in high concentrations (>98%). The amount of captured CO₂ that is reused in this way is very low. This is illustrated by the case of the International Fertilizer Association. They report that the industry globally sells 2.2% of the CO₂ produced in the Haber-Bosch process to other uses (5.2 MtCO₂ globally).

This is a rather small amount when taking into account that the current emission of CO₂ for the production of ammonia, olefins and aromatics in Europe alone account for respectively 30, 35 and 6.6 Mtonnes CO₂/year.

2.4.3 Using CO₂ as a chemical building block

Use of CO₂ as a chemical building block is possible in the following ways:

1. Production of algae containing valuable proteins, amines and oils. As part of the carbon cycle known as photosynthesis, plants, algae and cyanobacteria absorb carbon dioxide, light and water to produce carbohydrate energy for themselves and oxygen as a waste product. This process requires energy (sun light) and very complex catalysts (chlorophyll) and time. Currently numerous pilot scale projects are under ways to develop means to reach the required scale.

³ An example of softdrinks carbonised by the plant CPU:
<http://www.contourglobal.com/portfolio/?id=7>.



2. Dedicated production of pure chemical components:
 - a Urea (the International Fertilizer Association reports that the industry globally utilises around 36% of the CO₂ removed. More than 90% is used for the synthesis of ammonia into urea).
 - b Polyurethanes (pilot plant on kilogram scale by Bayer in cooperation RWTH Aachen).

The limitation of using CO₂ as a basic chemical is that it is a very stable compound. Therefore, most reactions involving CO₂ are endothermic. Nature has solved this by the development of very sophisticated catalysts (chlorophyll) in order to be able to use sunlight as an energy source. Scientists are able to copy this reaction for a number of chemicals. However, in most applications the speed of reaction currently is a factor 100-10,000 too low to make production on industrial scale feasible. This means that this technology is far away from large scale application. Therefore this can not be regarded as an alternative to CCS in the period until 2050.

2.5 Conclusions

CCS is limited available and therefore should be used for those processes that do not have an alternative like the steel industry as shown in our previous report.

Policymakers may want to reconsider access to the limited storage capacity for CCS for those industries that currently have alternative options.

The use of CO₂ as a basic chemical is put forward as an alternative to the limited available storage capacity for CO₂. Elegant as this option may seem, the reuse of CO₂ is still the area of fundamental research with a limited number of applications that are or may be commercially available by 2050. There are no indications that this market will grow to such a level that it may provide an alternative to CCS.





3 Battle for biomass

3.1 Availability and demand

Based on the current production numbers for ammonia and for olefins and aromatics considerable amounts of woody biomass and/or bioethanol are required. The alternative biomass based production routes for ammonia and for olefins and aromatics discussed in this report would require respectively approximately 25-65 Mtonne/year of woody biomass and approximately 80-85 Mtonne/year of ethanol. Depending on the alternative method selected as is shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Required amounts of biomass per alternative production method assuming current production levels

Process description	Amount of woody biomass (Mtonne/year)	Amount of bioethanol (Mtonne/year)
Water electrolysis based NH ₃	0	0
Biomass gasification based NH ₃	38	0
Bioethanol based ethylene	0	34
Bioethanol based propylene	0	28
Bioethanol based aromatics (BTX)	0	21
Biogasification based aromatics (BTX)	25	0

For comparison, current consumption of woody biomass for energy in the EU amounts to 173 Mtonne/year, while demand is expected to increase to 350 Mtonne/year in 2030 as a result of EU's renewable energy policy.

In this perspective demand for woody biomass for production of ammonia seems modest compared to demand for utilisation as a renewable fuel. The amount of ethanol required for production of olefins and aromatics is of the same magnitude compared with the 2020 demand for biofuels under the RED.

However, there is raising concern for the global stress on biodiversity caused by European energy policies. For example wood pellet exports from Canadian forests to Europe have grown sharply since 2002 (Bradley, 2010). From this point of view an addition in the demand of biomass may result in unsustainable mechanisms.


3.1.1 Future forecast of demand and risk of unsustainable mechanisms

Studies on global agricultural markets clearly predict that new arable land will be required to meet future global demand for food and feed (BUBE, 2010). Although there will be increased productivity on current arable land (intensification), food and feed demand will probably grow faster, which means that mobilisation of new land is likely to occur.

In addition, the policies on heat and fuel from biomass add to the deficit in sustainably grown biomass. For bioenergy (heat) and biofuels the EU is unable to supply the required amounts. The expected deficit between sustainable supply and demand for wood is illustrated by the development of the EU wood balance, Figure 3.



Figure 3 Net balance of woody biomass (Mm³) development in the next decades



Source: EUWood, 2010. 1 Mm³ = 0.5 Mtonne.

If no additional policies are implemented to reduce demand or if targets are not adjusted, the gap between demand and availability will be filled up with imports and/or by unsustainable forest management and reserving cropland for cultivation of sugar and starch containing crops.

In both cases meeting demand will clearly result in deforestation directly due to import of unsustainably obtained wood or indirectly due to indirect land use change due to shifting of crop cultivation for food to other parts of the world.

Utilisation of woody biomass and ethanol as a raw material for the platform chemicals considered in this report will only add to the deficit, unless additional policies are adopted.

The risks mentioned above are not imaginary: current policies to stop biodiversity have failed as is reported in 2009 by the EEA, the European Commission and the Deutscher Bundestag (UMWE (2011) par. 2.2.3).

3.1.2 Future price developments of biomass

An indicative assessment of future biomass gasification based plant implies some estimates on biomass futures beyond 2020. The problem is that there is profound insecurity on biomass futures beyond 2020 or to predict what will influence these prices. This is caused by the structural uncertainty both with respect to market mechanisms (e.g. is the price for natural gas and other fuels still coupled to that of heating oil and crude?) and to the uncertainty about volumes of sustainably sourced biomass available.

Based on the thorough special report on pathways towards a 100% renewable electricity system of the German Advisory Council on the environment we can distinguish the following trends:

- The price of biomass technology is expected to decrease moderately, but at the same time the prices of energy crops and forestry fuels are expected to evolve similarly to conventional fuel price (UMWE (2011) figure 3-10).
- The rise in oil prices is structurally underestimated by the IEA (UMWE (2011) figure 3-8).

The above indicates that in general the current price ratio's are assumed.



We therefore adopted current market prices as an indication of the 2050 prices to make the assessment. If fossil fuel prices increase faster than the prices for biomass this is a conservative estimate. However, strong price rises in fossil fuel prices only occur on the long term if fossil fuels become scarce, in that case it is fair to assume a battle for biomass. In that situation biomass also will show a sharp price rise if all sourcing occurs sustainably.

3.1.3 European sugar beet based olefins and aromatics production

Sugar beet can be cultivated in almost the entire EU (IIASA, 2002) and could be combined with cereals cultivation in the conventional four crop rotation cycle as a breaking crop (see e.g. GM, 2002).

However, the required area is probably prohibitive and limitative with respect to the amount of sugar that can be produced from these crops.

Yields in the traditional sugar beet areas in the EU amount to approximately 10 tonne/year/ha of sugar. Sugar beets will probably yield another 2.5 tonne/year/ha of molasse (50% glucose) on average. These yields give - at a fermentation efficiency of 90% - a total of approximately 5 tonne/year/ha of ethanol. At such average yield, complete substitution of naphtha and other fossil fuel based feedstocks for the EU olefins and aromatics production would require an area of approximately 16 Mha's.

Given a total area of arable land for cereals and oilseeds - which is partly utilised for growing biofuels feedstocks - of approximately 70 Mha there is theoretically enough area available for inclusion of 16 Mha in a four crops rotation system of cereals with sugar beet. However, this would have the following consequences:

- no crop based bioethanol production in the EU for fuel use;
- replacement of all rape seed cultivated for biodiesel production (4.5 Mha);
- replacement of all oil seeds cultivated for edible oil production and other food and feed uses;
- all the above mentioned effects may cause deforestation or other ways of biodiversity loss due to indirect land use change.

In short, there is not enough land available in the EU for the production of biobased petrochemistry in addition to the current demands for biomass.

A first, broad analysis of available residues and cropland in the EU indicates that residues will not help us out either. Availability of crop residues that are logical as a feedstock for ethanol production seems limited. According to JEC (2007) the potential in the EU of straw that can be collected at a reasonable price amounts to approximately 230 PJ/year and can yield approximately 4 Mtonne/year of ethanol.

Based on the above one may conclude that a sustainable solution requires a combination of production of ethanol from high yield crops, use of available residues and significant decrease in demand.

3.1.4 European biomass based ammonia and aromatics production

In the case of a shift of the current ammonia production to wood-based ammonia production this results in an extra demand of 60-65 Mtonne/year for ammonia and aromatics production in the EU on a global market for industrial round wood of approximately 1,500 Mm³/year (750 Mtonne/year)⁴. This will likely mean a significant increase in pressure on this market.

⁴ See FAOSTAT database.



The European pulp industry, and panel and board industry already indicate that they see their raw materials being redirected to energy applications. This is likely to cause an increased demand for the realisation of large scale monoculture wood plantations with short rotation Eucalyptus trees on land that was previously natural land or cropland.⁵ And thus increasing the risk for deforestation caused by indirect land use change.

3.1.5 Effect of obliged use of biofuels

The transport sector has an obligation to use an increasing percentage of biofuel. The obliged use of biofuel has increased demand for bioethanol and other biomass based fuels. This has allowed for example the Brazilian sugarcane based bioethanol industry to become more sustainable, while at the same time the risk for biodiversity loss due to indirect land use change has increased, see Section 7.2.4.

The policy also seems to have inspired both the capacity increase for bioethanol production in Europe and pilot projects in which among others aromatics were produced for biofuels based on biomass. Similar trends were found for gasification of biomass. Both in the USA and the EU, the further technological development of gasification of biomass is primarily focused at production of biofuels (gasification as feed for Fischer-Tropsch process may yield biodiesel and SNG) and not on integrated gasification and ammonia production.

Since we did not find research initiatives aiming on greening the (petro-) chemical industry we expect that the current focus on biofuels is caused by the obliged addition of biofuels in fuel for cars in the EU27. Allowing for funding both by governments and private parties.

3.2 Technical and policy options to mitigate sustainability risks

In general policy options for mitigating land use change risks related to utilisation of biomass are:

- decrease in demand;
- minimal sustainability standards for the biomass sourcing;
- optimisation of the existing use of biomass;
- increasing the supply and production efficiency (within the limits of sustainable production).

Decrease in demand

Decrease in demand can be achieved by policies aiming for changes in consumption, reuse and recycling. In relation to this it is of interest to explore the potential of demand reduction in olefins by for example plastic recycle programs.

Another option to decrease demand for biomass is to focus on other energy or raw material sources for competing potential biomass applications. For wood the competing fossil fuel applications are heat and/or power generation. For these applications, the EU has still a significant unutilised potential of energy savings and renewable sources (SSREN, 2011), such as hydropower, sun, wind power and geothermal heat or even excess heat from industry.

For example in the case of low carbon ammonia production there are two potential low carbon alternatives to the conventional technology, one wood based and the other based on renewable electricity.

⁵ See e.g. <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/17098IIED.pdf> for examples.



Minimal sustainability standards for the biomass sourcing

Minimum sustainability standards on biomass sourcing. This to prevent direct deforestation and other net green house gas emission increasing activities.

Optimisation of the existing use of biomass

Utilisation of residues that are not in demand for feed, raw material applications or are not required for maintaining soil fertility and structure.

Increase the supply and production efficiency

Utilisation of crops and plants and conversion routes which yield maximum amount of energy or raw material per unit of area. Here an optimisation between high yield and environmental impact has to be found. We refer to the ongoing discussion on the road to sustainable agriculture and/or forest management within the framework of the common agriculture policy (CAP) post 2012.

3.3 Conclusions on side effects of biobased chemistry

Apart from the options mentioned in this study there are several functions that increasingly depend on the use of sustainably grown biomass when the use of fossil fuels is phased out. Since the amount of sustainable biomass is limited this requires clear policies to prevent unsustainable land use.

Policy measures could aim to reduce use, demand minimum sustainability standards on production of bioethanol, focus on the optimisation of existing biomass uses and increase the supply and production efficiency.





4 Conventional ammonia production

4.1 Current production volumes and applications

Annual ammonia production amounts to approximately 125 Mt, approximately 14 Mt/year of which are being produced within the EU (see Table 4).

Table 4 Annual ammonia production per region (figures in Mt/year)

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
EU	14	13	14	14	13
Stranded gas and associated gas	11	11	12	11	12
China	38	41	42	41	42
India	11	11	11	11	11
Indonesia	4	4	4	5	5
Russia	10	11	11	10	10
Ukraine	4	4	4	4	4
USA+Canada	12	12	13	13	12
Others	18	20	20	21	21
	122	126	131	130	130

Source: IFA website.

Globally approximately 85% (as of 2004) of ammonia is used as a raw material for fertilizers, such as urea and nitrate salts. For plants, nitrogen is an essential mineral for growth and is transformed in the plant into proteins and of enzymes. Most plants can only take up nitrogen from the soil, mostly as nitrate⁶.

Fertilizers produced from ammonia currently dominate the market for nitrogen fertilizers. However, before the nineteen twenties, nitrogen fertilizers mainly concerned natural nitrate salts, mined in Chile⁷.

Other major applications concern utilisation as a cleaning agent in households and use as a pH controlling agent in fermentation processes (e.g. brewing, wine making).

⁶ See e.g.: <http://www.efma.org/documents/file/publications/EFMANitrogenbooklet.pdf>.

⁷ See e.g. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Caliche_\(mineral\)#Chilean_Caliche](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Caliche_(mineral)#Chilean_Caliche) and http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sodium_nitrate.



4.2 Future demand

4.2.1 Factors and issues influencing future demand

As illustrated in the previous paragraph, global - and regional - demand for ammonia is strongly linked to agricultural applications, this being the main market of ammonia.

Demand by the agricultural sector will be determined by:

- type of crops cultivated;
- the area of the different cultivated crops;
- the yield aimed at (metric ton per hectare);
- agronomic practices applied in cultivation and the resulting efficiency with which nutrients are taken up by the crop.

The type of crops being cultivated and the amounts produced in turn are related to food consumption patterns - the amount of food consumed and the types of products consumed (meat, dairy, vegetables, staple food).

Current consumption patterns and agricultural practices in the EU are not yet sustainable:

- Part of the EU population suffers from overweight and cardiac diseases because of overconsumption of food compared with daily food intake requirements.
- Agricultural practices in the intensive agricultural sector in North-West Europe in the nineteen fifties to nineteen eighties relied on application of surpluses of fertilizers and manure. This resulted in a number of environmental problems such as eutrophication of surface and groundwater, reduced soil fertility and air pollution by ammonia. Agricultural practices have since been significantly improved. There is however still room for improvement in agricultural practices and nutrient application efficiencies. The agricultural sector aims to achieve these improvements and to become more sustainable. This is encouraged by the EU and national governments.

Policies on EU and national level are being developed to tackle these issues. For example:

- The Commission is developing strategies to reduce health impacts due to unhealthy diets⁸. Insurance companies are more and more taking into account live style in insurance contributions.
- The agricultural sector, research institutes and legislators are developing more sustainable agricultural practices, which will be included in the Common Agricultural Policy. Focus is on:
 - increasing the capacity of the soil to retain nutrients (and water) by increasing the carbon content of the soil. This can be achieved by leaving crop residues on the field, by growing green manure, adding organic fertilizers and by reducing tillage;
 - utilisation of more efficient agricultural practices such as only applying fertilizer in the crop rows and not indiscriminately distributing fertilizer over the entire crop field.

These developments will have a mitigating effect on demand for nitrogen fertilizer in the intensive North-West EU agricultural sector.

⁸ See e.g. http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/public_health/health_determinants_lifestyle/c11542c_nl.htm.




However, in Eastern Europe the situation is quite different. Much of the agricultural sector in this region still consists of subsistence farms with traditional agricultural practices, which have a hard time competing on an increasingly liberal market⁹.

Next to this, because of the traditional extensive agricultural practices, agriculture – and the associated limited nutrient gift – is depleting the soil of nutrients¹⁰.

In all, survivability of farming in Eastern Europe might actually require increased fertilizer use.

In general it should be kept in mind that there is a limited availability of natural fertilizers such as nitrogen capturing plants and bone meal for phosphorus. Without fertilizers the world probably could not feed 7 billion people. Crop yields attainable in Europe without fertilizers for example amount to a mere 1 metric ton of cereals instead of the 8 produced currently. On the other hand, utilisation should obviously not result in squandering of limited non-renewable resources and pollution and degradation of the environment and agricultural areas. So a sustainable balance has to be found between economically viable production and ecological sustainability.

Figure 4 Share of subsistence farms in Eastern Europe



Source: http://www.scarled.eu/fileadmin/scarled/publications/Poster_-_Lena_Fredriksson.pdf.

⁹ See e.g.: http://www.scarled.eu/fileadmin/scarled/publications/Poster_-_Lena_Fredriksson.pdf, http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/93082/2/sr_vol22.pdf.

¹⁰ See e.g. Alterra reports for EU.

Given these different mechanisms it is impossible to give an indication of the extent of this impact on actual future demand, within the scope of this project. In this study we therefore assumed a consumption level similar to current EU consumption level.

4.2.2 The European ammonia industry and European ammonia demand

As illustrated by IFA's trade map, the EU is a partly self supplying market, annually producing 14 Mtonne of ammonia. Another 3.26 Mtonne of ammonia is imported directly (1.87 Mtonne/year) or as DAP (0.1 Mtonne NH_3 eq./year) or urea (1.29 Mtonnes NH_3 eq./year).


The main challenges for the EU ammonia industry and fertilizer industry in general are linked to:

- The cost and availability of natural gas, the principal energy carrier and raw material. Natural gas is mainly imported into the EU. Prices in the EU are high compared to regions with high reserves, especially in regions with large reserves of associated gas or stranded gas.
- The obligation to reduce emissions. Regulation concerning CO_2 emissions, pollution prevention and control, and waste have been strengthened over the years.
- Competition from third country producers (Russia, North Africa, Middle East), operating under a different legislative framework.

European fertilizer production has been declining within the EU according to EFMA, mainly because of decreasing demand from agriculture, the lack of natural gas within the EU and its high price from abroad. The extra cost of ETS III are expected by EFMA to cause this long term decline to continue and to enhance imports.




Figure 5 Mineral streams from, to and inside Europe



4.3 Production process

Figure 6 Schematic representation of the ammonia production process




Source: <http://nzic.org.nz/ChemProcesses/production/1A.pdf>.



4.3.1 Applied technology


Currently, ammonia is globally produced almost exclusively via the Haber-Bosch process. The Haber-Bosch process is a catalytic process in which hydrogen reacts with nitrogen:



The process is typically operated at 15–25 MPa (150–250 bar) and between 300 and 550°C, the reactants passing over four beds of catalyst, with cooling between each pass. On each pass only about 15% conversion occurs, but any unreacted gases are recycled, so that eventually an overall conversion of 97% can be achieved.

The pressure is kept high to force the equilibrium to the ammonia side. Next to this, ammonia is removed from the equilibrium mixture of gases leaving the reaction vessel by condensing produced ammonia between each catalyst bed by cooling the gas stream. Unreacted hydrogen and nitrogen gases are then returned to the reaction vessel to undergo further reaction.

The required hydrogen is commonly produced by gasification of natural gas with steam and air:



The air also provides the nitrogen required in the Haber-Bosch reaction.

Figure 7 The Vemork power station at the Norsk H Rjukan reservoir



Source: <http://thefreeonline.wordpress.com/2011/07/04/co2-free-nh3-from-rjukan-waterfall1913/>.



As an alternative to natural gas, approximately 4% of global ammonia production is based on hydrogen produced from heavy residual oil and coal which is gasified with oxygen. An alternative for residual oil and coal could be (and has been) biomass and/or peat. In Oulu in Finland a peat and biomass based ammonia plant was operated in the nineteen eighties.

Table 5 Overview of current production facilities for ammonia in EU27

	Location	Company	Capacity (t/d)	First commissioned	Status	Feedstock
AT	Linz	AMI	1000 520	1974 1967	Rev. 1987 – 1990	NG NG
	Antwerp	BASF	1800	1991		
BE	Tertre	Kemira GrowHow	1200	1968	Rev. 1996/04	NG
	Litvinov	Chemopetrol	1150	1972		NG
EE	Kohtla-Järve	Nitrofert	500	1979		NG
FR	Grandpuits	Grande Paroisse	1150	1970		NG
	Rouen	Grande Paroisse	1150	1969	Rev.	NG
	Gonfreville	Yara	1000	1969		NG
	Pardies	Yara	450	1961		NG/Hydrogen
	Ottmarsheim	Pec Rhin-BASF	650	1967 – 1968	Rev. 1996	NG
	Ludwigshafen	BASF	1200/1360	1971/1982		NG
DE	Köln	Innovene	900	1969 – 1970	Rev.	NG
	Brunsbüttel	Yara	2000	1978	Rev. 1989	Vacuum residues
	Lutherstadt Wittenberg	SKW Piesteritz	2 x 1650	1974 – 75	Rev.	NG
	Gelsenkirchen	Ruhr Öl GmbH	1250	1973		Vacuum residues
	Thessaloniki	EKO Chemicals A.E.	400	1966/1976		Naphtha
EL	Nea Karvali	Phosphoric Fert Industry	400	1986		NG
HU	Pétfürdő	Nitrogénművek Rt.	1070	1975		NG
IT	Ferrara	Yara	1500	1977		NG
	Nera Montoro	Yara	400	1970		NG
LT	Jonava	Achema	1400	1978		NG
LV	Krievu sala	Gazprom	1770			
NL	Geleen	DSM Agro BV	1360/1360	1971/1984		NG
	Sluiskil	Yara	C: 900	1971	Rev.	NG
			D: 1500	1984		NG
			E: 1750	1987		NG
PL	Pulawy	Zakłady Azotowe Pulawy	2 x 1340	1966		NG
	Police	POLICE	2 x 750	1985		NG
	Kedzierzyn	ZAK	500	1954		NG
	Wloclawek	ANWIL	750	1972		NG
	Tarnów	ZAK	530	1964		NG
PT	Barreiro	Quimigal Adubos S.A.	900	1984	Rev. planned	Residues ^(a)
ES	Sabinanigo	Energía e Industrias Aragonesas	40	1925	Rev. 1980/95	H ₂ and N ₂ ^(b)
	Palos	Fertiberia S.A.	1130	1976	Rev. 1986/89	NG
	Puertollano	Fertiberia S.A.	600	1970	Rev. 1988/92	NG
SK	Sala Nad Vahom	Duslo	1070	1990		NG
UK	Billingham, Cleveland	TERRA Nitrogen	1150 ^(c)	1977		NG
	Sevenside	TERRA Nitrogen	2 x 400	1988		NG
	Ince, Cheshire	Kemira GrowHow	1050	1970	Rev.	NG
	Hull	Kemira GrowHow	815	1989		H ₂ and N ₂ ^(b)
NG Natural gas Rev. Revamped ^(a) visbreaker residues, vacuum residues ^(b) from other plant ^(c) name plate capacity, current ~1500						



Historically, BASF and Norsk Hydro first produced hydrogen for ammonia production by water electrolysis¹¹. The 60 MW Rjukan hydropower dam in Telemark, Norway produced ammonia via electrolysis of water for many years from 1913 producing fertilizer for much of Europe. Currently approximately 1% of global ammonium is still produced from hydrogen from electrolysis, the applied hydrogen being a by-product of the chlor-alkali process.

In Europe all kinds of processes are applied.

4.3.2 Current level of energy requirement and greenhouse gas emissions

According to EFMA (1999) a modern ammonia plant without steam export will consume:

- 22.1 GJ/tonne NH₃ for feedstock;
- 7.2-9.0 GJ/tonne NH₃ for fuel.

The associated CO₂ emission would amount to 1.2 tonne/tonne NH₃ and 0.4-0.5 tonne CO₂/tonne NH₃ respectively.

These figures concur with data mentioned in IPPC BAT REF document and Ecofys benchmark report. In accordance with this, the proposed benchmark level for emissions per tonne ammonia amounts to 1.61 tonne CO₂/tonne ammonia.

Fuel is utilised in the fired primary reformer for supplying heat required for the chemical reactions in the primary reformer. Heat of off gases of the primary reformer and heat from the exothermal reactions in the secondary reformer and ammonia synthesis is utilised for preheating natural gas feedstock and air, for desulphurisation and for generation of superheated steam. Superheated steam is utilised for driving compressors and other mechanical installations.

In less optimised plants especially fuel consumptions and associated CO₂ emissions will be higher

4.3.3 Opportunities for energy improvements and CO₂ reduction

The process itself is said to be close to its thermodynamic optimum leaving little opportunities for process improvements and savings in energy consumption¹². Potential measures mentioned in literature include:

- preheat combustion air;
- integration of a primary reformer;
- lower excess air in heater of primary reformer;
- utilisation of optimised absorbents in CO₂ capture;
- integration of a gas turbine providing combustion air to the primary reformer furnace.

Natural gas purchase costs are estimated to make up 70-90% of total production costs¹³, which implies that there is a strong autonomous drive to optimise energy consumption.

A directly implementable option that could reduce process emissions significantly is CCS of process CO₂.

¹¹ See e.g. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ammonia#Uses> and http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Haber-Bosch_process.

¹² See e.g. <http://oee.nrcan.gc.ca/industrial/technical-info/benchmarking/ammonia/results.cfm?attr=24>.

¹³ See e.g. <http://climatetechwiki.org/technology/ammonia-industry>.



The CO₂ from the process (70-75% of total emissions) is routinely captured and is frequently applied as a raw material or commodity. The International Fertilizer Association reports that the industry globally utilises around 36% of the CO₂ removed. Of this, around 33% is used for the synthesis of ammonia into urea, whilst the remaining 2.2% is sold on to other uses (5.2 Mtonne CO₂ globally), such as CO₂ use for enhanced oil recovery or soft drink carbonation¹⁴.

Preparation of captured process intrinsic CO₂ for CCS would require € 10-15 per tonne CO₂, mainly for compression to pressures required for transport and deep geological storage. Transport and storage will require an additional fee of € 5-10 per tonne CO₂. Total costs per tonne avoided CO₂ would be comparable to current and medium term trade prices in the ETS, which implies that under the right market conditions on the carbon market CCS would probably be an autonomous development.

Capture and storage of fuel related CO₂ would require installation of a post combustion capture plant and would require additional heat to be supplied by the steam cycle of the ammonia plant. Costs associated with capture of fuel associated CO₂ are estimated to amount to € 45-50 per tonne - higher than e.g. capture costs at coal fired power stations.

¹⁴ See http://www.unido.org/fileadmin/user_media/Services/Energy_and_Climate_Change/Energy_Efficiency/CCS_%20industry_%20synthesis_final.pdf.



5 Low carbon ammonia

As described in the previous chapter the energy use and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions related to the production of ammonia are mostly related to the production of the hydrogen required to make ammonia (NH₃).

As far as could be conducted from publicly available information the ammonia industry and national authorities are not focussing on development of alternatives for the conventional fossil fuel intensive hydrogen production (gasification of natural gas as the main source of hydrogen).

All alternatives mentioned in literature were discussed in desktop studies prepared by university researchers. These studies focussed on two routes:

- ammonia production based on hydrogen produced from water electrolysis;
- ammonia production based on hydrogen produced by biomass gasification.

Efforts for further development of these hydrogen production technologies within and outside the EU are discussed below.

5.1 European efforts

Hydrogen from water electrolysis

Further development of electrolyser technology is stimulated in the EU under the Fuel Cells and Hydrogen (FCH) Joint Technology Initiative with a total budget of M€ 1,000, of which M€ 500 from private investors. The program will run between 2008 and 2017. This program includes all aspects involved in utilisation of hydrogen as a fuel in transportation: production, storage and utilisation in vehicles.

Under the Seventh Framework Program (FP7) a number of smaller and more basic research projects are and have been financed. Projects currently being executed include ADEL, HYSTRUC, SusGhen and RELHY with a total budget of approximately M€ 10. Except for HYSTRUC these projects concern fundamental research projects focusing on aspects such as development of new membrane materials.

The HYSTRUC project on the other hand is aimed at 'development and testing of an innovative 30 Bar low cost, small size pressure module electrolyser (pme) in the MW power range for the cost efficient production of electrolytic hydrogen'. Apart from the aimed at scale the technology would fit the specifications of the Haber-Bosch process very well. The project is conducted by a consortium of Norwegian NORSK HYDRO, MTU Friedrichshafen GmbH from Germany and Prime Membrane Technologies NV from Flanders.

Biomass gasification

Development of biomass gasification is stimulated with widely orientated programs such as EUBIA, which focuses on different kinds of aspects (gasification technology, tar removal, syngas applications).

Most efforts in the EU are focussed on production of hydrogen based on the gasification of biomass to fuel in the form of so-called bio-SNG (synthetic natural gas). There is no specific focus on integration of biomass gasification with ammonia production.



However, as indicated in Section 5.5, integrated biomass gasification and ammonia production has already been demonstrated in Oulu, Finland in the nineteen eighties.

5.2 Non-EU efforts

Hydrogen from water electrolysis

In the USA a large program with a M\$ 250 budget is run by the Department of Energy (DOE) since 2004. As in the EU FCH program this program includes all aspects involved in utilisation of hydrogen as a fuel in transportation.

The DOE hydrogen program has developed a number of specific performance targets for production costs of hydrogen and for investment costs for electrolyzers. For large and central electrolysis plants with 20 kt/year production capacity, the targets are given in Table 6.

Table 6 Technical targets of wind powered electrolysis

Table 3.1.5. Technical Targets: Central Wind Water Electrolysis ^{a, b} (Technical targets are being reevaluated and will be updated in the next release)					
Characteristics		Units	2006 Status ^c	2012 Target	2017 Target
Hydrogen Cost (Plant Gate)		\$/gge H ₂	5.90	3.10	<2.00
Electrolyzer Capital Cost ^{b, d}		\$/gge H ₂	2.20	0.80	0.20
		\$/kW	665	350	109
Electrolyzer Energy Efficiency ^e		% (LHV)	62	69	74
Table 3.1.5.A. Central Wind Electrolysis H2A Example Cost Contributions ^{a, b} (Technical targets are being reevaluated and will be updated in the next release)					
Characteristics		Units	2006 Status ^c	2012	2017
Wind Farm ^f	Cost Contribution	\$/gge H ₂	2.50	2.10	3.00
	Capacity Factor	%	41	50	54
Electrolysis Unit	Cost Contribution ^d	\$/gge H ₂	2.20	0.80	0.20
	Capacity Factor	%	44	58	77
	Energy Efficiency ^e	% (LHV)	62	69	74
O&M	Cost Contribution	\$/ggeH ₂	1.50	0.80	0.80
By-product Electricity	Cost Contribution ^g	\$/gge H ₂	-0.30	-0.60	-2.00
	Percentage of electricity produced sold as by-product ^h	%	10	27	59
Total	Cost	\$/gge H ₂	5.90	3.10	<2.00

Source: NREL, 2010.

Total capital costs for this 20 ktonne/year plant are estimated at M\$ 60, for green field situation in the USA. Fixed operational costs are estimated at M\$ 3.3/year.

Biomass gasification

Similar to the situation in the EU, the further technological development of gasification of biomass in developed countries such as the USA is primarily focused at production of biofuels (Fischer-Tropsch products and SNG) and not on integrated gasification and ammonia production.



5.3 Breakthrough technologies selection

Based on the referred to desk top studies and on our own analysis of the historical developments in ammonia production technologies we identified two 'breakthrough' technologies, which both actually concern technologies operated historically:

- ammonia production based on hydrogen produced from water electrolysis;
- ammonia production based on hydrogen produced by biomass gasification.

The reason for selecting biomass gasification is that this route has already been demonstrated on commercial scale in Oulu, Finland. The reason for selecting ammonia production based on hydrogen from water electrolysis is a) the fact that a (small) fraction of global ammonia production is already based on hydrogen from electrolysis and b) the fact that much effort and money is put into improving water electrolysis for hydrogen production.

5.4 Water electrolysis

5.4.1 Generalised process description

For industrial ammonia synthesis a centralised electrolyser system is required, producing ten thousands tonnes per year of hydrogen. Such a plant will be constructed by combination of tens to hundreds of electrolysis cells, comparable with the situation at an aluminium smelter. Such plants have already been demonstrated (and are partly still operational) in Zimbabwe, Canada and Peru.

The electrolyser units will use process water and electricity input for electrolysis. Cooling water for cooling and potassium hydroxide (KOH, or lye) is needed for the electrolyte in the system.

When connected to the grid, the electrolyser system receives AC grid electricity which is converted via transformer and rectifier sub-systems into DC electricity for use by the electrolyser stack.

Process water is de-mineralised and softened to a specific resistance of 1 to 2 megaohm/cm in the Water Demineralizer Unit. The system requires one liter per normal cubic meter (Nm³) of hydrogen produced. This translates to roughly 1,5 tonne of water per tonne of ammonia produced.

The purity of the hydrogen gas coming off the electrolyser stack is 99.9%. Following the gas purifier, deoxidizer and dryer stages, the purity of hydrogen increases to 99.9998% (2 ppm).


Oxygen is removed from the lye in the Oxygen/Lye separator. The system modelled does not capture the oxygen gas, but capture of the high-purity oxygen gas is a possibility, allowing for oxygen to be supplied as a by-product.

The purified hydrogen will have atmospheric pressure or limited elevated pressure. For ammonia synthesis the hydrogen is compressed additionally to 150-250 bar.

The hydrogen and nitrogen produced by a standard cryogenic ASU (Air Separation Unit) will be processed by a standard ammonia synthesis process with several serially placed reactors with intercoolers and recirculation of unreacted reactants (synloop). Synloop and ASU consume approximately 390 kWh_e/tonne NH₃ for compression.




Figure 8 Flow sheet for water electrolysis based hydrogen production



Source: <http://ieahia.org/pdfs/Task25/alkaline-electrolysis.pdf>.

Alternatively, a Dutch firm, Proton Ventures claims it can supply small scale skid mounted water electrolyser based ammonia production units, which can be combined with an individual windmill or other type of decentralised renewable power source.

Figure 9 Flow sheet of skid mounted water electrolyser based ammonia production unit offered by Proton Ventures



Source: Proton Ventures, 2010.

5.4.2 Benchmark on the GHG emissions

The proposed benchmark level for emissions per tonne ammonia amounts to 1.61 tonne CO₂ eq. per tonne NH₃ for conventional ammonia production.

As described above the water electrolysis route consist of two steps:

- the production of hydrogen based on electrolysis of water using renewable power;
- the synthesis of ammonia from hydrogen and nitrogen by means of the Haber-Bosch process.

If the hydrogen is produced using renewable power, there are no GHG emissions related to the production of hydrogen.

The Haber-Bosch process is an exothermic process, which means that it generates heat, it only needs cooling and therefore it does not generate GHG emissions. Therefore the water electrolysis based ammonia production based on renewable power is a way to realise 100% reduction in GHG emissions related to ammonia production.

5.4.3 Current state of development of technology and technological development targets

As illustrated by Table 7 and Table 8, water electrolysis for hydrogen production actually already is an off the shelf commercially available technology.

However, there is still much opportunity for optimisation with respect to costs and energy efficiency:

- Current electrolyser investment costs range from € 700 to 1,300/kW (based on Lower Heating Value). The overall cost taking into account the complete installation is around 50% for a single electrolyser and decreases to ~10% for large plants (~100 electrolyser units).
- Targets mentioned for future specific investment costs amount to € 500/kW_e for the EU HYSTRUC program to € 250/kW_e as assumed in the NREL hydrogen program for a 2017 central electrolysis plant.
- The current energy efficiency is approximately 60%, targets for future improved electrolysis cells amount to 75-80%.

As indicated, several programs aim at achieving these goals at about 2020-2025 (see DOE's program).



Table 7 Overviews of commercially available technology for hydrogen production (part 1)

Manufacturer	Technology	← Operating Range Available Today →			
		System Energy Requirement (kWh/kg)	H ₂ Production Rate (kg/yr)	Power Required for Max. H ₂ Production Rate (kW)	H ₂ Product Pressure (psig)
Avalence	Unipolar Alkaline	56.4 – 60.5	320 – 3,600	2-25	Up to 10,000
Proton	PEM	62.3 – 70.1	400 - 7,900	3-63	~200
Teledyne	Bipolar Alkaline	59.0 – 67.9	2,200 - 33,000	17-240	60-115
Stuart	Bipolar Alkaline	53.4 – 54.5	2,400 - 71,000	15-360	360
Norsk Hydro	Bipolar Alkaline (high pressure)	53.4	7,900 - 47,000	48-290	~230
	Bipolar Alkaline (atmospheric)	53.4	39,000 - 380,000	240-2,300	0.3

Source: <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy04osti/36705.pdf> , Norsk Hydro is now: NEL.

Table 8 Overviews of commercially available technology for hydrogen production (part 2)

Manufacturer	Country of origin	Model	Capacity range Nm ³ /h	Pressure Bar g	Energy cons. kWh/Nm ³	Type of electrolyser
Hydrogenics	US/EU	IMET 300	1-3	25	4.2	Alkaline
		IMET 1000	4-15, 26-30, 31-45, 46-60	10 or 25	4.2	Alkaline
Teledyne	US	Titan™ HP	75,100,125,150	8-16	5.6	Alkaline
		Titan™ EC	28,33.5,42,56	4.2-8.1	5.6	Alkaline
		Titan™ HM	2.8, 5.5, 7, 8.4, 11.2	5.0	6.1 – 5.3	Alkaline
Norsk Hydro Electrolyser	N	Atm. (4000A)	0-377	0.02	4.1	Alkaline
		Atm. (5150A)	0-485	0.02	4.3	Alkaline
		HPE	10-65	12	4.8	Alkaline
IHT	CH	Lurgi system	110-760	32 atm	4.3-4.6	Alkaline
		Bamag system	3-330		3.9-4.5	Alkaline
Accagen	CH	Standard	1-100	10	4.4-6.3	Alkaline
		HP		30		
		VHP		200		
Idroenergy	IT		0.4-64	1.8-3.9	5-6	Alkaline
Proton	US	HOGEN S	0.53, 1.05	13.8	6.7(*)	PEM
		HOGEN H	2, 4, 6	15	7.3-6.6(*)	PEM

Source: http://www.empa.ch/plugin/template/empa/*/73305.

5.4.4 Indicative assessment of future centralised electrolysis plants

Based on an investment of € 250/kW_e to € 500/kW_e for the electrolyzers and associated systems and a specific power requirement of 4 kWh/Nm³ hydrogen following comparison was made between electrolysis based ammonia production and natural gas based ammonia production (see Figure 10).


For a centralised water electrolysis plant, investment costs are estimated as being one third of the investment costs of a conventional natural gas based plant of equivalent production capacity.

Investments for a natural gas based plant were adopted from several literature sources. According to Bartels (2008) investment costs for the ammonia synloop amount to approximately one third of total plant costs.



Investment costs for a water electrolysis based plant were estimated on the basis of assumed electrolyser cell costs and synloop costs for a conventional ammonia plant. The estimated investment costs concern a broad estimate, in accordance with the depth of the commissioned study.

Figure 10 Comparison of fuel/power consumption and CAPEX/OPEX for conventional and water electrolysis based ammonia production for a 2,000 tpd ammonia plant at 95% availability




Source: CE Delft, own calculations.

Depreciation costs and OPEX were estimated at 12 and 4% of investments respectively.

Total specific production costs per tonne of ammonia were estimated based on estimated power production costs for hydropower and wind power in 2050 given in the recent SRREN report and by EWEA.

Figure 11 Specific production costs for water electrolysis based ammonia in 2050



Source: CE Delft, own calculations.



Production costs for natural gas based ammonia are given as a range, representing production costs for low and high investments and for a future natural gas price ranging between € 3 and 6 per GJ natural gas (see PWC, 2009). This is lower than the current natural gas price of € 6 -8/GJ and excluding a possible future European energy tax.

Even at the low future estimate of natural gas of € 6/GJ, cheap hydropower can compete on price with conventional ammonia production provided that the decrease in capital costs as mentioned above is realised.

In all other cases the power availability is too low for a commercially operated ammonia plant and there is a surcharge for the production of ammonia varying between € 0-175/tonne NH₃ in case of hydropower based production and € 350-500/tonne NH₃ in case of wind-power based production (CO₂ prices of respectively € 0-100 and >€ 200/tonne CO₂).

In addition the fully commercially operated ammonia plant assumed in the assessment requires a power availability of 95%. The system supplying the required power will have to be significant in size: approximately 700 MW_e. Both minima for hydropower and wind power refer to power generation with an insufficient high availability, 60% for hydropower and 50% for wind energy.

Such cheap and large renewable power resources with very high availability are scarce although they exist on Iceland¹⁵, where cheap hydropower (€ct 2-3/kWh) could be harnessed.

An alternative to Iceland would be an integrated network with renewables that guarantees the high availability of sustainable power. However such high availability comes with a higher price, see Figure 11.

5.4.5 Limitations of this study

This assessment described above depends heavily on reliable future estimates for both the prices of both natural gas and renewable power. Based on the thorough special report on pathways towards a 100% renewable electricity system of the German Advisory Council on the environment, we can distinguish the following trends:

- The rise in oil prices is structurally underestimated by the IEA (UMWE (2011) figure 3-8). This may be true for the gas price either.
- The growth of the renewable power is structurally underestimated in studies by IEA and the European Commission (UMWE (2011) figure 3-4 and 3-5).

This indicates that our estimate of the feasibility of water electrolysis based ammonia production is likely to be conservative.

In addition this study focuses on the requirements within the current way of organising ammonia production. When decentralised small scale production of ammonia is considered the outcome may be different since at one hand one can benefit of peak-shaving tariffs for wind power. At the other hand limited use of production capacity due to limited availability of renewable power causes higher operational costs of the ammonia production plant since the capital costs of the installation have to be compensated by a considerably smaller production. Nevertheless, it may be interesting to look further into the combination of off-peak wind power and ammonia production.

¹⁵ See http://www.icelandexport.is/english/industry_sectors_in_iceland/energy_in_iceland/.



5.4.6 Conclusions on water electrolysis based ammonia

Ammonia production based on water electrolysis driven by renewable power sources is a proven technology to produce ammonia without causing GHG emissions.

Currently the production process is relatively capital intensive but given the research programs to decrease the capital intensity, it is fair to assume that by 2020 the capital costs involved with the production of ammonia are equal for a modern version of a conventional ammonia plant and a water electrolysis based ammonia plant.

This comparison excludes operational costs for the use of respectively natural gas and sustainably produced electric power. Only when cheap electric power is available (€ct 2-3/kWh) in abundance (700 MW_e) the price difference may be negligible.

Currently this situation exists on Iceland. In the future integrated network with renewables that guarantee the high availability of sustainable power may provide a solution.

This study focuses on the requirements within the current way of organising ammonia production. It may be interesting to look further into the combination of off-peak wind power and ammonia production.


5.5 Biomass gasification and ammonia production from syngas

5.5.1 The production process

Biomass based ammonia production will consist of two largely separate steps:

- biomass gasification with oxygen and steam and subsequent production of hydrogen from the produced syngas;
- ammonia production with the Haber-Bosch process from hydrogen and nitrogen.

Figure 12 Oulu Kemira plant lay out



Source: CE, 2008.



Industrial scale biomass and peat gasification and associated ammonia production has already been proved technically feasible in the late eighties at the Kemira Oulu ammonia production plant in Finland. The gasification technology concerned a pressurised bubbling fluidised bed with oxygen and steam as oxidising reactants. The plant was shut down after cheap Russian natural gas became available at the Finnish market. A second large (>100 MW_{th}) unit was realised in Berrenrath, Germany and produced syngas for commercial methanol production.

The applied HT Winkler gasification technology is still available and is owned by the German firm Krupp-UHDE. A 250 MW_{th} gasification plant is planned to be realised in the Värmland province in Sweden.

GTI is another technology supplier and can supply pressurised bubbling fluidised bed gasifiers of several tens of MW's. It's largest plant is the Skyde CHP plant in Denmark.


As indicated by both examples the technology has been available on a commercial scale.

A biomass gasification system with associated ammonia plant would include:

- a high temperature syngas cleaning (ceramic filter, sulphur and halogens absorbents);
- a reformer for conversion of the methane present in the product gas;
- a shift reactor for production of additional hydrogen production by conversion of CO into CO₂ by a reaction with steam;
- a high pressure membrane for hydrogen isolation;
- waste heat recovery heat exchangers for high pressure steam generation;
- an air separation plant for providing oxygen to the gasifier and nitrogen to the Haber-Bosch process;
- a gas turbine power island for generation of required power.

Given the size of gasifiers that have been operational, a 2,000 tonne per day world scale ammonia plant would probably require two 400 MW_{th} gasifiers.

Figure 13 HT Winkler gasifier at Berrenrath



Source: CE, 2008.



According to literature the total gasification-ammonia synthesis process will have a net energy efficiency of approximately 60% (compared with 65-70% for a new natural gas based plant) and will require 2.7 metric tonne of biomass per tonne of ammonia. At the current annual ammonia production in Europe of 14 Mtonne this would require 38 Mtonne of biomass. For gasification clean wood is the preferred fuel/feedstock.

5.5.2 Benchmark on the GHG emissions

The proposed benchmark level for emissions per tonne ammonia amounts to 1.61 tonne CO₂ eq. per tonne NH₃ for conventional ammonia production.

As described above the water electrolysis route consist of two steps:

- the production of hydrogen based on electrolysis of water using renewable power;
- the synthesis of ammonia from hydrogen and nitrogen by means of the Haber-Bosch process.

If the hydrogen is produced by gasification of clean sustainable sourced biomass, there are no GHG emissions related to the production of hydrogen. The Haber-Bosch process is an exothermic process, which means that it generates heat, it only needs cooling and therefore it does not generate GHG emissions. Therefore the biomass gasification based ammonia production is a way to realise 100% reduction in GHG emissions.

5.5.3 Indicative assessment of future biomass gasification based plants

As described in Section 3.1.2 on the development of the price of biomass in relation to fossil fuel prices the actual price development is very insecure. However, in most studies the price of biomass technology is expected to decrease moderately, but at the same time the price of energy crops and forestry fuels are expected to evolve similarly to conventional fuel price (UMWE (2011) figure 3-10).

The above indicates that in general the current price ratio's are assumed.

We therefore adopted current market prices as an indication of the 2050 prices to make the assessment. If fossil fuel prices increase faster than the prices for biomass this is a conservative estimate. However, strong price rises in fossil fuel prices only occur on the long term if fossil fuels become scarce, in that case it is fair to assume a battle for biomass. In that situation biomass also will show a sharp price rise if all sourcing occurs sustainable.

Figure 14 Comparison of fuel/power consumption and CAPEX/OPEX for conventional and biomass based ammonia production for a 2,000 tpd ammonia plant at 95% availability

Capital costs (M€)			Capital costs (M€)		
	min	max		low	high
- gasifier + syngas treatment	500	610			
- NH ₃ synloop	98	140			
- ASU					
	598	750		295	421
		670			360
Annual costs, M€			Annual costs M€		
	min	max			
Depreciation	72	90	Depreciation	35	51
O&M	24	30	O&M	12	17

Source: CE Delft, own calculations.



The capital costs related to the production of ammonia are estimated as follows. For a 2,000 tonne per day of ammonia sized plant, investment costs for gasifiers and syngas treatment are estimated to amount to M€ 500-610¹⁶, double that of a world scale natural gas based plant of the same production capacity.

This makes that the annual costs for depreciation, operation and management are double as high in a biomass gasification based ammonia plant than in a conventional ammonia plant.


In addition there are the raw material based costs.

Taking into account biomass costs of € 4.5-7.5 per GJ for clean wood total production costs are estimated at € 300-400 per Mtonne NH₃.

A price of € 4.5 per GJ is representative for market prices for EU domestic wood chips and for **production costs** for pellets imported from Brazil.

A € 7.5/GJ fee is representative for current market prices for pellets imported from North America.

Figure 15 Specific production costs for biomass based ammonia



Source: CE, own calculations.

The current price for natural gas varies between € 6-8/GJ. Therefore we used the average value of € 7/GJ in our calculations.

Based on these assumptions the production of ammonia based on biomass gasification has a surcharge of € 50-150/tonne NH₃ depending on the price of the biomass.

At a benchmark emission of 1.6 tonnes of CO₂ eq./tonne this requires a CO₂ price varying between € 31-93/tonne of CO₂ eq. to reach breakeven. This implies that even when competing with the very advanced ammonia plants that meet the benchmark emission of 1.6 tonnes of CO₂ eq./tonne of NH₃ produced the breakeven point may be at a CO₂ eq. price of € 31/tonne. This may be feasible if the gasification plant is integrated with other wood based industries.

¹⁶ See Hamelick (2004), BAL-fuel (1997), Rollins (2002).



5.5.4 Potential bottlenecks

As described in the chapter on the battle of biomass we already described that when sourcing biomass one should be aware of biodiversity loss due to indirect land use, see Section 3.1.1.


We assume that biomass may be considered carbon natural if it is derived from sustainably managed forests as the amount of biomass harvested from sustainably managed forests is smaller or equal to regrowth.

However, reports such as 'The upfront carbon debt of biomass' suggest that looking from a different perspective - the individual tree at a certain location - it takes decades for biomass from an elder tree to become carbon natural.

5.6 Conclusions on ammonia

The main characteristics and scores of the different technologies discussed in this chapter are summarised in Figure 16 and Table 9.

Figure 16 Schematic overview of what options there are to lower the carbon footprint of an ammonia plant compared to the reference



Source: CE Delft, own calculations.

Table 9 Overview of environmental and economic aspects for different types of ammonia production

	Current EU: average ammonia plant	New EU: new plant BAT REF	new plant BAT REF + CCS	Water electrolysis		Biomass gasification
				Cheap hydropower 2-4 €/kWh	Wind power 6-7.5 €/kWh	
Production capacity (ktonne/y)	200-700	500-1,000	500-1,000	694	694	694
Environmental aspects						
Fossil and biomass fuel and feedstock consumption	100% 36 GJ/tonne NH ₃	80%	20%	0	0	0
Electricity consumption (kWh/tonne- NH ₃)	0	0	0		8.620	0
CO ₂ emission (tonne/tonne NH ₃)	2,1	1,6 -22%	0,4 -81%	0 -100%	0 -100%	0 -100%
Economic aspects						
CAPEX (greenfield, M€)	Not relevant	360 ¹⁷	400	280-490	500-610	
OPEX (incl. energy, excl. depreciation costs)	100%	80%	90%	80-150%	250-350%	150-200%

Source: CE Delft, own calculations.

Table 9 and Figure 16 show that both biomass gasification and wind powered electrolysis based ammonia production have the potential to produce ammonia on a large scale without emission of GHG.

At a carbon price of € 30/tonne CO₂ eq. the breakeven point of ammonia production based on low cost biomass is reached. In this case the source of biomass necessarily is a rest stream of other wood based industries. Biomass from other sources may from a sustainability point of view be less attractive because of alleged ILUC aspects, see Section 3.1.1

The capital costs related to large scale electrolysis based ammonia production are expected to be enough decreased by 2020 to be a viable alternative, without other sustainability issues related to it. However, the high availability of low cost sustainably produced electricity may remain a bottleneck.

Nevertheless, Iceland offers the required availability of cheap renewable energy. Given the low energy prices the production of ammonia on Iceland based on water electrolysis may prove even cheaper than conventional ammonia production.

¹⁷ For a 700 ktonne/year plant.



6 Conventional olefins production

6.1 Introduction to the sector and market


Current production volumes and applications

Olefins are basic chemical compounds, such as ethylene (C_2H_4), propylene (C_3H_6) and various butylene (C_4H_8) isomers. These chemicals are used as a building block in a broad range of plastic materials.

Ethylene is the most important basic petrochemical for making plastics ethylene oxides and other chemicals, in 2006 one third of the basic petrochemicals produced worldwide was ethylene. Propylene was the second most produced basic petrochemical. The Western European production of ethylene and propylene varied between 2006 and 2010 around the 20.3 +/- 1.5 million tonnes of ethylene per year and around the 15 +/- 0.5 million tonnes of propylene¹⁸. Over the last five years the productions capacity in Western Europe of these basic chemicals seems to have stabilised.

Significant expansion of capacity is reported to be under construction in India and China.

Figure 17 Chemical formula's of respectively ethylene (C_2H_4), propylene (C_3H_6) and 1-butylene (C_4H_8)



6.2 Production process

Most of the olefins and a considerable part of the aromatics in Europe are produced by steam cracking of naphtha (73%), gasoil (10%) and gaseous feedstock (17%) like LPG (butane and propane) and ethane.

Steam-cracking of naphtha¹⁹

Steam cracking of naphtha is a petrochemical process in which naphtha is broken down into olefins and aromatics.

During the steam cracking the naphtha is diluted with steam and briefly heated in a furnace without the presence of oxygen. Typically, the reaction temperature is very high, at around 850°C, but the reaction is only allowed to take place very briefly. In modern cracking furnaces, the residence time is reduced to milliseconds to improve yield, resulting in gas velocities faster than the speed of sound. After the cracking temperature has been reached, the gas

¹⁸ APPE site(3 Oct 2011), <http://www.petrochemistry.net/capacity-and-production-propylene-and-derivatives.html>. These numbers are the production numbers of pure ethylene and propylene, all derivatives are excluded.

¹⁹ Sources: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Steam_cracking#Steam_cracking and 'Petrochemicals from oil, natural gas, coal and biomass: energy use, economics and innovation' PhD thesis by Tao Ren, Utrecht University, The Netherlands, 2009.



is quickly quenched to stop the reaction in a transfer line heat exchanger or inside a quenching header using quench oil.

The products produced in the reaction depend on the composition of the feed, the hydrocarbon to steam ratio and on the cracking temperature and furnace residence time.

Light naphtha gives product streams rich in olefins such as ethylene, propylene and butadiene. Full range and heavy naphtha feeds give some of these, but also give products rich in aromatics like benzene, toluene and xylene. The higher cracking temperature (also referred to as severity) favours the production of ethylene and benzene, whereas lower severity produces higher amounts of propylene, C4-hydrocarbons and liquid products. The process also results in the slow deposition of coke, a form of carbon, on the reactor walls. This degrades the efficiency of the reactor, so reaction conditions are designed to minimise this. Nonetheless, a steam cracking furnace can usually only run for a few months at a time between decokings. Decokes require the furnace to be isolated from the process and then a flow of steam or a steam/air mixture is passed through the furnace coils. This converts the hard solid carbon layer to carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide. Once this reaction is complete, the furnace can be returned to service.

Naphtha

Naphtha is currently obtained in oil refineries as one of the intermediate products from the distillation of crude oil. It is an intermediate between the lighter gasoline and the heavier kerosene. In the world market, several types of naphtha are being traded. The kinds of naphtha that are being used in steam cracking are:

- Light naphtha, also called paraffinic naphtha (in the range C_5H_{12} - C_6H_{14}) is a by-product of oil refinery. A small amount of light naphtha also comes from natural gas condensates in oil and natural gas fields. Steam cracking of light naphtha leads to a high yield of light olefins. Naphtha made from Fischer-Tropsch (FT) processes, or FT naphtha, is also a light naphtha that leads to an higher ethylene yield than regular light naphtha.
- Full range naphtha: This is a mixture of light and heavy naphtha (in the range of C_5H_{12} - C_9H_{20}). It is the most common type of naphtha used in steam cracking.

6.3 Current level of energy requirement and greenhouse gas emissions

The combined process and steam emissions related to this process are estimated to add up to 35 Mtonne of CO₂ equivalents, accounting for about 18% of the total GHG emissions from the chemical industry in the EU²⁰. This is partly explained by the high amounts of olefins produced, partly by the significant energy use related to steam cracking.

Opportunities for energy improvements and GHG emission reduction

According to the report of Ecofys and others the benchmark should be put between 0.5 and 0.7 tonne CO₂ eq./tonne product (mix of olefins and aromatics but primarily ethylene).

²⁰ Methodology for the free allocation of emission allowances in the EU ETS post-2012; report ordered by the European Commission and carried out by Ecofys and partners.



Tao Ren and others²¹ compared the energy use in conventional steam cracking with more innovative olefin technologies to get an indication for the room for energy efficiency increase. The main findings were:

- State-of-the-art naphtha steam cracking technologies can lead to savings of about 20% compared to the current world average energy use in steam cracking (0.84 tonne CO₂/tonne olefins²²).
- Catalytic olefin technologies as an alternative processes utilising naphtha, can lead to savings of 10-20% compared to the energy use in state-of-the-art naphtha steam cracking technologies.
- Advanced naphtha steam cracking technologies in the pyrolysis section, such as advanced coil and furnace materials, can together lead to savings of up to about 20% compared to the energy use in state-of-the-art naphtha steam cracking technologies (0.67 tonne CO₂/tonne olefins. Together with the potential improvements in the compression and separation sections, savings of up to 30% are possible compared to the energy use in state-of-the-art naphtha steam cracking technologies (0.59 tonne CO₂/tonne olefins.

The state of the art naphtha steam cracking is already been applied and alternative and advanced processes are already been applied to a certain extend or are being offered for commercialisation and can be widely used in the coming decades.

21 Ren T, Patel M, Blok K. 'Olefins from conventional and heavy feedstocks: Energy use in steam cracking and alternative processes' *Energy*, 2006;31(4): 425-451.

22 63% ethylene and 27% propene.






7 Low carbon olefins

7.1 Bioethanol as the key to low carbon olefins

When looking for breakthrough technologies to produce olefins, ethanol appears to be the key. Ethylene is easily made from ethanol and from ethylene all other olefins can be derived. Therefore below the production of ethylene from ethanol is discussed followed with additional information on the conversion of ethylene to propylene and butylene.

Figure 18 Chemical formula of ethanol




7.2 Ethylene from bioethanol

Sugarcane and sugar beets are the most efficient producers of bioethanol with a crop yield of $>5 \text{ m}^3/\text{ha}$. Most experience is based on Brazilian sugarcane. This because of the long standing Brazilian policy to produce bioethanol based on sugarcane to decrease dependency on foreign oil. Large scale bioethanol production on the basis of European grown sugar beets is possible for the same market price.

7.2.1 Status of the technology

Dehydration of bioethanol is a commercially offered technology (see Table 10).

Figure 19 Overview of bioethylene from ethanol initiatives



Source: Accenture, 2009.



The technology was applied for commercial production of ethylene in the 1950s and 1960s, but was in most parts of the world abandoned when cheaper naphtha based ethylene became available. With the desire of substituting fossil fuels, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and creating a green image, there is renewed interest in this technology. A number of initiatives is already operational or has been announced (see Figure 19).

Many initiatives are being developed by local authorities to increase capacity. for example in the Rotterdam area the Rotterdam Climate Initiative is aiming at realisation of a 500 ktonnes/year bioethylene plant and injection of the produced bioethylene in the regional ARG ethylene pipeline network. An advice to the national government recommends support for this initiative.

7.2.2 Benchmark on CO₂ and GHG emissions

According to the report of Ecofys (2009) the benchmark should be put between 0.5 and 0.7 tonne CO₂ eq./tonne product (mix of olefins and aromatics but primarily ethylene). Tao Ren and others²³ mentioned emissions of 0.59-0.67 tonne CO₂ eq./tonne product for advanced ethylene production methods (20-30% more energy efficient than the current state of the art methods).

7.2.3 Achievable reduction in energy consumption and GHG emissions

When producing ethylene from bioethanol the energy consumption related to the production of ethylene is 1 GJ/ton. When assuming that the required energy was supplied by natural gas the related GHG emissions are 0.057 tonne CO₂ eq./tonne product. This is a reduction of 90% in GHG emissions compared to the benchmark of 0.5 tonne CO₂ eq./tonne product mentioned by Ecofys.

Since GHG are a global problem one should not only compare the production steps in the European industry but also take into account the energy content of the raw materials to account for their production too.

Carbon footprint of naphtha based ethylene

Therefore we compare carbon footprints. According to Ecoinvent the carbon footprint and energy demand of the European fossil fuel based ethylene production amounts to 4.6 tonne CO₂ eq./tonne and 69 GJ/ton, of which 9.9 GJ/tonne are related to the production of ethylene and can be lowered by maximally 50%. The carbon footprint related to naphtha is 3.12 tonne CO₂ eq./tonne (JEC, 2007)²⁴.

This means that the benchmark footprint and energy use for European fossil fuel based ethylene amounts to 3.9 tonne CO₂ eq./tonne and 64 GJ/ton.

Carbon footprint of bioethanol based ethylene

The estimation of the carbon footprint and the energy demand are based on the assumption that ethylene will be produced from imported Brazilian ethanol.

According to the RED²⁵ and associated information from JEC (2007) and the Biograce GHG calculation tool, sugarcane based ethanol has a carbon footprint

23 Ren T, Patel M, Blok K. 'Olefins from conventional and heavy feedstocks: Energy use in steam cracking and alternative processes' Energy, 2006;31(4): 425-451.

24 JEC, 2007 (http://ies.jrc.ec.europa.eu/uploads/media/WTT_App_1_010307.pdf) says the carbon content of naphtha is 85%, equivalent with 3.12 tonne CO₂ eq./ton. According to list of GHG emission factors used by the Dutch government (<http://www.broeikasgassen.nl/docs/Nederlandse%20lijst%20energiedragerlijst%20publicatieversie.pdf>) the emission factor of naphtha equals 3.225 tonne CO₂ eq./tonne naphtha.

25 Renewable Energy Directive.



of 0.65 tonne CO₂ eq./tonne and has an energy demand of 28 GJ/ton, of which 27 biobased. Production of bioethylene from ethanol requires an additional 1 GJ/tonne of sugarcane (Ren, 2009) and will proceed with an efficiency of approximately 97%. The total carbon footprint and energy demand amount to respectively 1.22 tonne CO₂ eq./tonne and 49.7 GJ/ton, of which 5 GJ is of fossil origin.

Achievable reduction


This means that a shift to bioethanol would allow for a reduction of 80-90% in GHG emissions compared to the current state of the art and a reduction of 69% compared to the most advanced naphtha cracking options mentioned in Section 6.3.

This reduction can increase even more since the production of ethanol from sugarcane shows significant potential for improvement according to studies by Macedo et al. (2004)²⁶ and Oliveira (2005)²⁷.

7.2.4 Production of bioethanol from sugarcane²⁸

Most of the industrial processing of sugarcane in Brazil is done through an integrated production chain, allowing sugar production, industrial ethanol processing, and electricity generation from by-products. The typical steps for the production of ethylene from sugarcane include milling and refining, fermentation and distillation to produce ethanol, see Figure 20.

Figure 20 Schematic representation of the production process from sugarcane to ethanol



Milling and Refining

Once harvested, sugarcane is usually transported to the plant by semi-trailer trucks. After quality control sugarcane is washed, chopped and shredded by revolving knives. The feedstock is fed to and extracted by a set of mill combinations to collect a juice, called garapa in Brazil, that contain 10-15% sucrose and bagasse, the fiber residue. The main objective of the milling

²⁶ Macedo, I. d. C., M. R. L. V. Leal and J. E. A. R. Da Silva: 2004, Assessment of greenhouse gas emissions in the production and use of fuel ethanol in Brazil. Accessible via: Secretariat of the Environment of the State of São Paulo, Brazil.

²⁷ Dias de Oliveira, M.E., Vaughan, B. E., Rykiel, E. J. 2005. 'Ethanol as fuel: Energy, carbon dioxide balances, and ecological footprint.' BioScience 55(7): 593-602.

²⁸ Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biofuel_in_Brazil.



process is to extract the largest possible amount of sucrose from the cane, and a secondary but important objective is the production of bagasse with a low moisture content as boiler fuel, as bagasse is burned for electricity generation (see below), allowing the plant to be self-sufficient in energy and to generate electricity for the local power grid. The cane juice or garapa is then filtered and treated by chemicals and pasteurised. Before evaporation, the juice is filtered once again, producing vinasse, a fluid rich in organic compounds. The syrup resulting from evaporation is then precipitated by crystallisation producing a mixture of clear crystals surrounded by molasses. A centrifuge is used to separate the sugar from molasses, and the crystals are washed by addition of steam, after which the crystals are dried by an airflow. Upon cooling, sugar crystallises out of the syrup. From this point, the sugar refining process continues to produce different grades of sugar, and the molasses continue a separate process to produce ethanol.


Fermentation and distillation

The resulting molasses are treated to become a sterilised molasse free of impurities, ready to be fermented. In the fermentation process sugars are transformed into ethanol by addition of yeast. Fermentation time varies from four to twelve hours resulting in an alcohol content of 7-10% by total volume (°GL), called fermented wine. The yeast is recovered from this wine through a centrifuge. Making use of the different boiling points the alcohol in the fermented wine is separated from the main resting solid components. Fractional distillation can concentrate ethanol to 95.6% by weight (89.5 mole%). The mixture of 95.6% ethanol and 4.4% water (percentage by weight) is an azeotrope with a boiling point of 78.2 °C, and cannot be further purified by distillation. Because of the difficulty of further purification, 95% ethanol/5% water is a fairly common solvent.

7.2.5 Production of ethylene from ethanol

Dehydration of bioethanol to ethylene

Ethanol is catalytically dehydrated to produce ethylene according to the following chemical reaction.



The reaction is endothermic. Also the reaction is reversible with the equilibrium being favoured by higher temperatures (>375°C at a pressure 3,5 bar) and hindered by higher pressures and water vapour in the feed. As recovery of unconverted ethanol for recycle is energy and capital intensive, reaction conditions enabling >99% conversion of ethanol are usually preferred. The selectivity for ethylene varies with the type of process applied between 94-98% in commercial installations, see Table 10.

Table 10 Ethanol dehydrogenation technology suppliers

Technology supplier and process	Type of proces	Ethylene yield	Status
Lummus fixed bed process	Isothermal	94%	Commercial
Lummus fluidised bed process	Isothermal	99%	Pilot plant
Halcon/SD fixed bed process	Isothermal	96%	Commercial
NIKKI/JGC process	Isothermal	97%	Pilot plant
Petrobras process	Adiabatic	98%	Commercial



A typical selectivity breakdown at >99% conversion is shown in Table 11.

Table 11 Conversion selectivity for chemicals during a >99% conversion of ethanol by dehydrogenation

Ethanol selectivity	%
Ethylene	96.80
Ethane	0.50
Propylene	0.06
Butylenes	2.40
Acetaldehyde	0.20

Minor amounts of methane, carbon monoxide and dioxide, ethyl ethers and hydrogen are also formed.


Raw material requirements and specifications

Table 12 Raw material specifications

Raw material specifications	
Ethanol (typical composition)	Ethanol 95% vol
Acetaldehyde	100 ppm wt
Fusel oil	100 mg/l
Acids	10 mg/l
Methanol	0.3 vol%
Sulphur compounds (as S)	0.5 ppm wt
Catalyst	Alumina or Silveroxide catalysts

Process flow sheets

Figure 21 Flow sheet of the conversion of ethanol to ethylene by dehydrogenation




Source: Chematur brochure: Ethylene from Ethanol



The plants can be designed for crude, intermediate and polymer grade ethylene depending on the product application. The flow sheets in Figure 21 and Figure 22 show a typical polymer grade application. The process train for intermediate grade ethylene will be the same except that the caustic wash column and the stripper will be deleted. Crude grade ethylene is taken out after the quench column.

Figure 22 Flow sheet of the additional columns required for high purity polymerisation grade ethylene



Source: Chematur brochure: Ethylene from Ethanol.

There are no regeneration facilities for the catalyst included in the plant design, since these are considered obsolete because of the expected long life time of the catalyst.

7.2.6 (Estimated) investments and operational costs

A broad estimation of production costs and profitability

According to an economic feasibility study commissioned by Deltalinques and the Rotterdam Climate Initiative bioethylene could be produced in the Rotterdam area at prices that range from 20-50% above that of fossil based ethylene: approximately € 200-500 per tonne higher than the price of conventional ethylene - assuming a crude price of US\$ 90/barrel.


The analysis refers to imported Brazilian ethanol with current import taxation. Given the considered amount of ethanol, the authors concluded that currently import of Brazilian ethanol was the only realistic option.

The authors of the Accenture study (2009) used conservative basic assumptions. For example, for the selectivity for dehydrogenation of ethanol a value of 91% was considered, while suppliers of commercial technology indicate that the selectivity of modern processes ranges between 94-99%.



Therefore we made our own calculation for an imaginary plant of 500 ktonne/year in the Rotterdam area, as is illustrated in Figure 24.

Figure 23 Premium on price of bioethylene over conventional ethylene as a function of crude price



Source: Accenture, 2009.

As described in Section 3.1.2 on the development of the price of biomass in relation to fossil fuel prices the actual price development is very insecure. However, in most studies the price of biomass technology is expected to decrease moderately, but at the same time the prices of energy crops and forestry fuels are expected to evolve similarly to conventional fuel price (UMWE (2011) figure 3-10).

The above indicates that in general the current price ratio's are assumed

This is in line with our analysis that for projections of the post 2020 prices for biomass in general current price ratio's with fossil based fuels are assumed. We therefore adopted current market prices as an indication of the 2050 prices to make the assessment. If fossil fuel prices increase faster than the prices for biomass this is a conservative estimate. However, strong price rises in fossil fuel prices only occur on the long term if fossil fuels become scarce, in that case it is fair to assume a battle for biomass. In that situation biomass also will show a sharp price rise if all sourcing occurs sustainable.


The ethanol requirement is determined by the stoichiometrical relation resulting from the reaction equation describing the conversion of ethanol to ethylene and the selectivity of the conversion to ethylene. Investments related to a plant with a production capacity of 500 ktonne/year are reported to be € 200 million (Accenture, 2009).

The operational costs exclusive the ethanol and import duties, i.e. the CAPEX and OPEX follow from the investment of € 200 million, respectively 12 and 4%.



The operational costs related to the ethanol are 170% of the ethanol price, since you need 170 tonne ethanol per tonne ethylene produced. The same logic applies to the operational costs caused by import duties. The current bioethanol prices are significant higher than the production costs in Brazil. If one only had to pay the production costs of ethanol the price would be 509 €/tonne bioethanol instead of 925 €/tonne.

Figure 24 Calculation of bioethylene production costs



Source: CE, own calculations, in this figure ton implies metric ton = tonne.

For the following reasons we decided to work with the bioethanol price exclusive import duties:

1. In Europe production costs of bioethanol based on sugar beet are currently about 500 €/tonne (FAO, 2008). Large scale production of bioethanol is emerging in the European Union, predominately in France.
2. Import duties are put in place to protect the European market this is no longer necessary at the current price levels.

Feasibility surcharge bioethylene


At a price for bioethanol of 545 €/tonne bioethylene has a surcharge of € 54/tonne ethylene compared to naphtha based ethylene. This surcharge is caused by the higher price of bioethanol compared to naphtha.

There are different ways of looking at this:

1. CO₂ rights are expected to solve the price difference between bioethanol and naphtha. At a bioethanol price of 545 €/tonne the required CO₂ reduction cost is 16 €/tonne. The current price of CO₂ rights varies between € 12-13 per tonne. The projected CO₂ reduction costs in 2050 varies between 28-70 €/tonne (UMWE(2011), table 3-2). The calculation of the CO₂ reduction costs is explained in Figure 25.
2. The cost impact of bioethylene in the final consumer product is typically 1%. This implies that when targeting the right applications will allow to obtain 'Green' branding at a very small cost impact to end customer.



Figure 25 Schematic representation of calculation CO₂ reduction costs



Source: CE, own calculations.

7.2.7 Sustainability aspects of the bioethanol production in Brazil²⁹

The rapid expansion of ethanol production from sugarcane in Brazil has raised a number of questions regarding its negative consequences and sustainability. Negative impacts such as future large-scale ethanol production from sugarcane might lead to the destruction or damage of high-biodiversity areas, deforestation, degradation or damaging of soils through the use of chemicals and soil decarbonisation, water resources contamination or depletion, competition between food and fuel production decreasing food security and a worsening of labour conditions on the fields.

The above mentioned aspects have the attention of both the Brazilian government and the sugarcane industry. The increased demand for bioethanol may as well solve most of these threats since it results in the cash flow required to make improvements in current practices. However, the changes for damage or destruction of high-biodiversity areas due to irreversible conversion of virgin ecosystems also increase with increasing demand for bioethanol. Deforestation, for example, causes the extinction of species and their habitats, and the loss of ecosystem functions. Studies reveal that wide-scale destruction of forests can affect the hydrologic cycle and the climate, reducing regional precipitation and increasing temperatures.

In Brazil, the expansion of sugarcane is limited by the quality of the soil, pluviometric precipitation (sugarcane requires year round sufficient rain fall) and logistics. These requirements make it less likely that sugarcane will replace high-biodiversity areas.

²⁹ The sustainability of ethanol production from sugarcane, Energy Policy, Volume 36, Issue 6, June 2008, Pages 2086-2097, José Goldemberg, Suani Teixeira Coelho, Patricia Guardabassi.



However, deforestation in the Amazon region due to indirect land use change (ILUC) remains a possible threat. Increased pressure on existing farm land suitable for sugarcane farming may press farmers of other crops/cattle into the Amazon region.

7.2.8 Conclusions on the production of bioethylene

The production of ethylene on the basis of bioethanol is a commercial available technique. The ethylene can be produced in grades fully compatible with conventional ethylene required for regular plastic applications. Plastic made on the basis of bioethanol could/should be part of the regular plastic recycling.

The current price difference is small and is not considered a major obstacle for the large scale adoption of this technology.

Sustainability effects related to large scale bioethanol use without additional policy measures may form a bottleneck, as discussed in Chapter 3.

7.3 Bio-based alternative: Propylene and butylene from bioethanol

7.3.1 Current status of technology and policy

Biopropylene could be produced on the basis of bioethylene. Production of bioethylene can be achieved by dehydrogenation of bioethanol.

Dehydrogenation of bioethanol is a commercially offered technology (see previous paragraph).


The production chain would require dimerisation of part of the ethylene into butylenes (see Figure 26) and subsequent reaction of ethylene and formed butylenes by a metathesis reaction (see Figure 27). Both processes are offered commercially by e.g. Lummus and Axens.

A recent world scale example is the 725 ktonnes/year of propylene combination of dimerisation and metathesis being build for Borouge in the United Arab Emirates³⁰. The unit, which will convert ethylene into propylene to feed two new Borstar® technology polypropylene plants, will be the world's largest using ABB Lummus licensed technology. Total annual output from the metathesis plant will be 752 kilotonnes of propylene plus 39 kilotonnes of butylene totalling 791 kilotonnes.

30 Borouge is a joint venture between the Abu Dhabi National Oil Company (ADNOC) and Austria based Borealis.




Figure 26 Flowsheet of Lummus dimerisation process



Source: Plantas.


Figure 27 Flowsheet of Lummus metathesis process (Olefin Conversion Technology-OCT)



Source: Plantas.

The Lummus's OCT technology has a selectivity for ethylene of nearly 100%, the selectivity for butylene is 97%.

Figure 28 Schematic representation of skeleton isomerisation of isobutylene



Source: Plantas.

7.3.2 Economics

The aforementioned project for Borouge also gives an up-to-date indication of the investments involved for a combination of dimerisation and metathesis. The combination requires an investment of M\$ 300, approximately M€ 215³¹. Assuming no differences in costs between the Middle East and North-West Europe. Our calculation is illustrated in Figure 29.

Given the selectivity of the dimerisation process and metathesis process for butylenes and given the investment costs, the resulting production costs for propylene from bioethylene will amount to € 1,117 per tonne at a bioethanol price of € 545 per tonne.

7.3.3 Energy balance and CO₂ emissions

The estimation of the carbon footprint and the energy demand are based on the assumption that ethylene will be produced from imported Brazilian ethanol, as was assumed in the previous paragraph.

Production of biopropylene requires fuel, steam and electricity (Plantas Quimicas, 2009). The total carbon footprint and energy demand amount to respectively 1.44 tonne CO₂ eq./tonne and 55.6 GJ/ton, of which 5.8 GJ is of fossil origin.

For comparison, the average carbon footprint and energy demand given by Ecoinvent for average European fossil fuel based production amount to 4.74 tonne CO₂ eq./tonne and 73 GJ/ton, of which 6.8 GJ/tonne are related to the production of propylene and can be lowered by maximally 50%. The carbon footprint related to naphtha is 3.12 tonne CO₂ eq./tonne (JEC, 2007)³². This means that the carbon footprint of propylene based on the most advanced naphtha cracking, amounts to 3.93 tonne CO₂ eq./tonne and 70 GJ/ton.

This implies a reduction in GHG emissions of 63% when producing propylene on the basis of bioethanol compared to the BAT refs of naphtha steam-cracking based propylene production.

31 See <http://www.borealisgroup.com/news-and-events/company-news/2007/olefins-conversion-unit>.

32 JEC, 2007 (http://ies.jrc.ec.europa.eu/uploads/media/WTT_App_1_010307.pdf) says the carbon content of naphtha is 85%, equivalent with 3.12 tonne CO₂ eq./ton. According to list of GHG emission factors used by the Dutch government (<http://www.broeikasgassen.nl/docs/Nederlandse%20lijst%20energiedragerlijst%20publicatieversie.pdf>) the emission factor of naphtha equals 3.225 tonne CO₂ eq./tonne naphtha.



Figure 29 Calculation of production costs for biopropylene

<i>Estimating ethylene requirement</i>		Selectivity	Mass ratio's
- dimerisation		90%	
- metathesis			
a) ethylene		100%	50%
b) n-butenes		97%	52%
Ethylene requirement			107%

<i>Investment</i>	Capacity kton/year	Investment M€
plant X	725	215
	400	142
Scale factor	0,7	

<i>Specific production costs €/ton</i>	
CAPEX	43
OPEX	14
Bio-ethylene costs	1.061
Import duties ethanol	237

CAPEX	12%
OPEX	4%
Ethylene pricing:	989
Import duties	221

<i>Total propylene price</i>	
- excl. import duties	1.117 €/ton
- incl. import duties	1.354 €/ton

Source: CE, own calculations.


The calculation of the CO₂ reduction price based on the comparison in annual production costs and the carbon footprint of each production method are illustrated in Figure 30.

For comparison, the average carbon footprint and energy demand given by Ecoinvent for average European fossil fuel based production amount to 4.74 tonne CO₂ eq./tonne and 73 GJ/ton, of which 6.8 GJ/tonne are related to the production of propylene and can be lowered by maximally 50%. The carbon footprint related to naphtha is 3.12 tonne CO₂ eq./tonne (JEC, 2007). This means that the carbon footprint of propylene based on the most advanced naphtha cracking, amounts to 3.93 tonne CO₂ eq./tonne and 70 GJ/ton.

At a bioethanol production price of 545 €/tonne the CO₂ reduction costs associated with utilization of propylene produced from bioethanol would amount to € 27 per tonne CO₂ at the current average production footprint. Projected prices for CO₂ rights in 2050 vary with projected scenario between 28-70 €/tonne CO₂ (UMWE (2011) table 3-2).



Figure 30 Calculation of carbon footprint and energy savings for biopropylene



Source: Own calculations.

Elucidation: The energy content and carbon footprint of bioethylene and fuel, steam and electricity purchased from outside sources are aggregated, e.g. for CO₂:
 $(45 + 103 + 48)/1,000 + 1.07 \times 1,162 = 1,443 \text{ kg/tonne C3=}$.
 Next, the difference with the substituted raw material is calculated, per tonne product and annually.

7.3.4 Conclusions on the production of biopropylene and butylene

In general the same applies to the production of propylene and butylene on the basis of bioethanol as applies for ethanol.

The required technology is commercially available and allows for significant reductions in GHG emissions (>63%). The products are produced in grades fully compatible with conventional plastic applications. Plastic made on the basis of biopropylene or biobutylene could/should be part of the regular plastic recycling. The possible negative effects of large scale bioethanol requires attention of policy makers.

At a price of bioethanol of € 545 /tonne (possible for European sugar beet based bioethanol) a CO₂ price of € 27/tonne CO₂ eq. is required to equal costs compared with conventional propylene production. In 2050 the projected CO₂ price varies between 28-70 €/tonne CO₂ eq.

In the mean time could argue that given the low price impact of olefins on consumer products it is a low price for a green image.

7.4 Conclusions on olefins

Bioethanol seems the key to a carbon low olefins production. The reduction in GHG for ethylene are 90% compared to the current situation and 69% compared to the industry benchmark. For ethylene alone this represents a reduction potential of 51 Mtonnes CO₂ eq./year compared to the current production average and 40.5 Mtonnes CO₂ eq./year compared to the industry benchmark. The reduction potential for propylene and butylene are smaller but still >63% more efficient than the industry benchmark.



The production costs of biobased olefins are currently higher than the production price of conventional olefins. This is mainly due to the costs related to the use of bioethanol. Since the demand for biobased materials is expected to raise no price decrease is anticipated for the period after 2050.

The price difference is compensated by CO₂ rights at a price of 16 €/tonne CO₂ eq. for ethylene and 27 €/tonne CO₂ eq. for propylene. The current price for CO₂ rights varies between 10-15 €/tonne CO₂. Projected prices for CO₂ rights in 2050 vary with projected scenario between 28-70 €/tonne CO₂ (UMWE (2011) table 3-2).

Even before the CO₂ reduction prices are sufficiently high the price difference does not need to be a major obstacle since for most consumer applications the impact of the olefins price is <1%.

Since plastic made on the basis of bioethanol has the same properties as plastic based on ethylene from naphtha cracking this plastic could/should be part of the regular plastic recycling. More on possible sustainability effects related to large scale bioethanol use in Chapter 3.






8 Conventional aromatics (BTX) production

8.1 Introduction to the sector and market

Current production volumes and applications


Benzene, toluene and xylenes (BTX) are the basic aromatics intermediates used for the manufacture of other chemicals. The two main sources of feedstocks for the production of aromatics are naphtha steam crackers (see Chapter 6), and reformate from reformers.

Figure 31 Chemical formula of benzene (C_6H_6), showing the special nature of benzene molecules³³



Reformers are typically found in refineries, so refineries produce a significant proportion of the overall aromatics production. Particularly xylenes are more conveniently produced from reformers than from steam crackers due to the higher yields that are obtained with this type of processes.

Figure 32 Chemical formula's of ortho-xylene, metha-xylene, para-xylene (C_8H_{10}) and toluene (C_7H_8)



³³ More information on the special chemical characteristics of aromatics:
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aromaticity>.



Benzene is the most important aromatic. The Western European production of benzene, toluene and xylene (para and ortho combined) over the period from 2006 to 2011 was 20-25% lower than the reported production capacity. The yearly production varied +/- 10% around the following average numbers:

- benzene: 7.9 Mtonnes/year;
- toluene : 1.9 Mtonnes/year;
- xylenes³⁴: 2.4 Mtonnes/year.

These production numbers exclude the production of derivatives like cyclohexane, nitrobenzene, aniline and alkylbenzenes.

8.2 Process

The source of feedstock has an important impact on the process used for extraction of aromatics. In this sense we can distinguish four main process schemes for recovering aromatics based on the type of feed and product desired:

- benzene and/or toluene from naphta cracking;
- benzene and/or toluene extraction from reformat;
- mixed xylenes produced from reformat;
- para-xylene and/or ortho-xylene extraction and isomerisation from reformat (mixed xylenes).

Within these four main options there may be a lot of variations in the process scheme to accommodate to the particularities of each case; however the following description gives a generic indication of the required process.

Benzene and/or toluene from steam cracking

Raw product stream resulting from steam crackers is referred to as pygas and contains a large quantity of diolefins and olefins that need to be hydrogenate before extracting the aromatics. Also some other impurities such as sulphur need to be removed to obtain the specifications required in the aromatics. These requirements as well as the need to fractionate by distillation the desired cut (C6 cut for benzene and/or C7 cut for toluene) determine the required process scheme, which in general will contain the following stages:

- A first stage hydrogenation of pygas for the conversion of diolefins and other very reactive species in olefins or other more stable compounds. This is done in a catalytic reactor at temperatures below 200°C and under a hydrogen pressure typically between 20-50 bars.
- A series of distillation operations to prepare the desired cut for the extraction. These distillation operations may include depentanizers, dehexanizers, deheptanizers, deoctanizers and rerun columns according to the particular scheme.
- A second stage hydrogenation to convert olefins in saturated species as well as to transform sulphur species in H₂S that is further stripped in a column associated to the catalytic reactor. This reactor is operated at temperatures between 240°C and 350°C and at pressures typically below 50 bars. Some additional distillation may be required before extraction in some cases to remove heavies formed in the reactor.
- Aromatics extraction using either liquid-liquid extraction technologies or extractive distillation technologies. In both cases a solvent is needed to facilitate the separation of the aromatics from other species with very close boiling points, which prevents the use of conventional distillation.

34 APPE site(3 Oct 2011), <http://www.petrochemistry.net/capacity-and-production-propylene-and-derivatives.html>. These numbers are the production numbers of pure BTX, all derivatives are excluded. For xylenes the combined production of ortho and para-xylenes is reported.



Most common solvents used are sulfolane, n-methylpyrrolidone (NMP), n-formyl-morpholyne (NFM) dimethyl-sulfoxyde (DMSO) or variations of molecules similar to sulfolane.

- Final distillations of the extracted aromatics when benzene and toluene (or even some xylenes) are extracted together to separate each aromatics species.

Benzene and/or toluene extraction from reformat

Reformat products contain much lower quantities of olefins than pygas with no sulphur impurities so hydrogenation is not required. In this case the following steps are typically used:

- fractionation of reformat by distillation to produce the desired cut for extraction;
- extraction of aromatics in the same fashion as described in the case of pygas;
- clay treating to remove traces of olefins in the extracted product. This is typically done heating the product at about 200°C in the presence of specific clays;
- distillation of extracted aromatics when various species are extracted together. In some cases aromatics can be extracted jointly from reformat and pygas, which obliges to use a combination of both sequences of processes, previously described.

Mixed xylenes from reformat

A mixture of the three xylenes can be produced in some sites to be used either as solvents or as feed for further PX or OX extraction elsewhere. In this case the required steps are:

- fractionation of reformat to produce the C8 cut rich in xylenes. This typically involves a deheptanizer column and another column to remove heavier molecules than the C8s;
- clay treater to remove traces of olefins;
- when the reformat is coming from a reformer operating at low severity, it may contain significant quantities of non-aromatics C8 species that may require solvent extraction as described in the previous sections.

Para-xylene and/or ortho-xylene from reformat

Para-xylene (PX) and/or ortho-xylene (OX) are normally diluted in reformat C8 streams to about 20% each, being the meta-xylene (MX) the most concentrated compound also with important amounts of ethyl-benzene.

So the process is designed to convert as much as possible of the MX to PX/OX (when both products are desired) or MX/OX to PX when only this last one is the desired product. This is realised within the so-called xylenes loop:

- The C8 reformat cut is processed in a first column (xylenes column) where a purified C8 cut is obtained in the top. This distillation column is a very severe distillation that requires a lot of energy, which usually is heat-integrated with other units of the aromatics complex. When OX is also produced, the OX is separated in the bottom of the xylenes column with the C9 and heavies. In this case the column is even bigger and is usually referred as a super-fractionation unit.
- The C8 cut from the xylenes column is then processed in a special unit for recovering pure PX. C8 aromatic isomers have very close boiling points and chemical properties, so the separation of PX from other C8 aromatics needs to use other techniques. Two type of technologies are used for separating PX from the other C8 isomers:
 - shape selective adsorption of PX in a simulated moving bed adsorber taking benefit of the particular physical shape of this molecule;



- crystallisation of the PX molecule at temperatures between -4 to -60°C, taking advantage of the higher melting point of the PX in relation to other isomers.
- The remaining C8 aromatics isomers after extraction of PX are sent to a xylenes isomerization unit where some more PX is produced from MX and OX. In this unit also the ethyl-benzene is dealkylated producing benzene that is recovered in a deheptanizer column and exported out of the xylenes loop. The isomerized C8 are recycled back to the xylenes column where they are mixed with the C8 reformat feed. Light decomposition products (mainly ethane) from the isom section are extracted as Isom gas which is mainly used to fire furnaces within the PX/OX unit.

Additional processes: HDA and TDP

In some aromatics complexes there may be some additional processes for inter-conversion of aromatics molecules, especially from toluene, which is typically a less desired product, or from C9 aromatic molecules to obtain the most interesting benzene and xylenes products. The main processes used for that purpose are:

- Toluene Disproportionation (TDP) that takes place in presence of a catalyst to yield additional benzene and xylenes that are recovered somewhere else in distillation columns;
- Selective Toluene Disproportionation (STDP) similar to the previous process but a shape selective catalyst allows to produce preferentially PX instead of the other isomers;
- Toluene/C9 Aromatics transalkylation to produce also benzene and xylenes but in this case putting in the feed to this process also heavier aromatics as C9 or even C10s;
- Hydro-dealkylation (HDA) of toluene and/or xylenes to yield benzene.
- Thermal process that removes alkyl groups from the aromatic ring.

8.3 Current level of energy requirement and greenhouse gas emissions

The combined process and steam emissions related to the above described processes are estimated to add up to 6.6 Mtonne of CO₂ equivalents, accounting for about 3.5% of the total GHG emissions from the chemical industry in the EU³⁵.

Each of the above mentioned processes have different benchmark emissions, the correct method and therefore the exact outcome is still debated. The current status is summarised in Table 13.

Table 13 Benchmark values for BTX production in Europe

Process	Process, heat and electricity related emissions (t CO ₂ /t)
Benzene and/or toluene from steam cracking	0.37-0.43
Benzene and/or toluene extraction from reformat	0.27-0.28
Para-xylene and/or ortho-xylene from reformat	0.65
HDA and TPD	0.38-0.40

Source: Ecofys et al., 2009.

The current industry average is 6.6 Mtonnes CO₂ eq. on a BTX production of 11,9 Mtonnes, which equals an average value of 0.55 t CO₂ eq./t BTX.

³⁵ Methodology for the free allocation of emission allowances in the EU ETS post-2012; report ordered by the European Commission and carried out by Ecofys and partners.



9 Low carbon aromatics

9.1 Introduction

Sustainable production of aromatics will require the use of a carbon containing feedstock.

In this study we briefly describe two potential breakthrough technologies that are still in their early developments:

- catalytic pyrolysis of lignin;
- catalytic conversion of ethanol.

Of these two routes, lignin conversion would have the benefit that it could utilise residues and by-products from existing conventional biomass conversion processes such as pulp production and residues from second generation bioethanol production from lignocellulosic raw materials.

Both routes are however still being developed and will probably not be rolled out in time to allow significant reductions in aromatic production related greenhouse gas emissions.

Because of the early stage of development both routes are in, energy requirements, potential for reduction of greenhouse gas emissions per unit of aromatics and costs were only broadly assessed.

9.2 Lignin based production routes

The easiest way of production would be utilisation of a biomass feedstock already containing aromatics. In principle such a feedstock is amply available in the shape of lignin, the component that gives wood its mechanical strength. Lignin is part of the residual black liquor produced during wood pulping and conversion of lingo-cellulosic materials into bioethanol. Lignoboost technology developed by innventia allows isolation of lignin from the black liquor. Lignin production at pulp mills in the EU amounts to approximately 20 Mtonne/year³⁶. Two sulphite pulping mills – one in Sweden and one in Norway produce pure lignin for utilisation as a raw material.

However, although isolation of lignin is quite feasible, conversion into aromatic monomers is more difficult.


Lignin has a complex structure consisting of a wide range of monomers which are linked by a wide range of different bonds. As a result of its complex nature no technology has yet been developed and demonstrated at any scale larger than laboratory scale that allows breaking this complex structure in monomers or dimmers.

In fact conversion of lignin into aromatic monomers requires development of new technologies, as illustrated in Figure 34.

³⁶ See: <http://cordis.europa.eu/documents/documentlibrary/120695511EN6.pdf>.



Figure 33 Structure of wood and lignin



Source: <http://pubs.acs.org/action/showImage?doi=10.1021%2Fcr900354u&iName=master.img-001.jpg&type=master>.

Some promising routes currently being explored include:

- catalytic hydrocracking, tested by e.g. UOP³⁷ and at the Institut für Holztechnologie und Holzbiologie;
- catalytic pyrolysis over a zeolite (ZSM-5) catalyst, as being developed by e.g. Anellotech³⁸;
- liquefaction with a mixture of supercritical water and phenol³⁹.

³⁷ See <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy11osti/46586.pdf>.


³⁸ See <http://anellotech.com/tech.html>.

³⁹ See: [http://www.cellulosechemtechnol.ro/pdf/CCT9\(2010\)/P.353-363.pdf](http://www.cellulosechemtechnol.ro/pdf/CCT9(2010)/P.353-363.pdf).



Of these routes, catalytic fluidised bed pyrolysis seems the most advanced. The firm Anellotech claims it could build a first commercial plant for conversion of wood dust (not lignin) that would be operational by 2015 and is now trying to find the funds for this plant. A similar route is developed in the Netherlands by BTG and ECN, but the development of this route seems less far⁴⁰.

Figure 34 Technology development requirement



Source: <http://pubs.acs.org/action/showImage?doi=10.1021%2Fcr900354u&iName=master.img-006.jpg&type=master>.

Figure 35 Impression of current catalytic pyrolysis plant




Source: <http://newenergyandfuel.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/Huber-Pyrolysis-Plant.jpg>.

⁴⁰ See: <http://www.biorefinery.nl/fileadmin/biosynergy/user/docs/LignoCellulosicFeedstockBiorefinery-Reith.pdf>.




The efficiency of the process would be 40% (energy basis). The process would further yield light gases and coke, the latter being utilised to fuel the process. Given the role of coke, the process may be comparable with fluid catalytic cracking of heavy crude oil residues, a process applied at large scale at crude oil refineries. Other sources⁴¹ give following indications of products ranges for pyrolysis of lignin (see Figure 37).

Figure 36 Flow sheet of Anellotech's process



Source: <http://cnse.albany.edu/download/Anellotech.pdf>.

Figure 37 Indicative composition of products of catalytic pyrolysis of lignin



Source: <http://www.tappi.org/content/Events/11BIOPRO/26.2Ben.pdf>.

⁴¹ See: <http://www.tappi.org/content/Events/11BIOPRO/26.2Ben.pdf>.



Anellotech claims aromatics production costs could be as low as \$ 1.05/gallon (approximately € 170/tonne), assuming biomass costs of \$ 50/tonne. The investment in a 2,500 tonne/day plant would amount to M\$ 220. The plant would be self-supplying in energy^{42, 43}.

9.3 Ethanol to aromatics

The alternative production route would be to convert ethanol - or probably some other well defined and pure biomass derived hydrocarbon - into aromatics. For this route the same or a very similar catalyst would be applied: a ZSM-5 catalyst. The route has been known for decades and prove of principle is as old as thirty years⁴⁴.

The technology is part of Virent's⁴⁵ Bioforming technology in which monomer sugars are converted into gasoline, kerosin and diesel. This technology applies the (H)ZSM-5 catalyst too. However, this process is not focussed on production of aromatics and aromatics make up approximately 20% of the products slate.

However, other production routes, more focussed on aromatics production don't seem to be under development. This situation prohibits a direct evaluation of the financial aspects of aromatics production based on ethanol. Only an indirect evaluation of the process costs related to the production of biofuels can be given.

Current scale of technology concerns a 10,000 gallon of product per year pilot plant (\pm 30 ktpy).

Production costs per gallon of gasoline are estimated at \$ 2.25-2.50. The gasoline is indicated to contain more than 90% of the energy content of the processed biomass.

Shell, Cargill and Honda are involved in rolling out of this technology.

⁴² See: cnse.albany.edu/download/Anellotech.pdf.


⁴³ See: http://www.sari-energy.org/PageFiles/What_We_Do/activities/worldbiofuelsmarkets/Presentations/Bio-basedChemicalsCongress/David_Sudolsky.pdf.

⁴⁴ See: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0166983482800845>.

⁴⁵ See: http://www.virent.com/BioForming/Virent_Technology_Whitepaper.pdf.




Figure 38 Flow sheet of Virent's Bioforming sugar to fuel technology



Source: http://www.virent.com/News/in_the_media/catalytic_conversion_of_sugar.pdf and <http://www.wbi.wisc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2009/11/Aqueous-phase-reforming-process-Randy-Cortright-Virent-Energy-Systems.pdf>.

An indication of the structure of production costs is given in Figure 39.

Figure 39 Overview of structure of production costs of conventional bioethanol production and production of biogasoline



Source: http://files.eesi.org/Blanchard_073108.pdf.



9.3.1 Conclusions on aromatics

In principle there are two routes available to produce climate neutral aromatics, based on biomass:

1. Gasification of lignin (remains of a number of conventional plant based processes). When this method is integrated with conventional plant/wood based processes like papermaking this may have the advantage of using remains and thus less prone to ILUC effects. However, this requires that the energy efficiency of these conventional plant/wood based processes increases since most of the lignin currently is used as a biofuel for these processes.
2. Conversion of ethanol over a zeolite catalyst to aromatics (mixture of BTX). This process has the advantage that bioethanol as a raw material is available at a large scale, but comes with the possible sustainability consequences related to bioethanol use as discussed in Chapter 3.

Currently we can only do a very rough assessment on process costs since the only pilot process applying these insights is optimised for the production of biofuels instead of biochemistry. Based on the type of process we expect a surcharge comparable to the surcharge of propylene production.





10 Conclusions and recommendations

As described in the previous chapters, we identified the processes for the production of the following chemicals as major chemical processes:

- ammonia (NH_3);
- olefins (the group of small ketenes, i.e. ethylene (C_2H_4), propylene (C_3H_6) and various types of butylenes (C_4H_8) of which ethylene is the most produced);
- aromatics or BTX (benzene (C_6H_6), various types of xylenes (C_8H_{10}) and toluene (C_7H_8)).

We found that breakthrough technologies are available that may lead to reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in line with the 83-87% reduction in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions as deemed necessary by the European commission (EC, 2011a) and IPPC.

The potential of CO_2 as a building block seems less promising, only under some specific circumstances CO_2 can effectively be used as a chemical building block. Before 2050 it is not realistic to view CO_2 chemistry as a significant alternative to the limited CCS storage capacity.

The breakthrough technologies are based on renewable power and/or sustainably sourced biomass. Because biomass is also in demand as food, feed, construction material and fuel there is an increasing risk for adverse effects on the environment, including net increasing GHG emissions.

Therefore an integrated policy as for example is advocated by the “Roadmap to a resource efficient Europe” (EC, 2011b) is necessary to actually reach for a sustainable future when meeting the individual reduction targets of the industry, the transport sector and the power sector.

10.1 Outcomes of inventory of breakthrough technologies

For all three processes alternatives were found allowing for reductions in GHG emissions varying between 50 and 100%. Key to green house gas reduction were the use of biomass as a raw material or renewable power.

10.1.1 Ammonia production

The synthesis of ammonia from nitrogen and hydrogen is an energy producing (exothermic) reaction. Therefore, only alternatives to the current production method of hydrogen production by gasification of natural gas is required to realise a GHG neutral ammonia production. Two GHG neutral alternatives to produce hydrogen were found:

- water electrolysis powered by renewable power;
- biomass gasification.

Both pathways allow for a GHG neutral ammonia production, i.e. allowing for a GHG emissions reduction of 1.6 tonne CO_2 eq./ton NH_3 produced



Water electrolysis based ammonia production

Water electrolysis based ammonia production requires:

- roughly 1.5 tonne of water per tonne of ammonia produced; and
- 50-70 MWh renewable power per tonne of ammonia produced.

At the current European ammonia production of 14 Mtonne/year this translates to 21 Mtonne of water and 700-980 MWh renewable power.

The costs related to large scale production of ammonia in 2050 were assessed in comparison to the expected costs of conventional production in 2050. Even at the low future estimate of natural gas of 6 €/GJ, cheap hydropower can compete on price with conventional ammonia production provided that the foreseen decrease in capital costs for the electrolysis plants to 250-500 €/kWe are realised by 2020.

In all other cases there is a surcharge for the production of ammonia varying between 0-175 €/tonne NH₃ in case of hydropower based production and 350-500 €/tonne NH₃ in case of wind-power based production (CO₂ prices of respectively € 0 - € 100 and > € 200/tonne CO₂).

Biomass gasification based ammonia production

Biomass gasification based ammonia production requires roughly 1.8 tonne of biomass per tonne of ammonia produced. Since part of the biomass is burned to fuel the gasification this process is also a net heat producer.

At the current European ammonia production of 14 Mtonne/year this translates to 25 Mtonne of clean wood.

We estimated the costs related to large scale production of ammonia in 2050. The production of ammonia based on biomass gasification has a surcharge of 50-150 € /tonne NH₃ depending on the price of the biomass.

At a benchmark emission of 1.6 tonnes of CO₂ eq./tonne this requires a CO₂ price varying between 31-93 € /tonne of CO₂ eq. to reach breakeven. This implies that even when competing with the very advanced ammonia plants that meet the benchmark emission of 1.6 tonnes of CO₂ eq./tonne of NH₃ produced the breakeven point may be at a price of 31 €/tonne CO₂ eq. This may be feasible if the gasification plant is integrated with other wood based industries.

10.1.2 Olefins production

The least GHG emitting alternative production methods for olefins are bioethanol based. The final reduction in GHG emissions is determined by the following factors, in order of possible effect on magnitude:

- Emissions related to the bioethanol production.
- Specific compound produced: bioethanol is converted to ethylene, which can be converted to the other olefins. Each reaction step requires energy.
- The efficiency of the conversion process from bioethanol to the required olefins.

At the current European olefins production this translates to a demand of 65 Mtonne of bioethanol per year to replace the current European olefins production.

Ethylene production based on bioethanol

The production of 1 tonne of ethylene requires:

- 1.7 tonne bioethanol; and
- 48.7 GJ/tonne ethylene produced of which 5 GJ is of fossil origin.



The GHG emissions related to the production of ethylene from efficiently and sustainably produced bioethanol are 90% lower than the current industry average and 69% lower than the post 2012 ETS industry benchmark. This is because of the lower energy need of the conversion process from bioethanol to ethylene than from naphtha to ethylene and the lower carbon footprint related to bioethanol compared to naphtha as a raw material.

We estimated the costs related to large scale production of ethylene in 2050. At a bioethanol price of 545 €/tonne, this implies a surcharge of 54 €/tonne ethylene. This requires a CO₂ price of 16 €/tonne of CO₂ eq. to reach breakeven.

Propylene production based on bioethanol

The production of 1 tonne of propylene requires:

- 1.9 tonne bioethanol; and
- 55.6 GJ/tonne propylene produced of which 5.8 GJ is of fossil origin.

The GHG emissions related to the production of propylene from efficiently and sustainably produced bioethanol are 63% lower than the post 2012 ETS industry benchmark.

We estimated the costs related to large scale production of propylene in 2050. At a bioethanol price of 545 €/tonne, this implies a surcharge of 90 €/tonne ethylene. This requires a CO₂ price of 27 €/tonne of CO₂ eq. to reach breakeven.

10.1.3 Aromatics production

Two alternative routes to produce low carbon aromatics were found:

- direct conversion of ethanol to aromatics;
- biomass gasification.

Both routes allow for significant reduction in GHG emissions, although no exact estimate could be made due to a lack of pilot plants dedicated to the production of aromatics. All pilot-plants were dedicated to biofuel production. However, based on a comparison in process characteristics we can offer the following rough indications:

The direct conversion of bioethanol to aromatics should yield a GHG emission reduction of over 60%, at a surcharge comparable to the production of propylene from bioethanol, i.e. breakeven at a GHG reduction cost of 30 €/tonne of CO₂ eq.

The biomass gasification method should yield a GHG neutral alternative provided that the biomass is sustainably sourced. At a surcharge comparable to the surcharge of ammonia, i.e. breakeven at a GHG reduction cost of 30-90 €/tonne of CO₂ eq. depending on the wood price.

10.2 Economic assessment of breakthrough technologies

When assessing the economic feasibility of the presented breakthrough technologies one should bear the following in mind:

- Projected CO₂ reduction costs for 2050 are estimated to range between 28 and 70 €/tonne CO₂ eq. in 2050 (UMWE (2011) table 2-3). This seems sufficient to make all biobased options economically feasible.
- The rise in oil prices is structurally underestimated by the IEA (UMWE (2011) figure 3-8). This may be true for the gas price either.



- The growth of the renewable power is structurally underestimated in studies by IEA and the European Commission (UMWE (2011) figure 3-4 and 3-5).
- The effect of the price of basic chemicals on the price of a consumer product is typically below 1%. This implies that a product can obtain 'Green' branding at a very small cost impact to the end customer.

10.3 Requirement for additional integrated policies?

None of the sectors studied seem to systematically work on alternatives to their current processes. The foreseen process ameliorations will only allow for maximally 30% emission reduction, the rest is to be solved by large scale CCS. While the capacity for CCS limited.

Nevertheless breakthrough technologies have been identified. The identified breakthrough technologies are all based on renewable power with a high availability or on sustainably sourced biomass. In the EU such sources have a limited potential and are also claimed for other applications, e.g. transport. Consequently there is a risk of competition and -in case of biomass utilisation- a risk of adverse effects.

10.3.1 Importance of sustainability of applied biomass

Apart from the options mentioned in this study there are several functions that increasingly depend on the use of sustainably grown biomass when the use of fossil fuels is phased out. Since the amount of sustainable biomass is limited this requires clear policies to prevent unsustainable land use.

If the use of biomass leads to direct or indirect to land degradation the positive effect on GHG emissions mentioned in this report are overshadowed by increased GHG emissions related to the land degradation.

10.3.2 Policy measures to encourage the transition to a low carbon chemical industry

This study on the chemical industry and the previous study on the steel, cement and pulp, paper and print industries show that there are breakthrough technologies available. However, the implementation requires an integrated industry and energy policy. In this policy choices have to be made in order to prevent unsustainable mechanisms. One could think of the following instruments to realise these choices:

The influence of the EU ETS as a mechanism to provide a reward on GHG emission reduction has been mentioned before. The range of reduction costs for CO₂ as projected in a number of scenario studies allows breakeven for most biobased alternatives.

To prevent a too high stress on biomass demand which could lead to unsustainable mechanisms, policy measures could aim to reduce use, and demand minimum sustainability standards on sourcing of biomass. In addition alternatives for biomass use like the renewable power based ammonia production could be favoured over biomass intensive alternatives.

To prevent lock in effects policy makers may consider to secure access to the limited CCS storage capacity to those industries that do not have an alternative to comply with the targets for 83-87% reduction in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.



References

Accenture, 2009

Bio Ethylene Business Case Evaluation of an investment in a 500 kta Ethanol to Ethylene plant to be built along side the ARG Ethylene Pipe Line

S.l. : Accenture, 2009

<http://www.energietransitie.nl/publicaties/bio-ethylene-business-case>

Amesco, 2007

H. Croezen, R. Eijs, M. Vosbeek, et al.

AMESCO Generic Environmental Impact Study on CO₂ Storage, final report

Groningen : Haskoning Nederland BV, 2007

Anellotech Inc., 2010

David Sudolsky

Petrochemicals from Biomass : presentation at The 2010 New Energy

Symposium, August 9-10, (2010)7 World Trade Center, NYC

<http://cnse.albany.edu/download/Anellotech.pdf>

Anellotech Inc., 2011

David Sudolsky

Bio-Based Chemicals : presentation at Biobased Chemicals Congress,

23 March, 2011

http://www.sari-energy.org/PageFiles/What_We_Do/activities/worldbiofuelsmarkets/Presentations/BioBasedChemicalsCongress/David_Sudolsky.pdf

Badgley, et al., 2007

C. Badgley, J. Moghtader, E. Quintero, E. Zakem, M.J. Chappell,

K. Avilés-Vázquez, A. Samulon, I.O. Perfecto

Organic agriculture and the global food supply

In : Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems, no.22 (2007); p.86-108

BAL-fuel, 1997

Alternar "BAL-fuels project", report Feasibility phase project for biomass-derived alcohols for automotive and industrial uses

Stockholm : Ecotrafic R&D AB and Nykomb Synergetics AB, 1997

Bartels, 2008

J.R. Bartels, M.B. Pate

A feasibility study of implementing an Ammonia Economy

Ames (USA) : Iowa Energy Center, Iowa State University, 2008

Ben and Ragauskas, 2011

Haoxi Ben and Arthur Ragauskas

Catalytic Pyrolysis of Lignin for Bio-oils, presentation at the 2011 International

Bioenergy and Bioproducts Conference (IBBC) and BioPro Expo & Marketplace,

March 14-16, Atlanta, GA, 2011

<http://www.tappi.org/content/Events/11BIOPRO/26.2Ben.pdf>



Biofuels Digest, 2011

Jime Lane

Brazil to invest \$22B in ethanol expansion, as GM CEO says ethanol has not much future in US

In : Biofuel Digest, June 2011

<http://biofuelsdigest.com/bdigest/2011/06/08/brazil-to-invest-22b-in-ethanol-gm-ceo-says-ethanol-has-not-much-future-in-us/>

Blommel, et al., 2008

Paul G. Blommel, Gregory R. Keenan, Robert T. Rozmiarek and

Randy D. Cortright

Catalytic conversion of sugar into conventional gasoline, diesel, jet fuel, and other hydrocarbons, paper

In : The international Sugar Journal, November 2008

http://www.virent.com/News/in_the_media/catalytic_conversion_of_sugar.pdf

Brebu and Vasile, 2010

Mihai Brebu and Cornelia Vasile

Thermal degradation of lignin : a review

In : Cellulose Chemistry and Technology, vol.44, no. 9, (2010); p.353-363

[http://www.cellulosechemtechnol.ro/pdf/CCT9\(2010\)/P.353-363.pdf](http://www.cellulosechemtechnol.ro/pdf/CCT9(2010)/P.353-363.pdf)

Bradley, 2010

Douglas Bradley

Canada Report on Bioenergy 2010.

In : Solutions, Climate Change, Ottawa, 2010

<http://www.bioenergytrade.org/downloads/canadareportonbioenergy2010sept152010.pdf>

BUBE, 2009

Uwe R. Fritsche (OEKO-Institut); Bettina Kampman and Geert Bergsma (CE Delft)

Better Use of Biomass for Energy : Position Paper of IEA REDT and IEA Bioenergy

Darmstadt ; Delft : OEKO-Institut ; CE Delft, 2009

<http://www.ce.nl/index.php?go=home.showPublicatie&id=1057>

BUBE, 2010

Bettina Kampman, Geert Bergsma, Benno Schepers, Harry Croezen (CE Delft) ; Uwe R. Fritsche, Klaus Henneberg, Katja Huenecke (Öko-Institut) ; Jan Willem Molenaar, Jan Joost Kessler (AidEnvironment) ; Stephan Slingerland, Coby van der Linde (CIEP)

Better Use of Biomass for Energy : Background Report to the Position Paper of IEA RETD and IEA Bioenergy

Darmstadt ; Delft : OEKO-Institut ; CE Delft, 2010

<http://www.ieabioenergy.com/LibItem.aspx?id=6476>

CE, 2008

Harry Croezen, Bettina Kampman

Bio-input for oil refineries : Overview of possibilities and constraints report
Delft : CE Delft, 2008



CE, 2010

Marisa Korteland and Harry Croezen

Technological developments in Europe : A long-term view of CO₂ efficient manufacturing in the European region

Delft : CE Delft, 2010

EC, 2010

Commission staff working document accompanying the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions : Unlocking Europe's potential in clean innovation and growth : Analysis of options to move beyond 20%, SEC (2010) xxx, Draft, not final, May 2010

Brussels : European Commission (EC), 2010

http://www.euractiv.com/sites/annumII/euractiv/files/EC2010_30_Staff_Working_Document.doc

EC, 2011a

Communication from the commission tot the European parliament, the council, the European economic and social committee and the committee of the regions : A roadmap for moving to a competitive low carbon economy in 2050, COM(2011) 112 final

Brussels : European Commission, 2011

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0112:FIN:EN:PDF>

EC, 2011b

Communication from the commission tot the European parliament, the council, the European economic and social committee and the committee of the regions : Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe, COM(2011) 571 final

Brussels : European Commission, 2011

http://ec.europa.eu/environment/resource_efficiency/pdf/com2011_571.pdf

Ecofys, et al., 2009

Ecofys : Fraunhofer ISI ; Öko-Institut

Methodology for the free allocation of emission allowances in the EU ETS post 2012 : Sector report for the refinery industry

S.I. : Ecofys, 2009

http://ec.europa.eu/clima/studies/ets/docs/bm_study_-_chemicals_en.pdf

EFMA, [-]

Understanding nitrogen and its use in agriculture

Brussels : European Fertilizer Manufacturers' Association (EFMA)

<http://www.efma.org/documents/file/publications/EFMANitrogenbooklet.pdf>

EUWood, 2010

U. Mantau, et al.

Real potential for changes in growth and use of EU forests

30 June 2010

http://ec.europa.eu/energy/renewables/studies/doc/bioenergy/euwood_final_report.pdf

EWEA, [-]

Costs and prices

Wind Energy : the facts, volume 2

Brussels : European Wind Energy Association, [-]

http://www.ewea.org/fileadmin/ewea_documents/documents/publications/WETF/Facts_Volume_2.pdf



GM and LBST, 2002

Raj Choudhury, Trudy Weber (GM); Jörg Schindler, Werner Weindorf, Reinhold Wurster (LBST)
GM Well-to-Wheel analysis of energy use and greenhouse gas emissions of advanced fuel/vehicle systems – a european study: annex
Ottobrunn : L-B-Systemtechnik GmbH, 2002

Goldemberg, et al., 2008

José Goldemberg, Suani Teixeira Coelho, Patricia Guardabassi
The sustainability of ethanol production from sugarcane
In : Energy Policy, Vol. 36, Iss. 6, (2008); p. 2086-2097

Hamelinck, 2004

Carlo Hamelinck
Outlook for advanced biofuels = Vooruitzichten voor geavanceerde biobrandstoffen
Utrecht : Universiteit Utrecht, Faculteit Scheikunde, 2004
<http://igitur-archive.library.uu.nl/dissertations/2005-0209-113022/full.pdf>

IIED, 2011

Lorenzo Cotula, Lynn Finnegan and Duncan Macqueen
Biomass energy: Another driver of land acquisitions?
In : IIED briefing : The global land rush August 2011
<http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/17098IIED.pdf>

IIASA, 2002

G. Fischer, H. van Velthuisen, M. Shah, F. Nachtergaele
Global Agro-ecological Assessment for Agriculture in the 21st Century: Methodology and Results
International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg, Austria, January 2002
<http://www.iiasa.ac.at/Research/LUC/SAEZ/pdf/gaez2002.pdf>

IPCC, 2005

B. Metz, O. Davidson, H.C. de Coninck, M. Loos and L.A. Meyer (eds.)
IPCC, 2005 : IPCC Special Report on Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage. Prepared by Working Group III of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
Cambridge (UK) ; New York (US) : Cambridge University Press, 2005

JEC, 2007

Well-to-Wheels analysis of future automotive fuels and powertrains in the European context
WELL-TO-TANK Report Version 2c, appendix 1, 2007
Description of individual processes and detailed input data
http://ies.jrc.ec.europa.eu/uploads/media/WTT_App_1_010307.pdf

Macedo, et al., 2004

I.D.C. Macedo, M.R.L.V. Leal and J.E.A.R. Da Silva
Assessment of greenhouse gas emissions in the production and use of fuel ethanol in Brazil
Accessible via: Secretariat of the Environment of the State of São Paulo, Brazil



NREL, 2010

Mark M. Wright, Justinus A. Satrio, and Robert C. Brown (Iowa State University), et al.
Techno-Economic Analysis of Biomass Fast Pyrolysis to Transportation Fuels
Golden : National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), 2010
<http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy11osti/46586.pdf>

NREL, 2010

Excel data sheet : 2011 Interim Update, Technical Plan - Production
World Ammonia (NH₃) statistics by region B'000 Tonnes production

NREL, 2010

2011 Interim Update, Technical Plan : Production
Website NREL's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy - Fuel Cell Technologies Program in 2009
http://www.fertilizer.org/ifa/content/download/7832/121893/version/4/file/2009_ammonia_public.xls

Oliviera, 2005

M.E. Dias de Oliveira, B.E. Vaughan, E.J. Rykiel
Ethanol as fuel : Energy, carbon dioxide balances, and ecological footprint
In : BioScience, vol. 55, no.7 (2005); p. 593-602

OudeJans, et al., 1982

J.C. Oudejans, P.F. Van Den Oosterkamp, H. Van Bekkum
Conversion of ethanol over zeolite h-zsm-5 in the presence of water
In : Applied Catalysis, Vol.3, Iss. 2, (1982); p. 109-115
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0166983482800845>

Pelletier and Tyedmers, 2010

N. Pelletier and P. Tyedmers
Forecasting potential global environmental costs of livestock production
2000-2050
In : Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, no.107 (2010);
p. 18371-18374

PWC, 2008

J.W. Velthuisen, et al.
A financial and economic comparison of coal, gas and wind as options for
Dutch electricity generation
Amsterdam : PricewaterhouseCoopers Advisory N.V., 2008

Proton Ventures, 2010

J.P. Vrijenhoef (Proton Ventures BV, The Netherlands)
From MEGA-ammonia to mini-AMMONIA
Presentation at the 7th NH₃ Fuel Conference Detroit, 26-9-2010 till 29-9-2010

Reith, et al., 2009

J.H. Reith, R. van Ree, R. Capote Campos, R.R. Bakker, P.J. de Wild,
F. Monot, B. Estrine, A.V. Bridgwater, A. Agostini
Lignocellulosic feedstock biorefinery for co-production of chemicals,
transportation fuels, electricity and heat - IP BIOSYNERGY and Beyond
Presentation at the Biorefinery Training Course, 12 June 2009, Ghent
<http://www.biorefinery.nl/fileadmin/biosynergy/user/docs/LignocellulosicFeedstockBiorefinery-Reith.pdf>



Ren, 2009

Tao Ren

Petrochemicals from oil, natural gas, coal and biomass: energy use, economics and innovation

Utrecht : Utrecht University, 2009

Ren, et al., 2006

Tao Ren, Martin Patel, Kornelis Blok

Olefins from conventional and heavy feedstocks : Energy use in steam cracking and alternative processes

In : Energy, vol.,31, no. 4 (2006); p. 425-451

SenterNovem, 2004

H.H.J. Vreuls

Nederlandse lijst energiedragers en standaard CO₂-emissiefactoren

S.I. : SenterNovem, 2004

<http://www.broeikasgassen.nl/docs/Nederlandse%20lijst%20energiedragerlijst%20publicatieversie.pdf>

SRREN, 2011

O. Edenhofer, et al.

IPCC Special Report on Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation

Cambridge (UK) ; New York (US) : Cambridge University Press, 2011

http://srren.ipcc-wg3.de/report/IPCC_SRREN_Full_Report.pdf

UMWE, 2011

Pathways towards a 100% renewable electricity system : Special report

Paragraph 2.2.3 on biodiversity loss

Berlin : SRU, German Advisory Council on the Environment, (UMWE), 2011

http://www.umweltrat.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/EN/02_Special_Reports/2011_10_Special_Report_Pathways_renewables.pdf;jsessionid=440763E95C4919B41D340DCA8F009A6F.1_cid095?__blob=publicationFile

UNIDO, 2011

Carbon Capture and Storage in Industrial Applications :

Technology Synthesis Report, Working Paper

S.I. : United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), 2010

http://www.unido.org/fileadmin/user_media/Services/Energy_and_Climate_Change/Energy_Efficiency/CCS_%20industry_%20synthesis_final.pdf

WBGU, 2009

R. Schubert, et al.

Future Bioenergy and Sustainable Land Use

Berlin : German Advisory Council on Global Change (WBGU), 2009

Websites**Ammonia uses**

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ammonia#Uses>

Anellotech Inc.

Simple, Novel Technology

<http://anellotech.com/tech.html>



APPE a

Petrochemicals Make Things Happen : flowchart
The Association of Petrochemicals Producers in Europe(APPE)
<http://www.petrochemistry.net/flowchart/flowchart.htm>

APPE b

Propylene and derivatives
The Association of Petrochemicals Producers in Europe(APPE)
<http://www.petrochemistry.net/capacity-and-production-propylene-and-derivatives.html>
Accessed : 3 October 2011

Aromaticity

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aromaticity>

Biorefinery process flow chart

<http://pubs.acs.org/action/showImage?doi=10.1021%2Fcr900354u&iName=master.img-006.jpg&type=master>

Botanic drawing of a plant

<http://pubs.acs.org/action/showImage?doi=10.1021%2Fcr900354u&iName=master.img-001.jpg&type=master>

Borouge, 2007

Borouge awards US\$300 million olefins conversion unit contract for Borouge 2 expansion project, Company release, 13-06-2007
<http://www.borealisgroup.com/news-and-events/company-news/2007/olefins-conversion-unit>

Caliche

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Caliche_\(mineral\)#Chilean_Caliche](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Caliche_(mineral)#Chilean_Caliche)

Chematur

Brochure from website: Ethylene from Ethanol
http://www.chematur.se/sok/download/Ethylene_rev_0904.pdf

ClimateTechWiki

A clean Technology Platform
Fuel switch in the ammonia industry
<http://climatetechwiki.org/technology/ammonia-industry>

Cracking (Chemistry)

The emission factor of naphta equals 3.225 tonne CO₂ eq./tonne naphta
From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Steam_cracking#Steam_cracking

Ethanol fuel in Brazil

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biofuel_in_Brazil

Freeonline

CO₂ free nh₃ from Rjukan Waterfall, 1913
Published on the freeonline. Wordpress.com July 4, 2011
<http://thefreeonline.wordpress.com/2011/07/04/co2-free-nh3-from-rjukan-waterfall1913/>



Haber process

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Haber-Bosch_process

Huber-Pyrolysis Plant foto

<http://newenergyandfuel.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/Huber-Pyrolysis-Plant.jpg>

IEA/HIA

Task 25 : High Temperature Hydrogen Production Process, Alkaline Electrolysis

<http://ieahia.org/pdfs/Task25/alkaline-electrolysis.pdf>

IFA

HomePage International Fertilizer Industry Association (IFA)

<http://www.fertilizer.org/>

IFA, 2011

http://www.fertilizer.org/ifa/content/download/7832/121893/version/4/file/2009_ammonia_public.xls

Iceland Trade-Directory

Industry Sectors in Iceland : Energy in Iceland

http://www.icelandexport.is/english/industry_sectors_in_iceland/energy_in_iceland/

IPPC BAT REF documents

- a) Reference Document on Best Available Techniques in the Large Volume Organic Chemical Industry, February 2003
ftp://ftp.jrc.es/pub/eippcb/doc/lvo_bref_0203.pdf
- b) Reference Document on Best Available Techniques for the Manufacture of Large Volume Inorganic Chemicals - Ammonia, Acids and Fertilisers, August 2007
ftp://ftp.jrc.es/pub/eippcb/doc/lvic_bref_0907.pdf

(The) Monday Campaigns, Inc.

Homepage

www.meatlessmonday.com

Natural Resources Canada

Business: Industrial : Benchmarking Results

<http://oee.nrcan.gc.ca/industrial/technical-info/benchmarking/ammonia/results.cfm?attr=24>

NREL, 2004

Technology Brief: Analysis of Current-Day Commercial Electrolyzers

National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL)

<http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy04osti/36705.pdf>

NREL

NREL's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy - Fuel Cell Technologies Program in 2009

http://www.fertilizer.org/ifa/content/download/7832/121893/version/4/file/2009_ammonia_public.xls



NZIC

Ammonia and Urea production

The New Zealand Institute of Chemistry (NZIC)

<http://nzic.org.nz/ChemProcesses/production/1A.pdf>

Plantas Quimicas, 2009

Plantas Quimicas homepage

<http://www.plantasquimicas.com/>

Sodium nitrate

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sodium_nitrate

Swiss Hydrogen Association, 2007

Hydrogen Report Switzerland 08/09

http://www.empa.ch/plugin/template/empa/*/73305

VIRENT

Site: Bioforming

http://www.virent.com/BioForming/Virent_Technology_Whitepaper.pdf

Virent, 2008

Mary Willoughby Blanchard

Presentation: Catalytic Conversion of Biomass to Gasoline, Diesel, Jet Fuel and other Hydrocarbons

http://files.eesi.org/Blanchard_073108.pdf

Virent, 2009

Randy D. Cortright

Presentation: Aqueous-phase Reforming Process

<http://www.wbi.wisc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2009/11/Aqueous-phase-reforming-process-Randy-Cortright-Virent-Energy-Systems.pdf>

WaCheUp, 2008

Final Activity report

<http://cordis.europa.eu/documents/documentlibrary/120695511EN6.pdf>

