


Does Europe Need a Hydrogen Network?

Tom Brown, Fabian Neumann, Lisa Zeyen, Marta Victoria (Aarhus Uni), Johannes Hampp (Gießen Uni)
t.brown@tu-berlin.de, Department of Digital Transformation in Energy Systems, TU Berlin
Florence School of Regulation, Insights Webinar, 23rd November 2022

1. Motivation
2. European Sector-Coupled Model PyPSA-Eur-Sec
3. Modelling Results
4. Openness and Transparency
5. Conclusions

Motivation

2050 scenarios for EU: power demand doubles, mostly met by VRE



Problem: collides with low acceptance for power grid expansion...




...and low acceptance for onshore wind



Can electrolytic hydrogen and a hydrogen network help?

Can we substitute for power grid by producing **electrolytic hydrogen** (here or abroad) and transporting it through a new and/or re-purposed **hydrogen pipeline network** to demand?



Which hydrogen demand sectors really need a hydrogen network?


For other potential hydrogen demand sectors, they need a hydrogen network if low cost H_2 is not locally available. But for each sector there are **alternatives to transporting hydrogen**.

sector	alternatives if hydrogen not available
backup power & district heat	use derivative fuels (e-methane, e-methanol)
process heat	electrify/use derivative fuels
heavy duty trucks	use battery electric vehicles
iron direct reduction	industry relocates to cluster/abroad
ammonia	industry relocates to cluster/abroad
high value chemicals	transport derivative precursors instead
shipping	transport derivative fuels instead
aviation	transport derivative fuels instead

⇒ There is **no strict need** for a hydrogen network, but it may be easier/cost-optimal.


Challenge 1: Need spatial resolution to see grid bottlenecks & infrastructure trade-offs.

⇒ One node per country won't work.




Challenge 1: Need spatial resolution to see grid bottlenecks & infrastructure trade-offs.

⇒ One node per country won't work.



Challenge 2: Need to co-optimize balancing solutions with generation.

⇒ Optimising separately is inefficient.




⇒ Need **very large** models, big data and methods for complexity management

European Sector-Coupled Model

PyPSA-Eur-Sec


- **Open source** tool for modelling energy systems at **high resolution**.
- Fills missing gap between **power flow software** (e.g. PowerFactory, MATPOWER) and **energy system simulation software** (e.g. PLEXOS, TIMES, OSeMOSYS).
- Good grid modelling is increasingly important, for integration of **renewables** and **electrification** of transport, heating and industry.




PyPSA is available on [GitHub](#). It is [used worldwide](#) by researchers, consultants, TSOs and NGOs.

What is PyPSA-Eur-Sec?

Model for Europe with all energy flows...




and bottlenecks in energy networks.




Lots of different types of data and process knowledge come together for the modelling.

Full pipeline of data processing from raw data to results is managed in an **open workflow**.


clustered network model




power plants and
technology assumptions




renewable potentials and hourly
time series for each region



demand projections
time series





- Includes cement, basic chemicals, glass, iron & steel, non-ferrous metals, non-metallic minerals, paper, refineries
- Enables regional analyses, calculation of site-specific energy demand, waste heat potentials, emissions, market shares, process-specific evaluations

Exogenous assumptions (modeller chooses):

- energy services demand
- energy carrier for road transport (2050: BEV for light-duty, BEV or FCEV for heavy-duty)
- kerosene for aviation
- energy carrier for shipping (2050: LH₂, NH₃, MeOH)
- steel production 2050: DRI with hydrogen, then electric arc (could compete with BF+CCS)
- electrification & recycling in industry

Endogenous (model optimizes):


- electricity generation fleet
- electricity, gas, hydrogen and carbon networks
- space and water heating technologies (including insulation)
- all P2G/L/H/C
- supply of process heat for industry
- carbon capture

Modelling Results

- Couple **all energy sectors** (power, heat, transport, industry)
- Reduce net CO₂ emissions **to zero**
- Assume **energy autarky**
- Assume 181 **smaller bidding zones**
- **Conservative** technology assumptions (for 2030 from Danish Energy Agency)


Examine effects of:

- **power grid expansion**
- **new hydrogen grid**
- **e-fuel imports**




Daily average of hourly electricity balance

Demand (negative values) is higher in winter thanks to power-to-space-heat; complemented by winter wind; electrolyzers have capacity factors in 40-60% range.




Distribution of technologies: 50% more power grid volume

Electricity grid expansion of 162 TWkm...




Distribution of technologies: 50% more power grid volume

Electricity grid expansion of 162 TWkm...




...and new hydrogen grid of 260 TWkm.




Distribution of technologies: 25% more power grid volume

Electricity grid expansion of 81 TWkm...




...and new hydrogen grid of 282 TWkm.






Distribution of technologies: no power grid expansion

No electricity grid expansion...




...and new hydrogen grid of 308 TWkm.






- Direct system costs **bit higher than today's system** (€ 700 billion per year with same assumptions)
- Systems **without grid expansion** are feasible, but more costly
- As grid is expanded, **costs reduce** from solar, power-to-gas and H₂ network; more offshore wind
- Total cost benefit of extra grid: ~ € 47 billion per year
- **Over half of benefit available at 25% expansion** (like TYNDP)

With and without hydrogen network




- **Cost** of hydrogen network: € 6-8 billion per year
- **Net benefit** is much higher: € 31-46 billion per year (4-5% of total)
- Hydrogen network brings **robust benefit** if you assume energy autarky
- Benefit is strongest without power grid expansion
- Power grid expansion is better if you have to choose



- Optimal hydrogen grid capacity rises as grid expansion is restricted
- Hydrogen grid is not a perfect substitute
- Around two-thirds of hydrogen grid can re-purpose existing methane network
- NB: These results come from an updated model which allows pipeline re-purposing


With e-fuel imports instead of autarky




- Allowing imports of electricity, green hydrogen, e-fuels, **changes infrastructure needs completely**
- PtX out-sourced from Europe
- Electricity imported too, providing seasonal balancing

E-fuel imports reduce costs, but not completely

Cost-optimal import volume of 3750 TWh, reducing costs by 7% versus autarky.



There is a **large degeneracy** of different possible energy systems close to the optimum.



Openness and Transparency


- integrated energy systems are **complex** (interacting networks, storage, DSM, etc.)
- results are **strongly driven by inputs and assumptions** (cost, demand, constraints)
- subject to many & changing **uncertainties** (technology cost & availability, acceptance, politics, geopolitics)
- many **trade-offs beyond cost** (environmental impact, acceptance, political/social support, land use, industry relocation versus security, e-fuel imports)
- many **competing interests** (fossil fuel suppliers, energy-intensive industry, NGOs, public)

Open energy modelling means modelling with open software, open data and open publishing.

Open means that anybody is free to download the software/data/publications, inspect it, machine process it, share it with others, modify it, and redistribute the changes.

This is typically done by uploading the model to an online platform with an **open licence** telling users what their reuse rights are.

The **whole pipeline** should be open:




openness . . .

- increases **transparency**, **reproducibility** and **credibility**, which lead to better research and policy advice (no more 'black boxes' determining hundreds of billions of energy spending)
- reduces **duplication of effort** and frees time/money to develop **new ideas**
- allows a **high level of customisability** given code is open
- enables **new actors to participate in debate** (e.g. NGOs, researchers, public)
- *can* improve research **quality** through feedback and correction
- allows easier **collaboration** (no need for contracts, NDAs, etc.)
- is essential given the increasing **complexity** of the energy system - we all need data from different domains (grids, buildings, transport, industry) and cannot collect it alone
- can increase **public acceptance** of difficult infrastructure trade-offs

Open example: TransnetBW used PyPSA-Eur-Sec

German **TSO TransnetBW** used an open model (PyPSA-Eur-Sec) to model the European energy system in 2050. Why? Easier to build on an existing model than reinvent the wheel.



All the code and data behind PyPSA-Eur-Sec is **open source**. You can run your own scenarios with your own assumptions in a simplified **online version** of the model:

<https://model.energy/scenarios/>

Basic scenario settings

Scenario name so you can identify the scenario later

no name

Fraction of 1990 CO₂ emissions allowed

0

per unit

Sampling frequency (n-hourly for representative year)

193

integer >= 25

Demand

Demand for electricity in residential and services sector compared to today

0.9

per unit

Demand for space heating in buildings compared to today

0.71

per unit

Demand for hot water in buildings demand compared to today

1

per unit

Demand for land transport (road and rail) compared to today

1

per unit

Demand for shipping compared to today

1

per unit

Demand for aviation compared to today

1.2

per unit

Demand in industry compared to today

0.9

per unit

Sector coupling options

Yearly sequestration potential for carbon dioxide

200

MtCO₂/a

Share of battery electric vehicles in land transport

0.85

per unit


Share of fuel cell electric vehicles in land transport

0.15

per unit

Breakdown of yearly system costs

All costs are in 2015 euros, EUR-2015.



Conclusions

- There are **many trade-offs** to be made between cost, unpopular infrastructure, speed of implementation and security
- BUT: many **near-optimal** compromise solutions with **other favourable properties**
- Need to find solutions which are **robust to uncertainty** \Rightarrow calculate many scenarios
- **Hydrogen networks** reduce system costs, especially if imports and power grid expansion are limited; but can avoid both power grid expansion and H₂ network (for a cost)
- Many more **tricky topics to come**: e-fuel/material imports, industry relocation, geopolitical risk spreading, carbon transport, use and sequestration
- **Openness and transparency** and critical to ensure **re-usability**, **customisability** and **swift policy response** by diverse actors

All input data and code for PyPSA-Eur-Sec is open and free to download:

1. <https://github.com/pypsa/pypsa>: The modelling framework
2. <https://github.com/pypsa/pypsa-eur>: The power system model for Europe
3. <https://github.com/pypsa/pypsa-eur-sec>: The full energy system model for Europe


Publications (selection):

1. F. Neumann, E. Zeyen, M. Victoria, T. Brown, *"Benefits of a Hydrogen Network in Europe,"* arXiv preprint (2022), [arXiv](#).
2. M. Victoria, K. Zhu, T. Brown, G. B. Andresen, M. Greiner, *"Early decarbonisation of the European energy system pays off,"* Nature Communications (2020), [DOI](#), [arXiv](#).
3. T. Brown, D. Schlachtberger, A. Kies, S. Schramm, M. Greiner, *"Synergies of sector coupling and transmission reinforcement in a cost-optimised, highly renewable European energy system,"* Energy 160 (2018) 720-739, [DOI](#), [arXiv](#).
4. J. Hörsch, F. Hofmann, D. Schlachtberger and T. Brown, *"PyPSA-Eur: An open optimization model of the European transmission system,"* Energy Strategy Reviews (2018), [DOI](#), [arXiv](#).
5. T. Brown, J. Hörsch, D. Schlachtberger, *"PyPSA: Python for Power System Analysis,"* Journal of Open Research Software, 6(1), 2018, [DOI](#), [arXiv](#).
6. D. Schlachtberger, T. Brown, S. Schramm, M. Greiner, *"The Benefits of Cooperation in a Highly Renewable European Electricity System,"* Energy 134 (2017) 469-481, [DOI](#), [arXiv](#).


Pathway for European energy system from now until 2050

For a fixed CO₂ budget, it's more cost-effective to **cut emissions early** than wait.


NB: These results only include electricity, heating in buildings and land-based transport.



Appearance of technologies until 2050 depends on temperature target




- Consider **pathway** of investments 2020-2050 at high resolution
- Compare local production with import of **synfuels from outside Europe**
- Extend offshore wind potentials by including **floating wind** for depths > 50 m
- Examine benefits of offshore **hub-and-spoke grid topology**
- Proper consideration of **wake effects** (currently 11% linear reduction of CF)
- Cost-benefit of **sufficiency**
- Improving **open access** to models



- Carbon capture (left): from process emissions, but also from heat production in industry and for combined-heat-and-power (CHP) plants
- Sequestration limited to 200 MtCO₂/a (enough to cover today's process emissions)
- Further carbon capture is used for Fischer-Tropsch fuels (kerosene and naphtha)
- The tighter the CO₂ budget, the more is captured, and at some point direct air capture (DAC) also plays a role
- If sequestration is relaxed to 1000 MtCO₂/a, then CDR compensates unabated emissions elsewhere

Example: 100% renewable electricity system for Europe



Within 10% of the optimum we can:



- Eliminate most grid expansion
- Exclude onshore or offshore wind or PV
- Exclude battery or most hydrogen storage



Robust conclusions: wind, some transmission, some storage, preferably hydrogen storage, required for a cost-effective solution.

This gives space to choose solutions with **higher public acceptance.**


Synthetic fuels from outside Europe?

Green hydrogen with pipeline transport costs around ~ 80 €/MWh in model. Shipping green hydrogen from **outside Europe** in liquid, LOHC or NH_3 form may not compete on cost (depends e.g. on WACC), but scarce land in Europe may still drive adoption.





- **Technical potentials** for onshore wind respect land usage
- However, they do not represent the **socially-acceptable potentials**
- Technical potential of ~ 480 GW in Germany is **unlikely to be built**
- Costs rise by $\sim \text{€ } 122$ billion per year as we **eliminate onshore wind** (with no grid expansion)
- Rise is only $\sim \text{€ } 45$ billion per year if we **allow a quarter of technical potential** (~ 120 GW for Germany)




- Includes cement, basic chemicals, glass, iron & steel, non-ferrous metals, non-metallic minerals, paper, refineries
- Enables regional analyses, calculation of site-specific energy demand, waste heat potentials, emissions, market shares, process-specific evaluations

Iron & Steel	70% from scrap, rest from direct reduction with 1.7 MWhH ₂ /tSteel + electric arc (process emissions 0.03 tCO ₂ /tSteel)
Aluminium	80% recycling, for rest: methane for high-enthalpy heat (bauxite to alumina) followed by electrolysis (process emissions 1.5 tCO ₂ /tAl)
Cement	Waste and solid biomass; capture of CO ₂ emissions
Ceramics & other NMM	Electrification
Ammonia	Clean hydrogen
Plastics	Recycling and synthetic naphtha for primary production
Other industry	Electrification; process heat from biomass
Shipping	Liquid hydrogen, ammonia & methanol
Aviation	Kerosene from Fischer-Tropsch

Carbon is tracked through system: up to 90% of industrial emissions can be captured; direct air capture (DAC); synthetic methane and liquid hydrocarbons; transport and sequestration 20 €/tCO₂; yearly sequestration limited to 200 MtCO₂/a

Decarbonisation of industry: process and fuel switching



Find the long-term cost-optimal energy system, including investments and short-term costs:


$$\text{Minimise } \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Yearly} \\ \text{system costs} \end{array} \right) = \sum_n \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Annualised} \\ \text{capital costs} \end{array} \right) + \sum_{n,t} \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Marginal} \\ \text{costs} \end{array} \right)$$

subject to

- meeting **energy demand** at each node n (e.g. region) and time t (e.g. hour of year)
- wind, solar, hydro (variable renewables) **availability time series** $\forall n, t$
- **transmission constraints** between nodes, **linearised power flow**
- (installed capacity) \leq (**geographical potentials** for renewables)
- **CO₂ constraint** (e.g. 95% reduction compared to 1990)


In short: mostly-greenfield investment optimisation, multi-period with linear power flow.

Optimise transmission, generation and storage **jointly**, since they're strongly interacting.



Weekly profile for the transport demand based on statistics gathered by the German Federal Highway Research Institute (BASt).


- Road and rail transport is fully electrified (vehicle costs are not considered)
- Because of higher efficiency of electric motors, final energy consumption 3.5 times lower than today at $1100 \text{ TWh}_{el}/a$ for Europe
- In model can replace Battery Electric Vehicles (BEVs) with Fuel Cell Electric Vehicles (FCEVs) consuming hydrogen. Advantage: hydrogen cheap to store. Disadvantage: efficiency of fuel cell only 60%, compared to 90% for battery discharging.



Availability (i.e. fraction of vehicles plugged in) of Battery Electric Vehicles (BEV).

- Passenger cars to Battery Electric Vehicles (BEVs), 50 kWh battery available and 11 kW charging power
- Can participate in DSM and V2G, depending on scenario (state of charge returns to at least 75% every morning)
- All BEVs have time-dependent availability, averaging 80%, max 95% (at night)
- No changes in consumer behaviour assumed (e.g. car-sharing/pooling)
- BEVs are treated as exogenous (capital costs NOT included in calculation)

Heating sector: Many Options with Thermal Energy Storage (TES)



Heat demand profile from 2011 in each region using population-weighted average daily T in each region, degree-day approx. and scaled to Eurostat total heating demand.

- All space and water heating in the residential and services sectors is considered, with no additional efficiency measures (conservative) - total heating demand is 3585 TWh_{th}/a.
- Heating demand can be met by heat pumps, resistive heaters, gas boilers, solar thermal, Combined-Heat-and-Power (CHP) units. No industrial waste heat.
- Thermal Energy Storage (TES) is available to the system as hot water tanks.

We model both fully decentralised heating and cases where up to 45% of heat demand is met with district heating in northern countries. Heating technology options for buildings:


Decentral individual heating
can be supplied by:

- Air- or Ground-sourced heat pumps
- Resistive heaters
- Gas boilers
- Small solar thermal
- Water tanks with short time constant $\tau = 3$ days



Central heating can be supplied
via district heating networks by:

- Air-sourced heat pumps
- Resistive heaters
- Gas boilers
- Large solar thermal
- Water tanks with long time constant $\tau = 180$ days
- CHPs

CHP feasible dispatch:



Building renovations can be co-optimised to reduce space heating demand.







There are difficult periods in winter with:

- **Low** wind and solar (\Rightarrow high prices)
- **High** space heating demand
- **Low** air temperatures, which are bad for air-sourced heat pump performance


Less-smart solution: **backup gas boilers** burning either natural gas, or synthetic methane.

Smart solution: **building retrofitting**, **long-term thermal energy storage** in **district heating networks** and efficient **combined-heat-and-power plants**.

Cold week in winter: inflexible (left); smart (right)



Example: 100% renewable electricity system for Europe



Within 10% of the optimum we can:

- Eliminate most grid expansion
- Exclude onshore or offshore wind or PV
- Exclude battery or most hydrogen storage

Robust conclusions: wind, some transmission, some storage, preferably hydrogen storage, required for a cost-effective solution.

This gives space to choose solutions with **higher public acceptance.**

Online animated simulation results:

pypsa.org/animations/

Choose cross-border transmission scenario

- ☐ No transmission (each country is self-sufficient in every hour)
- ☐ Transmission equivalent to today's capacities (but not necessarily in same place)
- ☐ 2x today's capacities
- ☐ 4x today's capacities
- ☐ 8x today's capacities

Choose season

- ☐ winter
- ☐ spring
- ☐ summer
- ☐ autumn

Choose time of week

Play

Toggle flow animation: On (only Firefox/Chrome; can be CPU intensive)

Suppliers (top half-pie)


- offshore wind
- onshore wind
- solar PV
- gas OCGT
- run-of-river
- hydro reservoir
- pumped hydro
- battery storage
- hydrogen storage

Consumers (bottom half-pie)

- electricity demand
- pumped hydro
- battery storage
- hydrogen storage

Scale

- 5 GW
- 25 GW
- 1 GW capacity
- 10 GW capacity
- 1 GW flow
- 10 GW flow



Live user-driven energy optimisation:

model.energy


Results for country GB in year 2013

Base load demand: 100.0 MW

Asset	Capacity	Cap Fir used [%]	Cap Fir avail [%]	Curtailment [%]	Rel Mkt Value [%]
Solar	165.4 MW	9.8	9.8	0.0	82.3
Wind	381.4 MW	26.7	29.6	9.9	59.7
Battery power	0.1 MW	9.2			
Battery energy	0.3 MWh	56.3			
Hydrogen electrolyser	102 MW	34.2		29.0	
Hydrogen turbine	94.1 MW	17.8			213.9
Hydrogen energy	75955.4 MWh	56.6			

Average system cost [EUR/MWh]: 85.4

Time period to display: full year



Without onshore: solar rooftop and offshore potentials maxxed out

If all sectors included and Europe self-sufficient, effect of **installable potentials** is critical.

