© EODev

8th July 2021 - Monaco Energy Boat Challenge

Energy solutions, analysis of their environmental benefits - a keynote speech reflecting on the solutions available today for the yachting & maritime industry

We deliver sustainable energy solutions

Table of content

1		Introduction
	1 1	
2		Review of environmental impact of different propulsion systems from well to propeller
	, ,	

3		Zoom on benefits and barriers of various promising solutions
---	--	--

4	Conclusion & Bibliography				
---	---------------------------	--	--	--	--



Introduction - Observations

- CO2 emissions produced by maritime sectors account for approximately 3.3% of global anthropogenic GHG [4]
- 70% of emissions generated within 400 km of mainland, especially in close proximity to ports [4]
- IMO imposing limits on the GHG emissions through ship energy efficiency regulations for new constructions (EEDI, EEOI, SEEMP)

CO2 emissions from shipping industry compared with global total emissions



International shipping

- Domestic Shipping and fishing
- Electricity and heat production
- Manufacturing industries and construction
- Rail

[4] Nuchturee et. al. , 2020

6 EODev

8th July 2021 – Monaco Energy Boat Challenge Source: Adapted from [4]

Introduction – what solutions ?



Figure 3-1 A simplified diagram of the chain from energy resources to mechanical energy for marine propulsion.

Source: [5] Brynolf, 2014



8th July 2021 – Monaco Energy Boat Challenge

Table of content

1	Introduction
2	Review of environmental impact of different propulsion systems from well to propeller
3	Zoom on benefits and barriers of various promising solutions
4	Conclusion & Bibliography



Energy efficiency of propulsion systems - from tank to propeller



6 EODev

8th July 2021 – Monaco Energy Boat Challenge Sources: [4] Nuchturee et. al. , 2020; Internal documentation

Energy efficiency of propulsion systems - from well to tank





Energy efficiency of propulsion systems - from well to tank



Energy efficiency of propulsion systems - from well to tank



Sources: [5] Brynolf, 2014, [9] Esser et. al., 2016

Overall energy efficiency - from well to propeller

Total primary energy consumption per unit of useful work at propeller (Total vs fossil)



6 EODev

8th July 2021 – Monaco Energy Boat Challenge GHG emissions from well to propeller

• Eq. CO₂ emissions includes weighted impact of CO₂, CH₄, N₂O over 100 years



Global warming potential per unit of useful work at propeller



Particulate matter emissions - from tank to propeller

Eq. 2.5μ m particulate matter emissions have both impact on health and on climate change



Direct particulate matter emissions per unit of useful work at propeller

Table of content





Biomass derived fuel : what perspectives and barriers?



4th Generation Breakthrough 3rd Generation Pyrolysis **Algal Biomass** 2nd Generation Solar-to-Fuel Macroalgae **Engineered Algae** Non-Edible Biomass 1st Generation Microalgae Gasification Wood **Edible Biomass** Straw Sugar Beet Grass Sugar can Waste Wheat Corn Source: [6] Alalwan, 2019

- First generation biomass (vegetable oils): competition with the food industry, degradation of arable land due to high production yields
- Production from algae represents a large-scale production potential (better biomass yield) : 1kWh of fuel requires 10 times more surface area if produced from palm oil than from algae fermentation [11]



8th July 2021 – Monaco Energy Boat Challenge

Biomass derived fuel : example of biodiesel

- Change of surface affectation : major environmental problems linked to the exploitation of palm oil in Indonesia (deforestation, loss of biodiversity, pollution by pesticides, etc.). Palm oil is the most widely used (20% of world consumption of this oil in 2018, the main factor in deforestation due to this fruit [10])
- Production cost of \$0.07/kWh to 0.1 \$/kWh (for a European rapeseed oil chain) The price of the raw material accounts for the majority of the total production cost. The high production cost is the main obstacle to the development of the sector [12].

Upstream GHG emissions of biodiesel from vegetable oil (average France values)



Source: [2] ADEME,2021

[10] Wikipedia, 2021, [12] Gebremariam, 2018



Hybrid electrical propulsion system - Hydrogen + battery

 Hydrogen – battery hybridization helps reducing the mass of the system while maximizing its efficiency

Storage type	Eq. Electrical capacity [kWhe]	Mass [kg]	Volume [m3]
Battery LiFePo	1	11.0	0.009
H2 Cylinder 350bar	1	1.1	0.023



Mean hydrogen production costs vs GHG emissions

Source: [13]-[20]

costs

Announced

distribution

0.07 €/kWh)

for 2030 in Europe:

1.2 - 2 €/kg (0.04 -

Table of content

1	Introduction
2	Review of environmental impact of different propulsion systems from well to propeller
3	Zoom on benefits and barriers of various promising solutions
4	Conclusions & Bibliography



• The direct emissions associated with the generation of electricity using grey hydrogen are worse than the use of conventional fuels



- The direct emissions associated with the generation of electricity using grey hydrogen are worse than the use of conventional fuels
- The high efficiency of fuel cell electrical propulsion system allows for a total cost of the solution 1.5 times higher than the cost of conventional ICE system



- The direct emissions associated with the generation of electricity using grey hydrogen are worse than the use of conventional fuels
- The high efficiency of fuel cell electrical propulsion system allows for a total cost of the solution 1.5 times higher than the cost of conventional ICE system
- Internal combustion engine supplied with liquefied biogas is environmentally competitive with green H2 systems



- The direct emissions associated with the generation of electricity using grey hydrogen are worse than the use of conventional fuels
- The high efficiency of fuel cell electrical propulsion system allows for a total cost of the solution 1.5 times higher than the cost of conventional ICE system
- Internal combustion engine supplied with liquefied biogas is environmentally competitive with green H2 systems

 ICE are always associated with particulate matter emissions. If biodiesel is not associated with a change in land use (e.g. Food oil waste or algae) it can however help reducing global warming potential



- The direct emissions associated with the generation of electricity using grey hydrogen are worse than the use of conventional fuels
- The high efficiency of fuel cell electrical propulsion system allows for a total cost of the solution 1.5 times higher than the cost of conventional ICE system
- Internal combustion engine supplied with liquefied biogas is environmentally competitive with green H2 systems

- ICE are always associated with particulate matter emissions. If biodiesel is not associated with a change in land use (e.g. Food oil waste or algae) it can however help reducing global warming potential
- The production cost of biohydrogen is of the same order of magnitude as biodiesel (5-10cts/kWh) but will decrease in future years



- The direct emissions associated with the generation of electricity using grey hydrogen are worse than the use of conventional fuels
- The high efficiency of fuel cell electrical propulsion system allows for a total cost of the solution 1.5 times higher than the cost of conventional ICE system
- Internal combustion engine supplied with liquefied biogas is environmentally competitive with green H2 systems

- ICE are always associated with particulate matter emissions. If biodiesel is not associated with a change in land use (e.g. Food oil waste or algae) it can however help reducing global warming potential
- The production cost of biohydrogen is of the same order of magnitude as biodiesel (5-10cts/kWh) but will decrease in future years
- The use of 100% renewable H2 is the only way to reduce emissions to a value competitive with direct RES production system (PV, wind, hydro,...)



- The direct emissions associated with the generation of electricity using grey hydrogen are worse than the use of conventional fuels
- The high efficiency of fuel cell electrical propulsion system allows for a total cost of the solution 1.5 times higher than the cost of conventional ICE system
- Internal combustion engine supplied with liquefied biogas is environmentally competitive with green H2 systems

- ICE are always associated with particulate matter emissions. If biodiesel is not associated with a change in land use (e.g. Food oil waste or algae) it can however help reducing global warming potential
- The production cost of biohydrogen is of the same order of magnitude as biodiesel (5-10cts/kWh) but will decrease in future years
- The use of 100% renewable H2 is the only way to reduce emissions to a value competitive with direct RES production system (PV, wind, hydro,...)
- The balances do not take into account the life cycle of the propulsion technologies and the real total emissions are therefore higher than announced



8th July 2021 – Monaco Energy Boat Challenge [1] S. Bengtsson, K. Andersson, and E. Fridell, 'A comparative life cycle assessment of marine fuels: liquefied natural gas and three other fossil fuels', *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part M: Journal of Engineering for the Maritime Environment*, vol. 225, no. 2, pp. 97–110, May 2011, doi: 10.1177/1475090211402136.

[2] 'ADEME - Site Bilans GES'. <u>https://www.bilans-ges.ademe.fr/fr/basecarbone/donnees-consulter/choix-categorie/siGras/1</u> (accessed Jul. 04, 2021).

[3] P. Marques, R. Garcia, L. Kulay, and F. Freire, 'Comparative life cycle assessment of lithium-ion batteries for electric vehicles addressing capacity fade', *Journal of Cleaner Production*, vol. 229, pp. 787–794, Aug. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.05.026.

[4] C. Nuchturee, T. Li, and H. Xia, 'Energy efficiency of integrated electric propulsion for ships – A review', *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 134, p. 110145, Dec. 2020, doi: <u>10.1016/j.rser.2020.110145</u>.

[5] S. Brynolf, 'Environmental assessment of present and future marine fuels', p. 106.

[6] H. A. Alalwan, A. H. Alminshid, and H. A. S. Aljaafari, 'Promising evolution of biofuel generations. Subject review', *Renewable Energy Focus*, vol. 28, pp. 127–139, Mar. 2019, doi: <u>10.1016/j.ref.2018.12.006</u>.

[7] M. Shakdwipee and R. Banerjee, 'Techno-economic assessment of fuel cell vehicles for India', *16th World Hydrogen Energy Conference 2006, WHEC 2006*, vol. 1, pp. 322–332, Jan. 2006.

[8] F. Baldi, S. Bengtsson, and K. Andersson, 'The influence of propulsion system design on the carbon footprint of different marine fuels', p. 12, 2013.

[9] A. Esser, F. Sensfuss, and C. Amann, 'Final report Evaluation of primary energy factor calculation options for electricity', p. 121.

[10] « Biogazole », *Wikipédia*. févr. 06, 2021, Consulté le: févr. 26, 2021. [En ligne]. Disponible sur: <u>https://fr.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Biogazole&oldid=179623760</u>.



Bibliography

[11] Hartman, Eviana (6 January 2008). <u>"A Promising Oil Alternative: Algae Energy"</u>. The Washington Post. Retrieved 10 June 2008

[12] S. N. Gebremariam et J. M. Marchetti, Economics of biodiesel production: Review , Energy Conversion and Management, vol. 168, p.74-84, juill. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.enconman.2018.05.002.

[13] RTE, 'La transition vers un hydrogène bas carbone - Atouts et enjeux pour le système électrique à l'horizon 2030-2035', Jan. 2020. [Online]. Available: <u>https://www.connaissancedesenergies.org/sites/default/files/pdf-actualites/Rapport_hydrogene-pdf.pdf</u>

[14] J.-L. Druville, J.-C. Gazeau, J.-M. Nataf, J. Cueugniet, and B. Legait, 'Filière hydrogène-énergie', Ministère de l'écologie, du développement durable et de l'énergie, Sep. 2015. [Online]. Available: https://www.economie.gouv.fr/files/files/directions_services/cqe/filiere-hydrogene-energie.pdf

Bibliography

[15] M. Binder, M. Kraussler, M. Kuba, and M. Luisser, 'Hydrogen from biomass gasification', *ElA Bioenergy*, p. 85, 2018.

[16] A. Mehmeti, A. Angelis-Dimakis, G. Arampatzis, S. McPhail, and S. Ulgiati, 'Life Cycle Assessment and Water Footprint of Hydrogen Production Methods: From Conventional to Emerging Technologies', *Environments*, vol. 5, no. 2, p. 24, Feb. 2018, doi: <u>10.3390/environments5020024</u>.

[17] E. Cetinkaya, I. Dincer, and G. F. Naterer, 'Life cycle assessment of various hydrogen production methods', *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 2071–2080, Feb. 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhydene.2011.10.064.

[18] DGEC and CEA, 'Plan de déploiement de l'hydrogène pour la transition énergétique', 2018. [Online]. Available: <u>https://www.ecologie.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/Rapport%20H2%20MTES%20CEA%200106.pdf</u>

[19] Y. K. Salkuyeh, B. A. Saville, and H. L. MacLean, 'Techno-economic analysis and life cycle assessment of hydrogen production from different biomass gasification processes', *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, vol. 43, no. 20, pp. 9514–9528, May 2018, doi: <u>10.1016/j.ijhydene.2018.04.024</u>.



[9] IEA, 'The Future of Hydrogen', p. 203, Jun. 2019.

Bibliography



8th July 2021 – Monaco Energy Boat Challenge

Time to shift

