



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/rser](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/rser)

## Competing uses of biomass: Assessment and comparison of the performance of bio-based heat, power, fuels and materials

S.J. Gerssen-Gondelach<sup>a,\*</sup>, D. Saygin<sup>a</sup>, B. Wicke<sup>a</sup>, M.K. Patel<sup>b,1</sup>, A.P.C. Faaij<sup>c,2</sup><sup>a</sup> Copernicus Institute of Sustainable Development, Utrecht University, Heidelberglaan 2, 3584 CS Utrecht, The Netherlands<sup>b</sup> University of Geneva, Institute for Environmental Sciences and Forel Institute, Energy Group, Route de Drize 7, 1227 Carouge/Geneva, Switzerland<sup>c</sup> Energy and Sustainability Research Institute, University of Groningen, Nijenborg 4, 9747 AC Groningen, The Netherlands

## ARTICLE INFO

## Article history:

Received 19 November 2012

Received in revised form

23 July 2014

Accepted 30 July 2014

## Keywords:

Biomass value chains

Bioenergy

Biomaterials

Technology review

Production costs

GHG abatement costs

## ABSTRACT

The increasing production of modern bioenergy carriers and biomaterials intensifies the competition for different applications of biomass. To be able to optimize and develop biomass utilization in a sustainable way, this paper first reviews the status and prospects of biomass value chains for heat, power, fuels and materials, next assesses their current and long-term levelized production costs and avoided emissions, and then compares their greenhouse gas abatement costs. At present, the economically and environmentally preferred options are wood chip and pellet combustion in district heating systems and large-scale cofiring power plants (75–81 US\$/tCO<sub>2</sub>-eq<sub>avoided</sub>), and large-scale fermentation of low-cost Brazilian sugarcane to ethanol (–65 to –53 \$/tCO<sub>2</sub>-eq<sub>avoided</sub>) or biomaterials (–60 to –50 \$/tCO<sub>2</sub>-eq<sub>avoided</sub> for ethylene and –320 to –228 \$/tCO<sub>2</sub>-eq<sub>avoided</sub> for PLA; negative costs represent cost-effective options). In the longer term, the cultivation and use of lignocellulosic energy crops can play an important role in reducing the costs and improving the emission balance of biomass value chains. Key conversion technologies for lignocellulosic biomass are large-scale gasification (bioenergy and biomaterials) and fermentation (biofuels and biomaterials). However, both routes require improvement of their technological and economic performance. Further improvements can be attained by biorefineries that integrate different conversion technologies to maximize the use of all biomass components.

© 2014 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

## Contents

1. Introduction	965
2. Methodology	966
2.1. Cost data standardization	966
2.2. Avoided GHG emissions and GHG abatement costs	967
2.3. Sensitivity analysis	968
3. Chain description	968

**Abbreviations:** AD, anaerobic digestion; BTX, benzene, toluene, and xylenes; BC, biochemical; CBP, Consolidated Bioprocessing; CC, combined cycle; CFB, circulating fluidized bed; CHP, combined heat and power; DDGS, dried distillers grain soluble; DLUC, direct land use change; ECH, epichlorohydrin; ETE, ethanol-to-ethylene; FAME, fatty acid methyl ester; FT, Fischer-Tropsch; GHG, greenhouse gas; GT, gas turbine; HHV, higher heating value; HTU, hydrothermal upgrading; ICE, internal combustion engine; IGCC, integrated gasification combined cycle; IGFC, integrated gasification fuel cell; ILUC, indirect land use change; IPCC, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change; LHV, lower heating value; LR, learning rate; MSW, municipal solid waste; MTBE, methyl tertiary butyl ether; MTO, methanol-to-olefins; NG, natural gas; NGCC, natural gas combined cycle; NNGT, natural gas-gas turbine; NOP, natural oil polyol; O&M, operation and maintenance; ORC, organic Rankine cycle; PA, polyamide; PBR, photobioreactor; PBT, polybutylene terephthalate; PC, pulverized coal; PDO, 1,3-propanediol; PE, polyethylene; PET, polyethylene terephthalate; PHA, polyhydroxyalkanoates; PLA, polylactide; PP, polypropylene; PS, polystyrene; PTT, polytrimethylene terephthalate; PUR, polyurethanes; PVC, polyvinylchloride; R&D, research & development; SC, steam cycle; SHF, separate hydrolysis and fermentation; SNG, substitute/synthetic natural gas; SRC, short rotation crops; SSCF, simultaneous saccharification and co-fermentation; SSF, simultaneous saccharification and fermentation; TC, thermochemical; TOP, torrefied and pelletized biomass; WTW, well-to-wheel

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +31 30 253 5446; fax: +31 30 253 7601.

E-mail addresses: [s.j.gerssen-gondelach@uu.nl](mailto:s.j.gerssen-gondelach@uu.nl) (S.J. Gerssen-Gondelach), [sayindeger@gmail.com](mailto:sayindeger@gmail.com) (D. Saygin), [b.wicke@uu.nl](mailto:b.wicke@uu.nl) (B. Wicke), [martin.patel@unige.ch](mailto:martin.patel@unige.ch) (M.K. Patel), [a.p.c.faaij@rug.nl](mailto:a.p.c.faaij@rug.nl) (A.P.C. Faaij).<sup>1</sup> Formerly with Copernicus Institute of Sustainable Development, Utrecht University; since September 2013 with University of Geneva, Institute for Environmental Sciences and Forel Institute, Energy Group, Route de Drize 7, 1227 Carouge/Geneva, Switzerland.<sup>2</sup> Formerly with Copernicus Institute of Sustainable Development, Utrecht University; since April 2014 with University of Groningen, Energy and Sustainability Research Institute, The Netherlands.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2014.07.197>

1364-0321/© 2014 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

3.1.	Feedstocks .....	968
3.2.	Biomass logistics .....	968
3.3.	Biomass pretreatment technologies .....	968
3.3.1.	Chipping, briquetting and pelletization .....	968
3.3.2.	Torrefaction .....	968
3.3.3.	Pyrolysis & hydrothermal upgrading .....	968
3.4.	Biomass conversion technologies .....	969
3.4.1.	Heat and power .....	969
3.4.2.	Fuels .....	970
3.4.3.	Materials .....	971
3.4.4.	Biorefinery .....	974
4.	Cost and emission data .....	975
4.1.	Feedstock yields .....	975
4.2.	Feedstock production costs .....	975
4.3.	Pre-treatment and transportation costs .....	975
4.3.1.	Costs of pretreatment .....	975
4.3.2.	Costs of logistics .....	975
4.4.	Biomass conversion costs .....	976
4.4.1.	Heat .....	976
4.4.2.	Power .....	977
4.4.3.	Fuels .....	979
4.4.4.	Materials .....	979
4.4.5.	Technological learning .....	979
4.5.	GHG emissions .....	984
4.6.	Synthesis: selection of value chains .....	985
4.6.1.	Selection of input cost and emission data .....	985
5.	Results .....	987
5.1.	Levelized costs .....	987
5.1.1.	Bioenergy .....	987
5.1.2.	Biomaterials .....	988
5.2.	Avoided emissions .....	989
5.2.1.	Bioenergy .....	989
5.2.2.	Biomaterials .....	991
5.2.3.	Avoided emissions per hectare .....	991
5.3.	GHG abatement costs .....	991
5.4.	Sensitivity analysis .....	991
6.	Discussion .....	993
6.1.	Data availability and quality .....	993
6.2.	Technological learning .....	994
6.3.	(I)LUC .....	994
6.4.	Allocation of costs and emissions .....	994
6.5.	Fossil energy price in bioenergy costs .....	994
7.	Conclusions .....	994
7.1.	Levelized costs .....	994
7.2.	Avoided GHG emissions .....	995
7.3.	GHG abatement costs .....	995
7.4.	Overall .....	995
	Acknowledgments .....	995
	Appendix A. Supporting information .....	995
	References .....	995

## 1. Introduction

In the last decade, biomass use for the production of modern bioenergy and biomaterials grew significantly in order to oppose the depletion of fossil resources (and associated increasing energy prices) and to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions [1]. For both energy and material application of biomass, it is expected that this growth will continue or even accelerate. For example, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reviewed recent literature and scenarios on long-term biomass deployment potentials and biomass demand for bioenergy [2,3]. In 2008, global bioenergy use accounted for a primary biomass supply of 50 exajoule (EJ<sub>p</sub>) per year. By 2050, the global biomass demand for bioenergy is projected to reach about 77 EJ<sub>p</sub>/year in the absence of climate policies (median case of baseline scenarios) and about 155 EJ<sub>p</sub>/year under the most stringent GHG mitigation scenarios [3]. In addition, Saygin et al. [4] estimate an economic potential of

biomass use of almost 20 EJ<sub>p</sub>/year for substitution of synthetic organic material in the chemical industry in 2050. Hence, a total biomass supply of 100–175 EJ/year would be required to meet the projected demand for both bioenergy and biomaterials in 2050. By the same year, the technical biomass deployment potential is estimated to be in the range of 100–300 EJ<sub>p</sub>/year [2].

The increasing demand for biomass will intensify the competition between biomass feedstocks as well as their applications; not only between food and non-food uses, but also between non-food applications for energy and materials. Thus, to ensure sustainable expansion of biomass use, we need insight in which routes (biomass value chains) are the most promising for producing heat, power, fuels and materials in terms of their technological, economic and environmental performance. This requires (i) a clear view on the status and prospects of potential value chains; and (ii) assessment and comparison of their economic and environmental performance in the short and longer term. Assessment of the

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8119074>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/8119074>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)