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Abstract

Carbon Capture and Utilisation (CCU) is seen globally as one of the available technologies that can contribute to avoiding the effects of global warming while securing energy supply by utilising CO₂ as a carbon source for chemical and fuel production. This thesis has measured the technical and economic performance of seven Carbon Capture and Utilisation (CCU) process designs (Base Case Models) based on best available technology. This was the first attempt to compare different routes of similar Technology Readiness Level to manufacture a liquid fuel from CO₂. In addition, this thesis also examines the techno-economic feasibility of selective CO₂ capture processes from biogas streams using ionic liquids as physical absorbents to assess the potential improvements that this developing technology could have on process performance.

The selected Base Case Models were modelled using the process simulation software Aspen Plus to determine mass and energy balances. In addition, an economic assessment was developed using Aspen Plus Economic Analyzer (APEA) and MS Excel to determine capital, operating and production costs.

The results revealed that the synthetic route based on CO₂ capture and steam methane reforming was the most promising CO₂-to-fuels route since it was able to achieve the highest overall plant energy efficiency (17.9%) and the lowest fuel production costs (£95.46 per GJ [LHV]); however this process cannot currently compete commercially with conventional fossil fuels. Further research in the specific areas suggested in this work is encouraged in order to bring fuel production costs down.

It was also demonstrated that the evaluated ionic liquids cannot compete with MEA in terms of bio-methane production costs; however, the simulation methodology developed in this study can be used as a basis for further work in the area since it allows consideration of ionic liquids made of any combination of cation and anion as well as different gas streams.
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1. INTRODUCTION

This thesis is grounded in the EPSRC-funded 4CU Project (officially called “A Coordinated, Comprehensive approach to Carbon Capture and Utilization (4CU Project, 2012; EPSRC, 2012). Specifically, this thesis is based on the work carried out in the Subproject 1 (SP1) of the aforementioned project which focuses on process analysis and optimization.

The aim of this thesis is to compare the feasibility of different CO₂ capture and utilisation processes in order to identify the most promising routes for the conversion of Carbon Dioxide into a synthetic fuel. Due to the lack of published work on techno-economic assessments of carbon dioxide utilisation processes, this thesis also aims at directing further research and development on the topic. The identification of the “best” synthetic routes is carried out through “whole system” mass and energy balances, which are calculated by using the commercial package Aspen Plus® as the process simulation software. In order to allow a fair and robust comparison among the different process concepts, initially the methodology considers only the best available and proven technology. Then, developing technologies such as CO₂ capture using ionic liquids are included in the different conceptual designs in order to examine the potential improvements in process performance (technical and economic) that these developing technologies might have.

Interpretation of the most promising process concepts can be carried out in a number of ways, such as: mass and energy efficiencies, lowest capital costs, lowest production costs, most environmentally benign or most socially acceptable. From the point of view of a chemical company investing in a project, the most promising process will be that which can generate the greatest profit. However, other factors must be taken into account at this stage of development such as the potential impacts that the process might have on the environment and the local community. Since the environmental and social impacts on the local community are
covered by other researchers from a different Subproject (SP2) of the 4CU project, this research will focus on efficiencies and costs to judge the different process designs and then identify the most promising technologies.

Since the process concepts considered in this study (CO₂ to fuels processes) are at an early stage of development, many assumptions will have to be made in order to be able to model such systems. Assuming parameters based on common practice (rules of thumb) involves a certain degree of uncertainty introduced into the system; therefore, a sensitivity analysis will be carried out in order to quantify the uncertainty in the different model parameters and examine how they can affect production costs.

Stabilization of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, increasingly high energy prices and securing the energy supply within an increased energy demand context have become major challenges in the UK as well as whole continental Europe. Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) is seen as one of the available technologies that can contribute to reduce CO₂ emissions (Figueroa et al., 2008; European Academies Science Advisory Council, 2013); however it does not solve the issues related to dependence on fossil fuels, when most of them are imported to Europe (Styring et al., 2011). In addition, not every country has enough storage capacity and the distance between the emission points and the storage locations make the cost of transport and storage excessive (Styring et al., 2011). Other reasons for searching alternative solutions to CCS may include risks related to leakage of stored CO₂ (Styring et al., 2011) or environmental impacts due to capture, transport and sequestration of the CO₂ (Zapp et al., 2012). As an alternative, Carbon Dioxide Utilisation (CDU) has attracted increasing interest in recent years as a way to mitigate GHG while reducing dependence on fossil fuels. The aim of CDU is to utilise CO₂ as a carbon source for
chemical and fuel production and thus generate value from CO₂ instead of disposing it underground.

Vast quantities of anthropogenic CO₂ are released globally every year with 31 Gt in 2011 and expected to almost double this amount by 2050 with 57 Gt (International Energy Agency, 2008). Consequently, CO₂ is (and will be) an abundant feedstock that could play a key role in securing energy supply by reducing dependence on imported fossil fuels while reducing GHG emissions to the atmosphere. Furthermore, CO₂ could be used as a chemical feedstock in the production of a wide range of chemicals (Mikkelsen et al., 2010; Quadrelli et al., 2011), which will further increase revenue from CDU.

Whereas CO₂ is already been used in the food industry or as a feedstock in the production of some chemicals, these markets are much smaller than that of fuels (Centi & Perathoner, 2009). Therefore, if CDU wants to make a significant contribution towards the reduction of CO₂ emissions, research should also focus on the conversion to fuels. The fact that the transportation sector is responsible for 22% of global CO₂ emissions encourages intense CDU research towards the production of fuels.

CO₂ hydrogenation is used to produce oxygenate-based fuels such as methanol and dimethyl ether. In fact, CO₂ hydrogenation towards the production of methanol has been subject of very intense research which has led to the commission of several plants, both bench and pilot scale, in Asia and Europe (Quadrelli et al., 2011). However, the production of hydrocarbon fuels from CO₂ (either through direct hydrogenation or through intermediate production of syngas via the reverse water gas shift reaction) has yet to be demonstrated. This is mainly due to the fact that the production of hydrocarbons via hydrogenation of CO₂ requires higher amounts of hydrogen and energy than oxygenates (Centi & Perathoner, 2009). However, there is a remarkable lack of published work on techno-economic feasibility studies in this area that supports
this argument. It is worth noting that hydrocarbons produced via the reverse water gas shift reaction coupled with Fischer-Tropsch synthesis (an industrial process that converts syngas to liquid fuels) are particularly attractive due to their ability to produce fully substitutable diesel and gasoline and thus, unlike alcohols and ethers, can be readily incorporated and integrated with conventional markets and supply chains.

The high hydrogen and energy requirements of CO$_2$-to-fuels processes are one of the main issues for the commercialization of these technologies. In order to make CDU processes as environmentally benign as possible, hydrogen should be made from renewable sources (wind, solar, etc.) or produced within the process. This endogenous production of hydrogen is especially interesting from the economic point of view since fossil-derived hydrogen is considerably cheaper than that produced from renewable sources (IPHE, 2011).

This thesis considers biogas produced from the anaerobic digestion of sewage sludge as the source of carbon in all process concepts. The biogas is formed mainly of CO$_2$ and CH$_4$, which is currently the main chemical feedstock for hydrogen production (via steam reforming of natural gas). One of the reasons why anaerobic digestion of sewage sludge was chosen is that this is a waste produced in vast amounts; in the EU, approximately 10 million tonnes (dry basis) of sewage sludge are generated per year (Appels et al., 2011). In this way, large amounts of waste can be converted into energy (fuels) via CO$_2$ utilisation. Furthermore, the anaerobic digestion of sewage sludge, despite its relatively small scale, has the highest biogas production capacity worldwide with about 0.59 m$^3$ of methane per kg of organic dry solids (Owens & Chynoweth, 1993).

It is widely known that large-scale production of fuels is necessary if a significant proportion of conventional fuels are to be replaced by fuels produced from alternative sources, e.g. CO$_2$ (AMEC, 2007; Dimitriou &
Bridgwater, 2010). In light with this, the relatively small scale of anaerobic digestion of sewage sludge could affect the commercial implementation of synthetic fuels derived from this carbon source. At the current early stage of development, anaerobic digestion of sewage sludge is seen as a suitable target application for synthetic fuel production, as explained earlier in this section; however, all process concepts developed in this thesis are sufficiently flexible to allow consideration of other carbon sources with industrial relevance if need be. These carbon sources could span from flue gases produced at fossil fuel-based power plants to exhaust gases form steel or cement plants, among others. In addition, the effect on production costs of the plant size will be assessed later in a sensitivity analysis.

Another reason for considering biogas produced from the anaerobic digestion of sewage sludge is that it is an important energy source due to its CH$_4$ content. This methane could be used either for providing the necessary amount of hydrogen for a CO$_2$ hydrogenation-to-fuels process via steam reforming of methane or for providing the necessary heat and electricity by means of Combined Heat and Power (CHP).

In the United Kingdom (UK) and overseas, the application of anaerobic digestion for several types of wet waste is a subject of intense research and industrial interest. It is estimated that wet food waste, which forms 15-20% of all municipal waste, will yield between 3 and 3.5 times more methane per tonne than sewage sludge (Gray et al., 2008). Recent social changes in the collection of domestic waste have produced large quantities of well segregated wet waste; therefore the technology is widely seen as having the potential to deliver a substantial impact on energy supply.

In addition to the advantages mentioned above, anaerobic digestion is a suitable target process for CO$_2$ utilisation technologies since it can act as a real world application requiring moderate capital investment. Furthermore, biogas production in the water industry is a process of a
smaller scale than, for instance, electricity generation facilities. This permits technology development from lab scale to pilot and demo scale more easily than if a larger flowrate of flue gas was to be processed (e.g. flue gases from coal-based or natural gas-based power plants).

With regard to contribution to knowledge, this research demonstrates the useful application of process analysis and modelling techniques to CDU processes, in particular CO₂-to-fuels technologies. The results are essential to inform industry about which synthetic routes show the greater potential regarding process efficiency and production costs. In addition, outcomes from this work will help policy makers to identify the most suitable developing technologies for synthetic fuel production from CO₂ and then to prevent research resources being spent in the wrong direction.

1.1 The 4CU project

The work from this thesis is part of the EPSRC-funded “4CU project”. The existence of this project signifies the level of interest in this topic and this interest will only increase as concern grows over the remaining fossil resources, climate change and energy security.

Carbon Dioxide Utilisation (CDU) is seen globally as one of the available technologies that can contribute to avoiding the effects of global warming. However, there are few options for economically isolating a pure stream of CO₂ from a practical process gas mixture and even fewer viable reaction routes which allow CO₂ to be converted into, for example, a synthetic fuel. Moreover, research found in literature tends to consider narrow-based research results devoid of the context required if serious effort is to be made to consider commercial implementation.

The 4CU project takes a comprehensive approach to solve those problems by developing novel separation techniques allied with advanced reactor studies to yield useful reaction routes from CO₂ to
fuel. This fuel will be carbon-neutral in the sense that the carbon would otherwise have been emitted to the atmosphere, for instance by breakdown in landfill. The project involves over 30 researchers (Academics, Post-doctoral Research Associates and PhD students) from four different universities (The University of Sheffield, Queens University Belfast, University College London and The University of Manchester) as well as a number of industrial and international collaborators. The work is of general application and it is intended to ensure coordination and thermodynamic discipline throughout the project by applying the findings to a model process system; biogas sweetening within the water industry.

The structure of the 4CU project and the interconnection between the different Sub-projects can be seen in Fig. 1.1.

![Fig. 1.1 Structure and interconnection between SPs](image-url)
Sub-projects 3 to 7 provide an ambitious research activity covering a range of advances in Chemistry, Chemical Engineering and Materials Science that are likely to take Carbon Dioxide Utilisation (CCU) forward. Sub-projects 1 and 2, by contrast, provide further research demonstrating how these advances will integrate within whole processes aimed at successful delivery of CDU. It must be noted that while this thesis forms a prominent part of the Sub-project 1 (SP1: Process Analysis), it is also involved in Sub-project 2 activities in terms of Sustainability Assessments.

The Industrial and Overseas Academic Steering Committee is formed by 13 members from across Europe and the USA and across different market sectors. The full list of institutions present in the Steering Committee and their country of origin can be found in Table 1.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Country of origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DLR</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tata Steel</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Bari</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Messina</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRS Clermont Ferrand</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINTEF</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDF Energy</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Matthey</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEFIC</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWTH Aachen University</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical University of Denmark</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho National Laboratory</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is the 4CU project’s ambition to put the UK at the forefront of international work in this field by creating a step change in the capability of the UK industrial and research communities to understand and analyse schemes for converting CO$_2$ into fuels. This is done by providing a model example and a ‘tool box’ of relevant unit operations, catalysts, materials and sustainability assessment techniques. This is the first attempt of its kind in the UK and it is emphasised that it is very different from previous work on CCS since the focus will be on Utilisation rather than Storage.

1.2 Thesis objectives and structure

1.2.1 Objectives

The main objectives of this thesis are as follows:

- Measure the technical performance in terms of mass yield, energy yield and overall energy efficiency of the selected process concepts by using the process simulation software AspenPlus to determine mass & energy balances.
- Build an economic model for each process design in order to estimate capital investment, Operating and Maintenance (O&M) and fuel production costs.
- Compare the technical and economic feasibility of different CO$_2$ capture and utilisation processes in order to identify the most promising routes for the conversion of carbon dioxide into a synthetic fuel.
- Develop a novel methodology based on the COSMO-SAC model to simulate CO$_2$ capture plants using ionic liquids.
- Conduct a sensitivity analysis on production costs for each process concept with respect to key performance and economic parameters.
The modelling task of this techno-economic study is the development of a steady-state representation of different CO₂ capture and utilisation process concepts. This will enable calculation of mass and energy balances and thus overall process efficiencies for each process concept. In addition, the mass and energy balances will be used to estimate the costs associated with selected process designs from which conclusions will be drawn in terms of recommendations for investors and policy makers.

1.2.2 Thesis structure

Chapter 2 describes the current status of CO₂ capture and utilisation technologies at different Technology Readiness Level (TRL). Some examples of successful implementation at industrial level of CO₂ transformations are also reviewed.

Chapter 3 includes a description of the processes developed to convert biogas into a synthetic fuel. Initially, the synthetic routes consider only the best available and proven technology. Then, these base case models are adapted to consider a developing technology: CO₂ capture using ionic liquids.

Chapter 4 describes the simulation methodology followed to model the different process designs in Aspen Plus. Performance indicators such as electricity produced by the CHP plant or thermal energy required by the CO₂ capture plant are included.

Chapter 5 presents the process simulation results from the evaluated process designs. A performance comparison in terms of mass yield, energy yield and overall energy efficiency of the selected process designs is also included.

Chapter 6 discusses the methodology used to economically assess the selected process concepts which are compared in terms of capital,
operating and production costs. Sensitivity analyses are carried out in order to evaluate the effect of different process parameters on fuel production costs.

Chapter 7 summarises the main results of this work and draws conclusions from them. Recommendations for future work in the field are also included in this chapter.
2. CO₂ CAPTURE AND UTILISATION

2.1 Background

It is widely accepted among the scientific community that the recent increase in man-made emissions of greenhouse gases, such as carbon dioxide (CO₂) is the main reason behind the observed rise in average global temperatures (Stocker et al., 2013; Skeptical Science, 2014). In fact, it is believed that CO₂ represents three quarters of the global man-made GHG emissions (Aydin et al., 2010). As discussed in the previous chapter, Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) has emerged in the recent years as one of the options in the mitigation technology portfolio that can contribute significantly towards the stabilisation of GHG emissions; however it does not solve the issues related to dependence on fossil fuels, storage capacity, cost of transport and storage and risks related to leakage of stored CO₂.

Aiming at partially solving these issues, Carbon Dioxide Utilisation has emerged as an alternative to complement CCS by converting the CO₂ into valuable products and then generating revenue from them instead of simply disposing of the CO₂ underground. This is of paramount importance as CDU considers the CO₂ as a resource and not as a waste, bearing in mind that the CO₂ molecule contains a carbon atom and our society relies on carbon to obtain fuels, materials such as polymers and commodity chemicals.

This chapter covers the main physical-chemical aspects of the CO₂ molecule and its transformations to value-added products, with a focus on transformations to fuels, given the main objectives of this thesis. A review of the emerging industrial applications of CO₂ conversion to fuels is also included.
2.2 The CO₂ molecule

Carbon dioxide (CO₂) is a naturally occurring molecule formed by two atoms of oxygen each covalently double bonded to a single carbon atom. It has a molecular weight of 44 Da and it is a gas at Standard Temperature and Pressure (IUPAC’s STP: 0 °C and 1 bar; (IUPAC, 2014)). It occurs naturally in the Earth’s atmosphere as a result of volcanic eruptions, plant and animal respiration as well as from forest fires. It is essential to the growth of photosynthetic plants (also known as green plants), which use solar radiation to convert carbon dioxide and water into sugars with oxygen being produced as a waste product. These are key elements of the so called natural carbon cycle by means of which the level of CO₂ in the Earth’s atmosphere is controlled and, as a consequence, the temperature of the planet.

The CO₂ molecule is infrared active due to two of its three vibrational modes: an anti-symmetric stretch and a bend. This infrared vibration activity is responsible of the role of CO₂ as a greenhouse gas. The Earth’s atmosphere is transparent to visible light coming directly from the Sun, which hits the surface of the Earth and is reemitted as infrared radiation. Although the main constituents of the atmosphere (nitrogen and oxygen) are also transparent to infrared radiation, other trace components such as carbon dioxide, water vapour, methane and nitrous oxide absorb a fraction of the radiation resulting in global warming (North, 2015).

Carbon dioxide is neither the only greenhouse gas nor the most potent. Methane has a Global Warming Potential (GWP) of about 86 times higher than CO₂ (over a lifetime of 20 years) while nitrous oxide’s GWP is 268 times higher that carbon dioxide’s GWP over a lifetime of 20 years (Forster et al., 2007); however, CO₂ is present in the Earth’s atmosphere at a much higher concentration than other GHGs. In 2013, the concentration of CO₂ in the atmosphere reached at 400 ppm by volume, an increase of nearly 50% since the start of the industrial
revolution (North, 2015). Burning fossil fuels to produce energy is believed to be responsible for the increase in CO₂ concentration in the atmosphere, a problem that will be aggravated in the near future as energy consumption is expected to grow steadily over the coming decades (British Petroleum, 2014).

Due to both double bonds present in the molecule of CO₂, it is a thermodynamically very stable compound with a standard enthalpy of formation (ΔH) of -394 kJ·mol⁻¹. As a result, it has been traditionally assumed that chemical transformations of carbon dioxide are going to be thermodynamically unfavourable. However this is not entirely true since the enthalpy of reaction is determined by the difference between the enthalpy of formation of the products and that of the reactants; therefore it is even possible for chemical transformations of CO₂ to be exothermic, as depicted in Scheme 2.1, for industrial production of ethylene carbonate from ethylene oxide and carbon dioxide (North, 2015).

![Scheme 2.1 Synthesis of ethylene carbonate from carbon dioxide and ethylene oxide](image)

A more rigorous approach to analyse whether chemical reactions are thermodynamically favourable or not relies on the free energy of reaction (ΔG_r) where ΔG_r=ΔH_r-TΔS_r. It should be taken into account that any chemical reactions are driven by differences in the Gibbs free energy between the reactants and the products of the reaction. Ultimately, in order to consider CO₂ as a ‘chemical feedstock’ the relative stability of the products as compared to the reactants must be noted. Fig. 2.1 shows the Gibbs free energy of formation of CO₂ and
related carbonaceous and other common substances (Jiang et al., 2010).

![Diagram showing Gibbs free energy of formation for selected chemicals](image)

**Fig. 2.1** Gibbs free energy of formation for selected chemicals

It is a common situation for CO$_2$ chemistry that not only is $\Delta G_r$ positive but also the reaction has high activation energy, so development of a suitable catalyst is required to achieve equilibrium more rapidly and at milder temperatures.

Carbon dioxide is currently being used in a number of industrial processes, as it shown in Table 2.1.
Table 2.1 Chemical produced commercially from CO₂ and their scale of production (North, 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemical</th>
<th>Scale of production (tonne·year⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urea</td>
<td>157,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aromatic polycarbonates</td>
<td>605,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salicylic acid</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclic carbonates</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aliphatic polycarbonates</td>
<td>76,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methanol</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As one can see, urea has by far the largest scale of production. It must also be noted that 14 million tonnes of CO₂ are used per annum as an additive in the hydrogenation of carbon monoxide to methanol (Mikkelsen et al., 2010). The industry uses approximately 120 million tonnes of CO₂ per annum, excluding the CO₂ used in Enhanced Oil Recovery (EOR), where CO₂ is not chemically converted (Mikkelsen et al., 2010). In addition, EOR allows the continuous use of a fossil resource such as oil which has been suggested to have very little or no impact on the life cycle CO₂ emissions compared to conventional extraction and use of oil (Jaramillo et al., 2009).

2.3 Transformations of CO₂

In this section, a review of the main transformations of CO₂ with the potential to make a significant difference in the process industry will be presented. CDU is a vast area of research and as a consequence it is not intended to show in this section every possible transformation of CO₂ but only the ones with the greatest potential in the short to medium term.
2.3.1 Chemical transformations

One group of possible products that can be synthesised from CO$_2$ is the organic carbonates. Since organic carbonates are currently being produced from toxic substances such as phosgene, alternative reaction routes are being researched. Organic carbonates can be produced from the dehydration reaction of alcohols with carbon dioxide by using an appropriate catalyst, as shown in Scheme 2.2.

$$2\text{ROH} + \text{CO}_2 \xrightarrow{\text{catalyst}} \text{ROOR} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$$

Scheme 2.2 Formation of carbonates from alcohols by a dehydrative condensation with CO$_2$

The main drawback of these reactions is that they do not proceed in high yields mainly due to the deactivation of the catalyst caused by the by-product water. Furthermore the syntheses of carbonates are often highly endothermic which requires energy being imported into the system or the utilisation of reactants with high free energy content so that the $\Delta G_r$ can be lowered (Mikkelsen et al., 2010).

Another group of compounds that can be produced from CO$_2$ are organic carbamates. Carbamates are stable substances derived from the unstable carbamic acid when two molecules of primary or secondary amines react with CO$_2$, as depicted in Scheme 2.3. It is the mechanism on which the CO$_2$ capture using amines is based (Styring, 2015).

$$\text{CO}_2 \xleftrightarrow{\text{R-NH}_2} \text{R-NH-COOH} \xleftrightarrow{\text{R-NH}_2} \text{R-NH-COO}^\ominus\text{RNH}_3^\oplus$$

Scheme 2.3 Formation of alkylammonium alkylcarbamate from two molecules of amine (R-NH$_2$) and CO$_2$
Also using amines, substituted ureas such as N-N'-dialkylurea can be produced using ionic liquids as a reaction media and a dehydrating agent as shown in Scheme 2.4 (Mikkelsen et al., 2010).

\[
\text{CO}_2 + 2 \text{H}_2\text{N} \rightarrow \text{CsOH} \rightarrow \text{BMImCL} \rightarrow 170^\circ \text{C, 4h} \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O}
\]

**Scheme 2.4** Synthesis of substituted ureas from CO\(_2\), primary amines and an ionic liquid (BMImCl)

Similarly, isocyanates can also be synthesised from CO\(_2\) using amines over organometallic Ti\(^{IV}\) and U\(^{V}\) catalysts (Quadrelli et al., 2011), as shown in Scheme 2.5.

\[
\text{RNH}_2 + \text{CO}_2 \xrightarrow{\text{catalyst}} \text{RNCO} + \text{H}_2\text{O}
\]

**Scheme 2.5** Synthesis of isocyanates (RNCO) from an amine and CO\(_2\)

Another class of organic compounds that can be formed from CO\(_2\) is carboxylic acids. Carboxylation of carbon nucleophiles with CO\(_2\) as an electrophile is a basic method to obtain carboxylic acids. Grignard reagents can be used as nucleophiles which react with CO\(_2\) at atmospheric pressure as shown in Scheme 2.6 (Mikkelsen et al., 2010).

\[
\text{R-M-X} + \text{CO}_2 \rightarrow \text{R-COO-MgX} \rightarrow \text{R-CO}_2\text{H}
\]

**Scheme 2.6** Synthesis of carboxylic acids from CO\(_2\) and a Grignard reagent
Esters and lactones can also be formed by combining some unsaturated compounds and carbon dioxide with metal complexes acting as catalysts as depicted in Scheme 2.7. Among the unsaturated compounds, olefins, dienes and acetylenes are good candidates for these reactions (Mikkelsen et al., 2010).

Scheme 2.7 Synthesis of a lactone from 1,3-butadiene and CO$_2$ over a palladium catalyst

Another way of chemically transform the molecule of CO$_2$ into value-added products is via its hydrogenation. CO can be manufactured in this from CO$_2$ via the reverse water gas shift reaction shown in Scheme 2.8.

\[
\text{CO}_2 + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{CO} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \quad \Delta H^0_r = +41.1 \text{ kJ·mol}^{-1}
\]

Scheme 2.8 The Reverse Water Gas Shift (RWGS) reaction

The water-gas-shift reaction has been extensively employed for the last several decades in order to adjust H$_2$/CO ratio in the syngas for Fischer-Tropsch applications (see section 4.1.3.5) and also to oxidise CO to CO$_2$ during production of H$_2$ by steam reforming of methane (Muradov, 2009). The reverse-water-gas-shift reaction, while not being historically attractive due to low demand, has attracted significant attention recently as a way to mitigate CO$_2$ emissions through CO$_2$ utilisation. The main issues regarding this reaction are its high enthalpy of reaction (requiring over 650 °C to significantly displace the equilibrium to CO and H$_2$) and the stability of the ZnAl$_2$O$_4$-based catalyst at such high temperature (Oh-Shim et al., 2003).
Another class of processes that has been extensively investigated is the hydrogenation of CO$_2$ using both homogeneous and heterogeneous catalysts. Among this group, one of the most important reactions is the catalytic conversion of CO$_2$ to methanol as shown in Scheme 2.9. The hydrogenation carbon dioxide to produce methanol has attracted significant attention recently as a way to store off-peak electricity from renewable sources; methanol can be either used directly as a chemical feedstock or converted further to valuable products such as dimethyl ether or gasoline, among others.

\[
\text{CO}_2 + 3 \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{CH}_3\text{OH} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \quad \Delta H^0 = -137.8 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}
\]

**Scheme 2.9** Catalytic hydrogenative conversion of CO$_2$ to methanol

As one can see from Scheme 2.9, water is produced as a by-product from the above reaction; a third of the hydrogen is converted to water which can be considered wasteful. Furthermore, the process from CO$_2$ is less thermodynamically favourable than that from CO (Hu *et al*., 2013). It becomes clear then that for successful implementation of this CO$_2$ utilization process to methanol at a commercial scale, further development of the catalysts being used (mainly copper, zinc and their oxides) is needed.

Another key factor in the industrial application of this technology is the availability of CO$_2$ and H$_2$. The first should not be an issue as long as a concentrated stream of CO$_2$ is available from processing plants (via CO$_2$ capture) such as steel making facilities, cement factories, among others, and also from power plants.

The availability of H$_2$ is more controversial since it is currently being manufactured from fossil fuels (mainly natural gas and naphtha) which in turn produces vast amounts of GHGs; therefore neither the reliance on fossil fuels is not solved nor the environmental performance of the
process over the life cycle. On the other hand, \( \text{H}_2 \) can be produced from water in a more environmentally sustainable way via electrochemical, thermal or photo-catalytic means as long as energy (in the form of heat, electricity or both) is brought to the process from renewable sources (Mikkelsen et al., 2010).

There is an alternative way to produce methanol: the “Carnol-process”. This is a synthetic method developed at the Brookhaven National Laboratory (USA), whereby hydrogen is produced by thermal decomposition of methane with solid carbon formed as a by-product. The produced hydrogen is reacted with \( \text{CO}_2 \) to produce methanol and water as a by-product (Mikkelsen et al., 2010). The Carnol process is shown in Scheme 2.10.

![Scheme 2.10 Two-step Carnol process for methanol production](image)

The hydrogenation of \( \text{CO}_2 \) can also be used to produce higher alcohols. These processes are thermodynamically favourable in terms of the Gibbs free energy, since water, a stable molecule with a highly positive free energy, is always produced as a by-product. An example of hydrogenation of \( \text{CO}_2 \) to ethanol using heterogeneous catalysis is shown in Scheme 2.11 \((\Delta H^0_f = -221.6 \, \text{kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1})\).

![Scheme 2.11 Hydrogenation of \( \text{CO}_2 \) to produce ethanol](image)
A similar reaction to the one depicted above, is the hydrogenation of \( \text{CO}_2 \) to form hydrocarbons such as methane over nickel, ruthenium and rhodium catalysts known as the “Sabatier reaction” (Mikkelsen et al., 2010), as shown in Scheme 2.12 (\( \Delta H^\circ_r = -259.9 \text{ kJ·mol}^{-1} \)).

\[
\text{CO}_2 + 4 \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{CH}_4 + 2 \text{H}_2\text{O}
\]

**Scheme 2.12** Hydrogenation of \( \text{CO}_2 \) to produce methane (“Sabatier reaction”)

Each mole of \( \text{CO}_2 \) converted needs 4 moles of \( \text{H}_2 \) and again the availability of \( \text{H}_2 \) becomes crucial given the fact that these reactions are suitable for \( \text{CO}_2 \) mitigation only if renewable energy sources are utilised to manufacture hydrogen and to supply the heat required in those reactions.

Formic acid can also be manufactured from \( \text{CO}_2 \) hydrogenation over a Rhodium catalyst with bulky ligands at moderate to high pressures (up to 40 bar) (Mikkelsen et al., 2010) as shown in Scheme 2.13.

\[
\text{CO}_2 + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{H} - \text{C} - \text{O} \quad \text{(Total 41 bar)}
\]

**Scheme 2.13** Formation of formic acid by hydrogenation of \( \text{CO}_2 \) over a rhodium catalyst

### 2.3.2 Photo-electrocatalytic reduction of \( \text{CO}_2 \)

Reducing \( \text{CO}_2 \) to value-added products by means of light energy is an area that has been intensively investigated. In an attempt to mimic the ability of green plants to reduce \( \text{CO}_2 \) to sugars, research in the area has concentrated on the development of materials that can be used as catalysts and energy converters for the photochemical process. Transitional metals are perhaps the most employed compounds to do
so since they absorb a wide portion of the solar light spectrum, have excited states that are maintain over time, are able to activate small molecules and cope well with degradation issues (Mikkelsen et al., 2010).

Different systems have been researched for photochemical CO$_2$ reduction. The systems differ from each other depending on what is used as a photosensitizer and what is used as a catalyst. Typical systems consist of Ru(bpy)$_3^{2+}$ as both a photosensitizer and as a catalyst or Ru(bpy)$_3^{2+}$ as a photosensitizer and another metal complex as a catalyst (Mikkelsen et al., 2010). There are dozens of systems that have been studied in the literature but a detailed review of these systems is beyond the scope of this thesis.

The photochemical process is usually carried out at room temperature and pressures, being the typical products formate (HCOO$^-$) and CO (Yan et al., 2015). Formate is produced in these systems in a total quantum yield of 15% and CO as a minor product. It has been reported that, for the most optimised systems, the reduced products can be formed in a 40% yield (Mikkelsen et al., 2010).

Although significant advances on photochemical reduction of CO$_2$ have been achieved in the recent times, challenges have been identified in order to make these systems more efficient and then being able to implement them commercially. The challenges are reproduced from Yan et al. (2015) as follows:

1. Photo-catalytic systems rely on the use of expensive and scarce noble metal in order to perform the photosynthetic process efficiently.
2. The current state of the art systems cannot reduce CO$_2$ efficiently enough with respect to the energy applied to the process.
3. A photosensitizer that can absorb a wide portion of the solar light spectrum and is highly catalytic for CO\(_2\) reduction has not been identified to date.

4. A mechanism of electrocatalysis at the semiconductor interfaces is yet to be suggested.

### 2.3.3 Chemical and electrochemical reduction of CO\(_2\)

As discussed earlier in this chapter, during the hydrogenation of CO\(_2\) to methanol one third of the hydrogen employed in the process (on a molar basis) is consumed to produce water. One way to avoid this is by reducing the CO\(_2\) to CO by using another reducing agent different from H\(_2\). This is the case of the (reverse) Boudouard reaction shown in Scheme 2.14.

\[
\text{CO}_2 + \text{C} \xrightarrow{\Delta} 2 \text{CO}
\]

**Scheme 2.14** Thermal reduction of CO\(_2\) with carbon to produce carbon monoxide

The thermal reaction between CO\(_2\) and carbon (or a carbon rich source, e.g. coal, biomass, etc.) is highly endothermic and only progresses at temperatures of 800 °C or above (Mikkelsen *et al.*, 2010). Once CO has been produced, methanol can be synthesised by adding the right amount of H\(_2\) to CO and then make syngas which can be converted into methanol over a heterogeneous catalyst (LeBlanc *et al.*, 1994).

CO\(_2\) can also be reduced to CO in an electrolysis cell. In an electrolysis process, electricity is passed through a substance that undergoes chemical change. A typical example of this technology is water electrolysis to produce gaseous H\(_2\) and O\(_2\). Despite the different configurations of electrolyzers, they all consist of an anode (positive electrode), a cathode (negative electrode) and an electrolyte that serves as the medium for charge movement between electrodes.
With respect to its operating temperature, electrolysers can be generally classified into:

a) Low Temperature Electrolysers (LTE): $T < 200 \, ^\circ\text{C}$
b) High Temperature Electrolysers (THE); $T > 700 \, ^\circ\text{C}$

Low temperature electrolysers such as alkaline and proton exchange membrane (PEM) have been available for many years with energy efficiencies of up to 75% (Laguna-Bercero, 2012). On the contrary, high temperature systems have only attracted significant attention in the last years. In spite of this, it is recognised that High Temperature Electrolysis has an important role to play in the future energy portfolio (Elder et al., 2015).

Recent investigations have shown that Solid Oxide Electrolysis Cells (SOEC) can be used to co-reduce simultaneously $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ and $\text{CO}_2$ at high temperature (over 700 °C) to produce syngas ($\text{CO} + \text{H}_2$) (Zhan et al., 2009; Stoots et al., 2010; Ebbesen et al., 2011; Graves et al., 2011; Ebbesen et al., 2012). The co-electrolysis of $\text{CO}_2$ and $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ allows the formation of syngas (as opposed to “dry” $\text{CO}_2$ electrolysis that produces just $\text{CO}$) which is a precursor to synthetic fuels such as methanol, dimethyl ether or long chains hydrocarbons via Fischer-Tropsch synthesis (Elder et al., 2015). Fig. 2.2, shows the operation of a SOEC.
As depicted in Fig. 2.2, electricity is used to chemically reduce the feed (CO$_2$ and H$_2$O) to produce H$_2$ and CO plus oxide ions (O$^{2-}$), which travel through the electrolyte from cathode to anode.

Operating at higher temperatures can be justified after taking into consideration the thermodynamics of the process. Scheme 2.15 shows that the electrolytic reductions of carbon dioxide and water are both endothermic.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{H}_2\text{O} & \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \frac{1}{2}\text{O}_2 & \Delta H_r^0 = 268 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1} \\
\text{CO}_2 & \rightarrow \text{CO} + \frac{1}{2}\text{O}_2 & \Delta H_r^0 = 283 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}
\end{align*}
\]

Scheme 2.15 Electrochemical reduction of water and carbon dioxide

As one can see, the total energy required to electrolyse CO$_2$ and H$_2$ at constant temperature and pressure corresponds to the enthalpy of reaction. According to the definition of the Gibbs free energy, the following is true: \( \Delta G_r = \Delta H_r - T \Delta S_r \). In other words and for the co-
electrolysis of CO₂ and H₂O, the total energy required for the co-electrolysis process to take place (ΔHᵣ) is composed of a free energy term (ΔGᵣ) and a entropy term (TΔSᵣ), where ΔGᵣ must be provided as electrical energy, while the term TΔSᵣ must be provided as thermal energy. Therefore, as the temperature increases, the electrical energy required decreases, making the process more efficient. In addition, reaction kinetics increase at high temperature according to Arrhenius equation, which leads to a decreased internal resistance in the cell and then, following the Ohm’s law, a greater current for the same voltage (Elder et al., 2015).

As for the materials employed to manufacture the SOEC, different systems have been suggested depending on whether they are to be used as the electrolyte, the fuel electrode or the oxygen electrode. An electrolyte material must have good oxide ion conductivity but very low electronic conductivity, while being chemically stable at different operating conditions and having a thermal expansion coefficient similar to that of the electrodes. Four systems have been suggested in the literature as having high oxide ion conductivity: electrolytes based on zirconia (ZrO₂), ceria (CeO₂), lanthanum gallate (LaGaO₃) and bismuth oxide containing materials (Elder et al., 2015). The addition of other materials, known as dopants, increases the ion conductivity while minimising the electronic conductivity. The most commonly used system of this kind is known as yttria stabilised zirconia (YSZ).

The selection of materials to act as electrodes is also challenging. Besides the issues that apply to the electrolyte, such as chemical and thermal stability, other specific constraints affect the material selection and design of electrodes. The performance of the electrode is determined by how efficient the interaction between ionic, electronic and gas phases is. The region where these three phases co-exist forming a reaction site is called the triple phase boundary (TPB) and the larger this point is, the higher the electrode efficiency (Elder et al.,
2015); therefore, understanding the TPB is of paramount importance when designing efficient electrodes.

2.3.4 Biological transformations of CO$_2$

Photosynthesis is the process by which green plants use light energy from the Sun to convert CO$_2$ and water into carbohydrate molecules, such as sugars. Therefore, replicating natural photosynthesis for large scale CO$_2$ transformations is an area of research that has attracted significant attention in the last years.

In general, photosynthesis is an inefficient process, especially in larger plants which use a vast amount of energy to build their structure. On the contrary, smaller plants experience a considerably higher photosynthetic efficiency since they do not need to use as much energy to build their structure. An extreme example of these small plants is the case of micro-algae (also called single-cell algae) which are the simplest and smallest form of vegetal life. Unlike larger plants, microalgae rely only on water as their supporting structure, allowing the cells to use a much larger amount of energy for reproduction (Mikkelsen et al., 2010). It can be then expected that microalgae are capable of using solar light to convert CO$_2$ with an efficiency ten times greater than that of terrestrial plants (Mikkelsen et al., 2010).

Due to the potential of microalgae cultivation for CO$_2$ fixation, research has focussed on finding suitable algal strains. Much of the research in the field has concentrated on the development of bioreactors. Due to the fact that the fixation rate of CO$_2$ by the algae is very slow, photobioreactors systems are very important since they allow the deployment of a vast area of algae cultivation which enhances the fixation of CO$_2$. The most widely used type of photobioreactor currently being exploited on a commercial scale is an open pond called a raceway pond (Mikkelsen et al., 2010). However, open pond photobioreactors often suffer from contamination by other organisms and
current research is going towards the optimization of closed systems. It is claimed that closed systems give an increased algae concentration which translates into an easier harvesting process (Mikkelsen et al., 2010).

A different type of biological transformation of CO\(_2\) is that carried out through non-photosynthetic pathways by anaerobic microorganisms (bacteria methanogens). This type of microorganism grows optimally between 20 and 95 °C and only uses carbon monoxide and hydrogen or carbon dioxide and hydrogen as the source of carbon and energy (Mikkelsen et al., 2010). Scheme 2.12 shows the biocatalytic conversion of CO\(_2\) into CH\(_4\) by methanogen organisms.

This biological conversion of CO\(_2\) to methane is able to operate at moderate temperatures (around 35 °C) and is not affected by the presence of other gases in the systems besides CO\(_2\) and H\(_2\)O. By contrast, the catalytic hydrogenation of CO\(_2\) into methane (also known as the Sabatier reaction), require temperatures of up to 700 °C and pressures of up to 20 atm (Mikkelsen et al., 2010). In addition the catalyst used in the reaction suffers from poisoning by sulphur present in the flue gas. Therefore the synthesis of methane from CO\(_2\) and H\(_2\) via biological pathways offers an alternative to the conventional thermal process. It must be noted that large scale production of methane by methanogens is only suitable for CO\(_2\) mitigation provided that renewable energy sources are utilised to manufacture hydrogen.

2.3.5 Reforming

Synthesis gas (a mixture consisting mainly of CO and H\(_2\)) is industrially manufactured by reacting methane and steam; a process called “steam methane reforming” (Scheme 2.16).

\[
\text{CH}_4 + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{CO} + 3\text{H}_2 \quad \Delta H^\circ_r = +206.3 \text{ kJ/mol}^{-1}
\]

**Scheme 2.16** Steam methane reforming
As opposed to steam reforming, “dry” methane reforming can be employed to manufacture synthesis gas by reacting CO₂ and methane over a nickel-based catalyst. The reaction (Scheme 2.17) is strongly endothermic and only progresses at elevated temperatures of up to 1000 °C (Mikkelsen et al., 2010).

\[
\text{CH}_4 + \text{CO}_2 \rightarrow 2\text{CO} + 2\text{H}_2 \quad \Delta H^0_r = +247.3 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}
\]

**Scheme 2.17** “Dry” methane reforming

A similar process to form syngas is known as “bi-reforming”, where steam reforming and dry reforming are combined at temperatures in the range 800-1000 °C (Scheme 2.18).

\[
2\text{CH}_4 + 2\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow 2\text{CO} + 6\text{H}_2
\]

\[
\text{CH}_4 + \text{CO}_2 \rightarrow 2\text{CO} + 2\text{H}_2
\]

\[
3\text{CH}_4 + 2\text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{CO}_2 \rightarrow 4\text{CO} + 8\text{H}_2 \rightarrow 4\text{CH}_3\text{OH}
\]

**Scheme 2.18** Bi-reforming process involving a 3:2:1 ratio of CH₄/H₂O/CO₂

Regarding industrial application, catalyst deactivation is the main problem with reforming reactions, especially with dry reforming, mainly due to coke formation, which is thermodynamically favoured at temperatures below 900 °C. The formation of coke has been attributed to the Boudouard reaction and the cracking of methane shown in Scheme 2.19 (Mikkelsen et al., 2010).

\[
2\text{CO} \leftrightarrow \text{C} + \text{CO}_2
\]
Scheme 2.19 Formation of carbon from the Boudouard reaction and by cracking of methane

\[
\text{CH}_4 \leftrightarrow \text{C} + 2\text{H}_2
\]

Since the equilibrium of the Boudouard reaction can be shifted to the left by increasing the temperature, one way of minimising coke formation would be to perform the dry reforming reaction at temperatures higher than 900 °C; however, catalyst stability becomes an issue in this range of temperatures (Mikkelsen et al., 2010). Therefore, research is currently focussing on the development of catalyst (mainly nickel-based) that can operate at high temperatures and for a long period of time.

2.3.6 Synthesis of higher hydrocarbons

Despite the fact that different alternatives have been proposed to replace fossil fuels for the transport sector, such as hydrogen fuel cells and Li-ion batteries, it is recognised that petrol and diesel vehicles will continue to dominate our transport requirements for, at least, the next two decades (British Petroleum, 2014). The concept of carbon-neutral hydrocarbon fuels from CO\textsubscript{2} has attracted significant attention recently as they can help stabilize GHG emissions throughout the life cycle, while securing the energy supply. The idea underlying this approach is to take the CO\textsubscript{2} back into a hydrocarbon molecule, provided that all energy sources used in the processes and in the manufacturing of any raw materials, e.g. hydrogen, are also carbon neutral.

The conversion of CO\textsubscript{2} into higher liquid hydrocarbons can be achieved via direct or indirect routes, as depicted in Fig. 2.3.
In Fig. 2.3, the *indirect routes* (top level in Fig. 2.3) are those which employ synthesis gas as an intermediate from which hydrocarbons or oxygenates (such as methanol) are produced through Fischer-Tropsch synthesis or methanol synthesis respectively.

*Direct routes* for the conversion of CO$_2$ into a synthetic hydrocarbon fuel employ the reaction between CO$_2$ and H$_2$ over a modified Fischer-Tropsch catalyst (Ni-based or Fe-based). In this process, an initial reverse water gas shift reaction takes place generating syngas followed by a Fischer-Tropsch synthesis whereby higher hydrocarbons are produced (France *et al.*, 2015).

The hydrocarbon fuel production from CO$_2$ allows for the use of a carbon neutral fuel that is entirely compatible with current transport infrastructure and vehicles. Furthermore, this fuel contains no sulphur, nitrogen and metal-containing compounds and it has a very low content of aromatics. It seems then that if renewable resources are used in the
manufacture of such fuels, they might have a significant contribution in the future transport fuels portfolio while reducing CO₂ emissions.

2.3.7 Inorganic transformations

The conversion of CO₂ into solid carbonates – a process known as carbon mineralisation, is being actively researched since it may allow permanently storage of CO₂ into solid materials. The process combines CO₂ with minerals that contain calcium and/or magnesium to produce stable solid magnesium and calcium carbonates. Although the process is thermodynamically favoured, it is kinetically challenging; therefore, most of the research in the area is focussed on accelerating the processes involved.

It has been suggested by researchers that instead of injecting CO₂ into geological formations to permanently store it – a process known as in situ carbon mineralization, the minerals can be mined and reacted with CO₂ to produce value-added products such as carbonates – a process known as ex situ carbon mineralization (Gadikota & Park, 2015). This process may solve the issues associated with the long-term stability of the geologically stored CO₂.

There are two schemes for carbon mineralization: the engineered weathering of silicate minerals and carbonation of alkaline industrial wastes. The first approach considers the reaction between CO₂ and earth abundant minerals such as olivine [(Mg,Fe)₂SiO₄] and serpentine [(Mg,Fe)₃(OH)₄(Si₃O₉)]. The minerals need to be mined and ground for ex situ carbon mineralization. The second scheme uses alkaline industrial wastes such as fly ash, bottom ash, cement kiln dust or steel slag, among others, and combines them with CO₂ to produce solid carbonates. The characteristics of each of these two approaches are summarised in Table 2.2.
Carbon mineralization can also be used for \( \text{CO}_2 \) capture from the atmosphere by using basic absorbents such as calcium hydroxide \( \text{Ca(OH)}_2 \) or potassium hydroxide KOH and combining them with \( \text{CO}_2 \). In these processes calcium carbonate \( \text{CaCO}_3 \) and potassium carbonate \( \text{K}_2\text{CO}_3 \) are formed respectively. The \( \text{CO}_2 \) absorption is an exothermic reaction while the desorption is an endothermic reaction, which is an obstacle to commercial implementation of this technology due to energy costs associated with the release of \( \text{CO}_2 \); however, there is an ongoing effort towards the development of carbon mineralization to capture \( \text{CO}_2 \) from the atmosphere. One promising process consists of the reaction between KOH and \( \text{CO}_2 \) to form \( \text{K}_2\text{CO}_3 \), which is then electrolysed in water. This allows not only the release of \( \text{CO}_2 \) but also the production of gaseous H\(_2\), with a limited input of energy (Mikkelsen et al., 2010).

**Table 2.2** Characteristics of silicate minerals and industrial wastes routes (adapted from Gadikota & Park (2015))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Silicate minerals</th>
<th>Industrial wastes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CO}_2 ) storage capacity is in the order of ( 10^{12} ) tonnes of carbon.</td>
<td>Limited to about 300 Mt of wastes produced annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystalline structure may be an obstacle to reactivity</td>
<td>Lack of crystalline structure and disordered surfaces improve reactivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires pre-processing such as mining, crushing, dissolution, etc.</td>
<td>Pre-processing is not necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CO}_2 ) needs to be sent to the mining site.</td>
<td>In many cases, ( \text{CO}_2 ) and industrial wastes are produced at the same facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depending on the type of mineral, extreme reaction conditions may be needed to ensure high conversions.</td>
<td>Due to their high reactivity, high conversions are achieved even at room temperature.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.8 Integrated capture and conversion

Integrated CO₂ utilisation consists of processes in which the capture of CO₂ from a practical industrial stream is not necessary. Instead, the gaseous stream containing CO₂ is used, which avoids the costs associated with CO₂ capture. There are two main processes that have been suggested suitable for integrated CO₂ utilisation using flue gas directly: mineralisation and tri-reforming.

Mineralisation using flue gas is a similar process to the mineralisation of CO₂ explained in section 2.3.7, being the main difference that CO₂ capture is not required in this case. It is beyond the scope of this document to go deeper on this kind of processes, given their similarities with ex situ mineralisation processes. It is worth highlighting though that flue gas mineralisation processes differ from each other in the type of feedstock used, the operating conditions (pressure and temperature) and the additives being used.

The tri-reforming process directly uses flue gas and methane for the production of syngas. This process, that has been actively investigated, combines the endothermic CO₂ reforming of methane (also known as “dry” reforming) and steam reforming of methane with the exothermic partial oxidation of methane and catalytic combustion of methane in a single reactor (Pekdemir, 2015). Table 2.3 show the reactions involved and their standard enthalpy of reaction (ΔH°298).
### Table 2.3 Main reactions of the tri-reforming process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction name</th>
<th>Chemical reaction</th>
<th>$\Delta H^{\circ} {}_{298}$ (kJ·mol$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRM: Dry Reforming of Methane</td>
<td>$\text{CH}_4 + \text{CO}_2 \rightarrow 2\text{CO(g)} + 2\text{H}_2(g)$</td>
<td>+247.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRM: Steam Reforming of Methane</td>
<td>$\text{CH}_4 + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2(g) + 3\text{H}_2(g)$</td>
<td>+206.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM: Partial Oxidation of Methane</td>
<td>$\text{CH}_4 + 1/2\text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{CO(g)} + 3\text{H}_2(g)$</td>
<td>-35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCM: Catalytic Combustion of Methane</td>
<td>$\text{CH}_4 + 2\text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{CO}_2(g) + 2\text{H}_2\text{O(g)}$</td>
<td>-880.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This process makes use of the CO$_2$ as well as the H$_2$O and O$_2$ in the fluegas. The incorporation of the last two reactions produces heat that is used in the first two reactions. The demand of O$_2$ can be satisfied by injecting air in the reactor, since it has been suggested that the presence of N$_2$ in the reactor should not pose a problem for the process (Halmann & Steinfeld, 2006). The CH$_4$ can be supplied from natural gas, but in order to make the process as environmentally benign as possible it can also be supplied from biogas (a methane-rich gaseous mixture consisting mainly of CH$_4$, CO$_2$ and trace impurities). Conversions of up to 97% of CH$_4$ and 80% of CO$_2$ have been reported over a suitable catalysts at equilibrium temperature of 850 °C and atmospheric pressure (Song & Pan, 2004).

#### 2.3.9 Prospective in CO$_2$ conversions

Many of the processes described in this section have the potential of mitigating CO$_2$ emissions with large scale use of CO$_2$ (Mikkelsen et al., 2010). It is believed though that the development of suitable catalysts will play a key role in the conversion of CO$_2$ on an industrial scale. There are therefore ongoing efforts to develop catalytic systems that can achieve simultaneously high energy efficiency, high reaction rates and high value products (Hu et al., 2013). However, the fact that many...
of the reaction mechanisms involved in CO$_2$ conversions are not well known has been identified as an hindrance to commercial deployment (Hu et al., 2013).

Another important aspect in CO$_2$ utilisation is that, if a significant contribution to reducing the accumulation of CO$_2$ in the atmosphere is to be made, the raw materials, e.g. hydrogen and energy inputs, e.g. electricity to the processes must come from renewable, low-carbon sources. This will ensure that the environmental impacts (global warming potential, acidification, etc.) associated with the processes are low over the life cycle of the system considered.

The cost of developing the aforementioned technologies could also prevent them from becoming a reality, since conventional, fossil resources are usually cheaper. It is crucial then that public and private organizations work closely in order to develop the processes at the right pace so that eventually costs would be brought down (Hu et al., 2013).

2.4 Previous studies of CCU systems

As in any other chemical system, process simulations are very valuable if serious effort is to be made to consider commercial implementation of syngas production from CO$_2$/H$_2$O co-electrolysis. Ideally a cradle-to-grave life cycle assessment is needed in order to evaluate overall process efficiency, cost and environmental impacts over the whole life cycle. A study by O’Brien et al. (2009) using UniSim process simulator showed that a high temperature electrolyser operating at 800 °C coupled with a high temperature gas cooled nuclear reactor achieved up to 50% overall efficiency. The main product from the co-electrolysis plant was syngas. The integral co-electrolysis model assumes local chemical equilibrium among the four process-gas species (CO$_2$, H$_2$O, H$_2$ and CO) via the water-gas shift reaction. Results from the UniSim electrolysis model were validated by comparison with results obtained from a fully three-dimensional computational fluid dynamics model.
developed using FLUENT, and by comparison with experimental data. The authors did not consider in their model the methane production from syngas (methanation reaction). The main drawback from this study is that it is assumed that a stream of pure CO$_2$ is readily available in the plant, which is fed into the co-electrolyser. This is an oversimplification especially when the source of electricity to drive the co-electrolysis process is assumed to be a nuclear plant, where a source of CO$_2$ is not available. In a real world application, CO$_2$ would have to be captured from an industrial source, e.g. a coal-fired power plant, and transported to the co-electrolysis plant site. The CO$_2$ capture and transport processes will lower considerably the overall efficiency of the process. In addition, results on syngas production costs were not provided by this study.

A techno-economic analysis study by Fu et al. (2010) also considered high temperature steam/CO$_2$ electrolysis, in this case, for the production of Fischer-Tropsch liquid fuels. As in the study by O’Brien et al. (2009), the calculation of the composition of the cathode outlet gas, a local chemical equilibrium model was used, where a chemical equilibrium of the RWGS reaction at the cathode outlet temperature was assumed. The methanation reaction was not considered in the model. The electrolyser operated at 800 °C and was fed with CO$_2$ and steam. Conversely to the study by O’Brien et al. (2009), Fu et al. (2010) assumed that the electrolyser was operated in thermoneutral mode, i.e. the enthalpy increment of the reaction system is exactly balanced by the electrical energy input to the system and therefore, an external heat input to the electrolyser is not needed. Nevertheless, the steam/CO$_2$ feedstock needs to be heated up to 800 °C prior to be fed to the electrolyser (68 kW heat load). The authors do not specify the source of this high-temperature heat. The results showed that FT diesel could be produced at a price of 1.6 €·litre$^{-1}$ (baseline scenario: CO$_2$ price 160 €·t$^{-1}$, electricity price 56 €·MWh$^{-1}$, no O$_2$ sale credit).
Another techno-economic analysis study by Becker et al. (2012) was carried out to assess the feasibility of synthetic fuel production via high temperature co-electrolysis of steam and CO₂. In this case, the methanation reaction (methane production from syngas) was considered. The authors modelled a system in which CO₂ captured from the flue-gases of a coal-fired power plant was fed along with steam into a high temperature electrolyser (800 °C) to produce syngas. The syngas was converted in a slurry bubble column FT synthesis reactor and the synthetic fuel upgrading island was also included in the study. The authors demonstrate that methane formation is negligible at atmospheric pressure, which validates the assumption of water-gas-shift equilibrium. This study is the only one of the three assessed in this section that considered the conversion of CO₂ to fuels from the source (power plant flue gas) to the final market product (gasoline and diesel). Furthermore, the authors developed a comprehensive energy integration methodology so that the combustion of the FT offgas stream can be used to pre-heat the steam/CO₂ feedstock up to 800 °C. This is particularly interesting since the authors claim that the only plant inputs needed to produce gasoline and diesel are water, CO₂ and electricity.

2.5 CO₂ capture from power plants

The purpose of CO₂ capture is to generate a concentrated stream of pure CO₂ so that it can be reacted with other chemicals to produce value added products (fuels, chemicals, etc.) given sufficient input of energy and a suitable catalyst. Depending on the process and/or source of CO₂ in question, there are three main approaches to capturing the CO₂ generated from the fossil fuel feed: Post-combustion capture, pre-combustion capture and oxy-combustion (oxyfuel) technology. Fig. 2.4 gives an overview of CO₂ capture systems.
2.5.1 Post-combustion capture

Post-combustion systems separate CO₂ from the flue gases produced by the combustion of the fuel in air. It is widely believed that post-combustion technologies present the greatest near term potential for reduction of CO₂ emissions because they can be retrofitted to existing fossil fuel-based power plants and may be applied to other industrial emitters of CO₂ such as cement and steel production plants. Fig. 2.5 depicts a simplified post-combustion capture block diagram.

Fig. 2.5 A simplified block diagram of post-combustion CO₂ capture
Current operational challenges in post-combustion capture have been addressed through the use of different methods such as chemical absorption, adsorption, gas separation membranes, and cryogenic distillation. The basic operation as well as advantages and disadvantages of these technologies are highlighted in Table 2.4.

**Table 2.4 Basic operation of post-combustion capture technologies (Spigarelli & Kawatra, 2013)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absorption</td>
<td>A gaseous component (CO(_2)) is separated from a gas stream by the use of an absorbent.</td>
<td>End of the pipe solution. Allows flexibility of operation in plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adsorption</td>
<td>A gaseous component (CO(_2)) is separated from a gas stream by the use of an adsorbent.</td>
<td>Allows CO(_2) capture from either post or pre-combustion gas streams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membrane separation</td>
<td>Membrane acts as a filter to remove one or more gas components from a mixture and generate a component rich (CO(_2)) permeate.</td>
<td>Currently used commercially for CO(_2) removal from natural gas. High capture efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryogenic distillation</td>
<td>CO(_2) is physically separated from other gas stream constituents on the basis of dew and sublimation points.</td>
<td>It has been utilised for years to separate atmospheric air into its primary components. No chemical reagents are needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite the fact that carbon dioxide capture using solid adsorbents is considered one of the most promising technologies for CCS (Figueroa et al., 2008), of all the approaches that can be taken for post combustion capture of CO₂, amine absorption is currently the most mature technology on the market.

2.5.2 Pre-combustion capture

In pre-combustion technologies the primary fuel (coal, natural gas, etc.) is processed in a gasifier using air or (preferably) oxygen and steam to produce syngas (a mixture comprising mainly CO and H₂). CO is then converted to CO₂ to produce a gas stream consisting of CO₂ and the H₂ from which the CO₂ is separated. Since the CO₂ is captured and stored, H₂ gas stream is then used as a carbon-free fuel source for energy production. Pre-combustion can be used in natural gas or coal based plants that employ Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) technology (Working Group III of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2005). Fig. 2.6 depicts a simplified pre-combustion capture block diagram.

Currently, four pre-combustion capture technologies exist, namely: Selexol, Rectisol, Fluor, and Purisol. Going into too much depth here is beyond the scope of this research. However, it must be noted that these pre-combustion technologies are proven industrial scale processes (Gale et al., 2009). The fact that increased CO₂ partial pressure allows
for efficient separation techniques or solvent regeneration by pressure reduction is much more energy efficient than heating the solvent (as in post-combustion technologies). On the contrary, a disadvantage that must be noted is the fact that for non-gaseous feed stocks (i.e. coal or crude oil) the syngas stream must be cleaned due to impurities present in the material being gasified (Gale et al., 2009). Furthermore, IGCC systems have high investment and operating costs (Kanniche et al., 2010).

### 2.5.3 Oxy-combustion (Oxy-fuel)

In oxy-combustion technologies the fuel is combusted in an O₂/CO₂ atmosphere as opposed to air. This produces a gas stream containing CO₂, H₂O, and other trace impurities. Cooling and compressing the gas stream removes the water vapour. Fig. 2.7 depicts a simplified oxy-combustion block diagram.

![Fig. 2.7 Simplified block diagram of oxy-fuel processes](image)

A fraction of the flue gas stream (CO₂ and H₂O) may be recycled and added to the oxygen stream to control the flame temperature in the
furnace since pure oxygen has a combustion temperature of about 3500 °C (Spigarelli & Kawatra, 2013).

This technology may have potential as a capture option since the concentration of N\textsubscript{2} in the flue gas is (ideally) zero, as opposed to when air is used for combustion, which lowers the processing needed (Working Group III of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2005).

Although oxy-fuel systems are able to capture nearly all of the CO\textsubscript{2}, there are drawbacks. Firstly, large volume of O\textsubscript{2} is required which increases the capital and operating costs. Secondly, oxy-combustion equipment increases plant footprint (Spigarelli & Kawatra, 2013).

2.5.4 CO\textsubscript{2} capture using ionic liquids

As previously discussed in this chapter, addressing climate change concerns during the coming decades will likely require significant contributions from CCS (Zhang et al., 2012) and CDU (Styring et al., 2011). Currently, the most developed large scale CO\textsubscript{2} capture technologies that can produce an enriched stream of CO\textsubscript{2} are based on amine solvents such as monoethanolamine (MEA) (Notz et al., 2011; Rubin et al., 2012; Zhu et al., 2013). The advantages of using such solvent rely on the fact that they offer a high CO\textsubscript{2} absorption capacity and relatively low cost. On the contrary, they are generally prone to evaporate, liable to be corrosive at elevated temperatures and expensive to regenerate due to the energy penalty (Zhu et al., 2013; Kittel et al., 2009; Abu-zahra et al., 2007). In recent years, alternative materials have been suggested for CO\textsubscript{2} capture, including: KS-1 solvent, Econamine FG+SM, ionic liquids, amidoxim, metal–organic frameworks, microporous organic polymers, zeolitic imidazolate frameworks and membranes, among others (Zhang et al., 2012).
Ionic liquids are among the class of novel solvents that have high CO$_2$ affinity and therefore have attracted significant attention in recent years (Brennecke & Gurkan, 2010; Zhang et al., 2012). They offer a number of advantages against amine-based solvents such as their extremely low vapour pressure, which prevents the solvent from being released to the atmosphere and causes lower energy penalty in the CO$_2$ stripping/solvent regeneration, and their low corrosivity (Reddy, 2009; Zhang et al., 2012). In fact, a CO$_2$ capture simulation study performed by Shiflett et al. (2010) showed a 16% reduction in the energy penalty of the process when using [bmim][Ac] ionic liquid compared to a commercial monoethanolamine (MEA) process. Other aspects such as the cost of running such a plant remain unclear due to the high selling price of the ionic liquid, although it is expected to decrease as the demand for the solvent increases. Another key feature of ionic liquids for CO$_2$ capture is the vast number of possible combinations of cation and anion, which allows the solvent to be custom made for specific applications (Lee & Lin, 2015).

Currently, research efforts focus on reducing the issues concerned with industrial applications of ionic liquids. These efforts can be summarised as follows (Zhang et al., 2012):

1. The synthesis of novel ionic liquids with enhanced absorption capacity by functionalization with an amine or other groups.

2. Designing supported ionic liquids membrane materials (SILMs) that allow the tunability of the system’s physical/chemical properties for specific applications. In most cases, the tunability of the properties consists of reducing the viscosity of the sorbent in order to increase the gas mass transfer rate into the liquid.

3. The measurement and model-based estimation of the physical/chemical properties of the multi-component systems containing the gaseous species present in the flue gas (CO$_2$, N$_2$, O$_2$, etc.) and the ionic liquids.
4. The study of the transport properties, kinetics and the design of CO\textsubscript{2} capture processes with ionic liquids considering real industrial gases. Furthermore, the assessment and comparison of energy consumption and economic performance of CO\textsubscript{2} capture processes using ionic liquids is of paramount importance.

5. The life cycle environmental impacts, toxicity and risk assessment of ionic liquids have been subjected to intense research; however, life cycle assessment (LCA) studies on specific ionic liquids used in CO\textsubscript{2} capture systems are scarce.

Point 3 in the above list is especially important since experimental data are often needed to determine the physical properties of the ionic liquid as well as its interaction with the gaseous species. Properties such as heat capacity, liquid viscosity, liquid density or vapour-liquid-equilibrium (VLE) data are often needed if robust models are to be built. The need for developing costly and time consuming experimental set-ups to measure physical/chemical properties of the pure ionic liquids and the ionic liquid-gas mixture is seen as one of the hindrances to developing process simulation studies (Basha \textit{et al.}, 2014; Basha \textit{et al.}, 2013; Shiflett \textit{et al.}, 2010). In this study, a novel methodology is developed to determine the suitability of ionic liquids for use in CO\textsubscript{2} capture processes as well as the costs associated with such processes. The methodology is based on the predictive COSMO-SAC activity coefficient model, where the interaction between the gas and the IL is determined through the screening charges on the molecular surfaces obtained from quantum mechanical solvation calculations (Lee & Lin, 2015); therefore, no experimental data are needed to quantify the interaction between the gases and the liquid. The methodology can also be used to obtain the mass and energy flows required to perform the LCA studies highlighted in point 5 of the above list.
2.6 Emerging industrial applications of CO\textsubscript{2} transformations

In the previous section, developing technologies for CO\textsubscript{2} utilisation have been summarised. The range of products is broad with complex processes involved, which make them difficult to scale-up. Demo and pilot plants have been built in the recent years focusing mainly on lower alcohols, polymers, reduction reactions and mineral carbonates. The following sections will provide a summary of these emerging applications for carbon dioxide conversion.

2.6.1 Methanol plants

Methanol is mainly used as a chemical feedstock and to a lesser extent for use as fuel blends. It is one of the top commodity chemicals with a global demand of 61 Mt in 2012 (Armstrong, 2015). Due to this fact and that it is the simplest of the alcohols (which eases the synthesis process), methanol is an ideal candidate for CO\textsubscript{2} utilisation. In addition, methanol is currently produced via catalytic hydrogenation of CO, where CO and hydrogen are produced from steam reforming of methane (or natural gas). This gives the process a high carbon footprint, which brings another reason to consider the manufacture of methanol from CO\textsubscript{2}.

The process to manufacture methanol from CO\textsubscript{2} is described in Scheme 2.9. It is not a complex process as it only needs CO\textsubscript{2}, H\textsubscript{2} and energy. However, hydrogen needs to be produced and in order to make the process as environmentally benign as possible, the preferable way of manufacturing H\textsubscript{2} is via water electrolysis, which is costly. Furthermore, a concentrated stream of CO\textsubscript{2} is required too.

The Iceland-based company Carbon Recycling International Ltd has been producing renewable methanol at its pilot plant since 2007. The process benefits from being located at a volcanic area, from where it takes the CO\textsubscript{2}. The electricity required to electrolyse water and manufacture H\textsubscript{2} is also generated at a nearby geothermal power plant.
The current production rate is 5 million litres per annum that are sold as a fuel blend (CRI Ltd, 2012). The company has signed an agreement with Methanex Inc., the world’s largest producer of methanol, to build large-scale projects (50 million litres per annum), which can be replicated worldwide (Methanex Corporation, 2013).

The Japanese chemical company Mitsui Chemicals utilises CO₂ to produce 100 tonnes of methanol per annum at their pilot plant in Osaka. This process uses the flue gas that also contains NOₓ and SOₓ from their ethylene production plant and water photolysis to synthesize hydrogen (Armstrong, 2015). The reaction is carried out over a copper- and zinc-based catalyst and the final product is used as a precursor for plastic production (Armstrong, 2015).

2.6.2 CO₂ reduction pilot plants

Mantra Venture Group is using electrochemical reduction to produce formic acid and formate salts from CO₂. The company has finished the design stage of their pilot plant at the Lafarge cement plant in Richmond, Canada, with a design capacity of 100 kg of CO₂ transformed per day (Mantra Energy, 2014). The aim of Mantra Venture Group is to use the flue gas from the cement plant and renewable electricity to produce chemicals that do not need further processing and that are exportable directly from the plant (Armstrong, 2015).

2.6.3 Reforming processes

The Korea Gas Corporation (KOGAS) is using its proprietary adiabatic auto-thermal technology to synthesise DME directly from CO₂, CH₄, O₂ and H₂O. The tri-reforming process detailed in Table 2.3 produces syngas in the first step and DME is produced from syngas in a second step. The process uses a proprietary catalyst at 200-300 °C achieving conversions of up to 68% of CO (Armstrong, 2015).
In Japan the Gas to Liquids (GTL) process developed by JOGMEC and Nippon GTL Research Technology Association converts natural gas into clean liquid fuels with up to 40 mol\% CO\textsubscript{2} in the feedstock (Armstrong, 2015). The process uses the tri-reforming technology to produce syngas from CH\textsubscript{4}, CO\textsubscript{2} and O\textsubscript{2} and H\textsubscript{2}O over a noble metal-based catalyst. The syngas is then transferred to a Fischer-Tropsch reactor where waxes and light oil are produced, obtaining zero emission of CO\textsubscript{2} (within the plant boundaries) with recycling of unreacted syngas, according to a simulation study by Ha et al. (2010). Finally, the heavy products are fed to the hydrocracking upgrading unit where kerosene, naphtha and gas oil are produced at a rate of 500 barrels per day (Quadrelli et al., 2011).

2.6.4 Polymer plants

Ongoing research has focused on the conversion of CO\textsubscript{2} into plastics since these are capable of sequestering CO\textsubscript{2} over long periods of time. There are several companies that are very close to the commercialization of CO\textsubscript{2}-derived plastics, which can incorporate up to 50\% CO\textsubscript{2} by weight (Armstrong, 2015).

The German company Bayer Material Science, in partnership with RWE, RWTH Aachen University and the CAT Catalytic Centre, is currently producing through the so called “dream reaction” the precursor to make polyurethane foam from CO\textsubscript{2}. The CO\textsubscript{2} is captured using a monoethanolamine scrubber from the Niederaussem coal-fired power plant operated by RWE (Bayer MaterialScience, 2012). Cradle-to-grave Life Cycle Assessments (LCA) have been carried on the process with results indicating that the Bayer process has a life cycle reduction in CO\textsubscript{2} emissions of 9\% compared to polyurethane foam produce from fossil fuels (Armstrong, 2015). Due to the successful research and development at Bayer’s pilot plant, the company has announced its plans to scale-up the technology to produce flexible foams from CO\textsubscript{2} at a rate of several thousands of tonnes per annum.
Novomer Inc., a company based in the United States, converts waste CO$_2$ from ethanol production into poly propylene carbonate and poly ethylene carbonate containing up to 50% CO$_2$ by weight (Armstrong, 2015). The company has developed a low cost, cobalt-based catalyst to synthesise the polymers at low temperature and pressure. In partnership with the US Department of Energy National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL), Albemarle Corp. and the Eastma Kodak Company, Novomer built a demonstration plant to test commercial and environmental feasibility of the production process. After successful results, the company announced the construction of the first full scale CO$_2$-to-polimers plant which started production in January 2015 with a capacity of 7 tonnes of poly propylene carbonate poliol per day (Chemical Engineering, 2015).

The Chinese company Jiangsu Jinglon-CAS Chemical Co. Ltd is also recovering CO$_2$ from an ethanol production waste stream to convert it into propylene carbonate poliol. Currently the company produces 22,000 tonnes of propylene carbonate poliol with plans of building a full-scale plant by 2016 with a capacity of 100,000 tonnes per annum (Sizhen, 2011).

The Japanese company Asahi Kasei Chemicals Corporation manufactures polycarbonate by means of an award winning phosgene-free process that uses CO$_2$, ethylene oxide and bisphenol A as feedstocks. This novel process is relevant not only for incorporating CO$_2$ into the polymer but also for eliminating the highly toxic phosgene. In 2002, the company started the commercial production of polycarbonate with the first plant built in Taiwan producing at a rate of 65,000 tonnes per annum. The process has been licensed worldwide since then with plants in South Korea, Russia and Saudi Arabia (Armstrong, 2015).
2.6.5 Mineralization plants

Mineralization is another key target in CDU since it normally integrates capture, storage and utilisation into a single process, what reduces the costs and environmental impacts related CO$_2$ utilisation. In addition, mineralization processes are often exothermic, which further reduces the cost and emissions.

Carbon8 Systems Ltd is a UK-based company founded as a result of ongoing research at different universities in the country. The company produces carbonate-based construction aggregate from CO$_2$ and industrial solid waste, contaminated soils and air pollution control residues (e.g. fly ash from municipal waste incinerators). In 2012, the company commissioned a full-scale production plant in Suffolk (UK) capable of producing 36,000 tonnes of aggregate per annum (Armstrong, 2015).

Calera Corporation and Skyonic are producing calcium carbonate and sodium carbonate by means of Carbon Mineralization at their plants in California and San Antonio respectively. Skyonic estimates that in 2015 commercial production will begin sequestering up to 225,000 tonnes of CO$_2$ (Armstrong, 2015).
3. DESCRIPTION OF PROCESS CONCEPTS

3.1 Base Case Models

3.1.1 Overview

As discussed in the Introduction, this work will compare the feasibility of different CO\textsubscript{2} capture and utilisation processes in order to identify the most promising routes for the conversion of carbon dioxide into a liquid hydrocarbon. The source of CO\textsubscript{2} will be the biogas produced from the anaerobic digestion of sewage sludge in a wastewater treatment plant. Initially the methodology considers only the best available and proven technology (Base Case Models); then, a developing technology, CO\textsubscript{2} capture using ionic liquids, is included in the different conceptual designs in order to examine the potential improvements, if any, that this developing technology could have in process performance.

The CO\textsubscript{2} utilisation system considered in this study is shown in Fig. 3.1.

Fig. 3.1 Process system for the production of fuels from biogas via CO\textsubscript{2} utilisation (orange lines represent process units that are not present in all process concepts. In some cases, the CO\textsubscript{2} capture plant is placed after the CHP for post-combustion CO\textsubscript{2} capture).

It consists of five sections or process steps: CO\textsubscript{2} capture from biogas, heat and power generation, syngas production, conversion of CO\textsubscript{2} to...
CO and fuel synthesis. This CO\textsubscript{2} utilisation system is fulfilled in seven different process design configurations (Base Case Models) which are grounded on typical biogas valorisation technologies. Table 3.1 shows the different technologies involved in the different process designs along with the main process steps.

Table 3.1 Summary of the technologies involved in the different process designs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process sections</th>
<th>PD-MEA1</th>
<th>PD-MEA2</th>
<th>PD-CHP1</th>
<th>PD-CHP2-CHP1-OXY</th>
<th>PD-CHP2-OXY</th>
<th>PD-CHP1-POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO\textsubscript{2} capture\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHP\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air-combustion</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxy-combustion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H\textsubscript{2} recovery\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syngas production\textsuperscript{d}</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO\textsubscript{2} conversion\textsuperscript{e}</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel synthesis\textsuperscript{f}</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}MEA-based CO\textsubscript{2} capture. \textsuperscript{b}Combined Heat and Power. \textsuperscript{c}Pressure Swing Adsorption (PSA). \textsuperscript{d}Steam reforming of methane. \textsuperscript{e}Reverse Water-Gas-Shift (RWGS). \textsuperscript{f}Fischer-Tropsch synthesis.

The choice the CO\textsubscript{2} utilisation process system depicted in Fig. 3.1 is justified by the following facts:

1. The thesis focuses on liquid fuel production.
2. Only the best available technology in each process step is considered.
3. It allowed fully implementation in Aspen Plus using existing or modified Aspen models.

The different process designs are depicted in more detail as block diagrams in Fig. 3.2 - Fig. 3.8. The first process design (PD-MEA1 in Table 3.1 and Fig. 3.2) incorporates a monoethanolamine (MEA) gas treatment unit, which is often used to upgrade biogas to the same standards as natural gas by removing CO₂ and other trace constituents (Tippayawong et al., 2010) as well as a methane steam reformer for syngas manufacturing.

Fig. 3.2 Process flow diagram of PD-MEA1
It was already highlighted in the Introduction that the high hydrogen and energy requirements of CO$_2$-to-fuels processes are one of the main issues for the commercialization of these technologies. In light with this, the selection of PD-MEA1 as one of the base case models is of particular interest because it permits the generation of H$_2$ \textit{in situ} via steam reforming of methane. This endogenous production of hydrogen via steam methane reforming is especially interesting from the economic point of view since fossil-derived hydrogen is considerably cheaper than that produced from renewable sources (IPHE, 2011).

Similarly to PD-MEA1, PD-MEA2 (shown in Fig. 3.3) also incorporates a monoethanolamine (MEA) gas treatment unit; however PD-MEA2 does not include steam methane reforming since the upgraded bio-methane is assumed to be injected into the natural gas grid.

**Fig. 3.3 Process flow diagram of PD-MEA2**

PD-MEA2 was chosen to assess the importance of generating H$_2$ \textit{in situ} (as in PD-MEA1) in terms of process efficiency and costs. The aim is to evaluate whether is more convenient to export the upgraded bio-methane at the expense of having to obtain the hydrogen externally or,
by contrast, to produce H\(_2\) within the plant via steam methane reforming.

The third case (PD-CHP1, Table 3.1 and Fig. 3.4) is based on another biogas application: combustion of untreated biogas in a combined heat and power (CHP) unit to produce electricity and heat.

**Fig. 3.4 Process flow diagram of PD-CHP1**

The selection of PD-CHP1 as one of the base case models was made in order to investigate the effect of a combined heat and power (CHP) plant on process performance and costs. Combustion of “raw” biogas in a CHP plant is a common application in the water industry. Usually, the heat produced by the plant is used to raise the temperature in the anaerobic digesters while the electricity is usually consumed within the plant or exported to the grid (ADE, 2015). In PD-CHP1, the heat generated by the CHP plant is still used to warm up the digesters while
the electricity is used to power electric equipment such as pumps and compressors employed in the CDU plant.

The fourth design (PD-CHP1-OXY, Table 3.1 and Fig. 3.5) is equivalent to PD-CHP1, although PD-CHP1-OXY employs oxygen for oxy-combustion of the untreated biogas in the CHP unit.

Fig. 3.5 Process flow diagram of PD-CHP1-OXY

Oxy-combustion was chosen in PD-CHP1-OXY since it was anticipated that a large volume of flue gas produced by the CHP unit would have to be processed downstream, which eventually would result in a large energy consumption (heating, cooling and electricity) as well as high capital costs related to the large scale of the equipment involved. In order to assess the effect that reducing the volume of the CHP exhaust stream could have on process performance and thus on overall costs,
additional process concepts are considered in this study, which use oxy-combustion of the biogas instead of combustion with air. This, on one hand, will reduce the volume of exhaust gas to be processed downstream (since there are no inert gases like N₂ in the oxygen stream). On the other hand, producing a large amount of pure oxygen from air will incur in additional costs; therefore, the trade-off between the lower volume of exhaust stream and the additional cost of oxygen production will be assessed and quantified.

The fifth design (PD-CHP2, Table 3.1 and Fig. 3.6) comprises an MEA CO₂ capture system placed before the CHP plant which in this case is fed with the upgraded bio-methane (i.e. more concentrated in CH₄) rather than untreated biogas as in the second case; thus, this is a pre-combustion CO₂ capture system.
The main difference between PD-CHP1 and PD-CHP2 is the CO$_2$ capture plant, which is present in the latter. By capturing the CO$_2$ in the biogas, upgraded bio-methane can be combusted in the CHP plant instead of raw biogas. This is of particular interest since, by doing this, the CHP plant efficiency can be increased by increasing the energy density of the fuel to be burnt. However, there is an energy penalty in the CO$_2$ capture plant as a result of the MEA re-generation. Thus, the trade-off between increased CHP plant efficiency and CO$_2$ capture energy penalty can be investigated by comparing PD-CHP1 and PD-CHP2 in terms of process efficiency and costs.
The sixth configuration (PD-CHP2-OXY, Table 3.1 and Fig. 3.7) is similar to PD-CHP2 but PD-CHP2-OXY employs oxygen for oxy-combustion of the upgraded bio-methane in the CHP unit.

As with PD-CHP1-OXY, PD-CHP2-OXY was chosen in order to assess the effect that reducing the volume of the CHP exhaust stream could have on process performance and thus on overall costs. An additional process concept is considered (PD-CHP2-OXY), which use oxy-combustion of the biogas instead of combustion with air.
The seventh design (PD-CHP1-POST in Table 3.1 and Fig. 3.8) is similar to PD-CHP1 but an MEA unit is incorporated after the CHP plant so that this process design is based on post-combustion CO\(_2\) capture (Hunt et al., 2010).

As discussed before in this section, a large volume of flue gas produced by the CHP unit has to be processed downstream in the CDU plant, which eventually results in a large energy consumption as well as high capital costs related to the large scale of the equipment involved. The process design PD-CHP1-POST includes CO\(_2\) capture plant so that it allows the removal of the excess air used in the CHP plant, which acts as an inert diluent, decreasing the efficiency of the downstream processes and necessitating higher power consumption for the subsequent syngas compression.
3.1.2 Plant size and feedstock

Biogas produced from the anaerobic digestion of organic matter is the feedstock in the proposed CO$_2$ utilisation process system because of its high CO$_2$ concentration (which eases separation), its high energy content (due to its CH$_4$ content) and the fact that it is an established industry with a high degree of implementation worldwide (Appels et al. 2011; Owens & Chynoweth 1993). This last consideration is important since the Base Case Models considered in this thesis use only the best available and proven technology. It should be emphasised that the conclusions from this research are not limited exclusively to biogas feedstocks as the processes considered allow the use of any other gas stream containing CO$_2$, such as flue gas from industrial sources; however, the consideration of alternative feedstock would be a subject of further study in the area and thus is not included in this work.

This work considers as feedstock biogas produced at a rate of 3,775 kg·h$^{-1}$ via anaerobic digestion of primary and secondary sludge, at an industrially relevant figure typified by the Minworth Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) operated by Severn Trent in Birmingham, UK (REA, 2013). The effect on production costs of several process parameters, such as plant size, will be assessed later in this work.

3.2 CO$_2$ capture using ionic liquids

As discussed in section 2.5.1, the most developed large scale CO$_2$ capture technologies that can produce an enriched stream of CO$_2$ are based on amine solvents such as monoethanolamine (MEA) (Notz et al., 2011; Rubin et al., 2012; Zhu et al., 2013). The advantages of using such solvents that they offer a high CO$_2$ absorption capacity and a relatively low cost. On the other hand, they are generally prone to evaporate, liable to be corrosive at elevated temperatures and expensive to regenerate due to the energy penalty (Zhu et al., 2013; Kittel et al., 2009; Abu-zahra et al., 2007). In the recent years,
alternative materials have been suggested for CO₂ capture, including: KS-1 solvent, Econamine FG⁺SM, ionic liquids, amidoxim, metal–organic frameworks, microporous organic polymers, zeolitic imidazolate frameworks and membranes among others (Zhang et al., 2012).

Ionic liquids are among the class of novel solvents that have high CO₂ affinity and therefore have attracted significant attention in recent years (Brennecke & Gurkan, 2010; Zhang et al., 2012). They offer a number of advantages against amine-based solvents such as their extremely low vapour pressure, which prevents the solvent from being released to the atmosphere, and their low corrosivity (Reddy, 2009; Zhang et al., 2012). Furthermore, the vast number of possible combination of cations and anions allows the solvent to be custom made for specific applications (Lee & Lin, 2015).

It is known that a potential candidate ionic liquid for CO₂ capture processes must possess a high CO₂ affinity, significant pressure/temperature dependence of CO₂ solubility and high selectivity towards CO₂ solubility over other components present in the gas mixture, such as CH₄, N₂, H₂, H₂S, etc. (Lee & Lin, 2015). Consequently, many studies have focussed on these desirable properties of the candidate ionic liquid, either experimentally or through mathematical modelling; however, just a few studies (Basha et al., 2014; Basha et al., 2013; Eisinger & Keller 2014; Shiflett et al., 2010) have focussed on whole-scale process analysis, which is essential if serious effort is to be made to consider commercial implementation of this technology.

Besides considering MEA-based CO₂ capture, this thesis also examines the techno-economic feasibility of selective CO₂ capture processes from biogas streams using ionic liquids as physical absorbents. The aim of this study is to identify the most promising ionic liquid for biogas upgrading in terms of process efficiency and costs. In order to do so, a new simulation methodology has been developed, which enables the
estimation of physical properties of the ionic liquids as well as the solubility of the gaseous species (CO\textsubscript{2} and CH\textsubscript{4}) in them. This simulation methodology can be used as a basis for further work in the area since it allows consideration of ionic liquids made of any combination of cation and anion as well as different gas streams.

3.2.1 Process description

The target application considered in this study is biogas upgrading (up to 95 vol. % CH\textsubscript{4}) using ionic liquids which selectively absorb CO\textsubscript{2} physically. Three different processes have been studied, each of them employing a different ionic liquid. The design of the three processes is identical, differing only in the type of ionic liquid used; this will allow a fair comparability between the processes in terms of energy requirements, solvent capacity, solvent loss and cost.

The flow diagram of the biogas upgrading plant is shown in Fig. 3.9. It is a pressure-swing regenerative process based on the one suggested by Shiflett et al. (2010). It consists of a multistage compressor, a packed absorption column for CO\textsubscript{2} absorption, a flash evaporator for solvent regeneration, a centrifugal pump for solvent recirculation, a pre-absorber solvent cooler and a gas turbine for electricity recovery.
The biogas (1) generated from anaerobic digestion of sewage sludge in a Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) is compressed from atmospheric pressure and temperature (1 atm and 15 °C) to the column’s operating pressure of 30 bar in a multistage gas compressor with intercooling. The compressed biogas at 15 °C and 30 bar is fed counter-currently into the packed absorption column with the ionic liquid (9) at 15 °C and 30 bar, which selectively absorbs CO₂ in the biogas to form a CO₂-rich ionic liquid solution. The upgraded bio-methane stream (3) lean in CO₂ (95 vol. % CH₄) is released from the top of the absorber while the ionic liquid solution rich in CO₂ (4) is fed into a flash drum. The ionic liquid is regenerated in the flash drum by pressure swing, i.e. by realising its pressure to 0.01 bar. It is then recycled back by the centrifugal pump to the absorption column for re-use, while the concentrated CO₂ stream (6) is released from the top of the flash drum. It should be noted that since this is a pressure-swing capture process, external supply of heating is not involved in any of the unit operations.
The three ionic liquids selected to act as physical absorbents for CO₂ capture are: 1-Ethyl-3-methylimidazolium bis[(trifluoromethyl)sulfonylimide, 1-Hexyl-3-methylimidazolium bis[(trifluoromethyl)sulfonylimide and trihexyl(tetradecyl)phosphonium bis[(trifluoromethyl)sulfonylimide. Their molecular structures are depicted in Figs. 3.10-3.12.

Fig. 3.10 1-ethyl-3-methylimidazolium bis[(trifluoromethyl)sulfonylimide, [C₂MIm][Tf₂N]

Fig. 3.11 1-hexyl-3-methylimidazolium bis[(trifluoromethyl)sulfonylimide, [C₆MIm][Tf₂N]
The three ionic liquids have the same anion, namely bis[((trifluoromethyl)sulfonyl)imide, ([Tf$_2$N]$^-$) and are based on three different cations: e.g. two 1-alkyl-3-methylimidazolium ([C$_n$MIm]$^+$ with $n = 2$ or $6$) and the trihexyl(tetradecyl)phosphonium ([P$_{66614}$]$^+$). The bis[((trifluoromethyl)sulfonyl)imide anion has been selected as ILs based on this anion have a high affinity for CO$_2$ capture (Cadena et al., 2004) in comparison with those based on, for instance, the hexafluorophosphate ([PF$_6$]$^-$) anion (Anthony et al., 2005). Imidazolium cations have been selected as they are very well reported in the literature and they have a particular structure presenting an unsaturated ring (i.e. the positive charge is mainly delocalised on the cation structure) a contrario of the phosphonium cation which presents a charge mainly localised on the Phosphorus atom. Furthermore, the selected phosphonium cation has an acyclic structure containing very large alkyl chain lengths that increase the cohesive energy of this cation in comparison with selected imidazolium cations. In fact, Van der Waals forces are higher in the phosphonium than selected imidazolium cations, in contrast to the Coulombic forces. In other words, this cation’s selection allows investigation of impacts of cation structure, cation-anion interaction on the CO$_2$ uptake and process modelling and costing. Finally, the reasons why these ionic liquids have been chosen as
solvents for selective CO$_2$ capture in this study are their high CO$_2$
affinity and CO$_2$/CH$_4$ selectivity (Lee & Lin 2015; Sumon & Henni 2011;
Lei et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2012) as well as the availability of data
regarding pure component physical properties (NIST, 2013).
4. SIMULATION METHODOLOGY

4.1 Background

Model-based representations of chemical, physical, biological, and other technical processes as unit operations are essential to fully understand the behaviour of whole systems. In these cases, the use of computer programs becomes beneficial as they allow the solution of thousands of algebraic equations in seconds (Peters et al., 2004). Furthermore, process simulation software can be used in all the three stages of a chemical process: research & development, design and production (Aspen Technology, 2013c).

Process simulation software can be divided into two groups: dynamic and steady-state (Dimitriou, 2012). In dynamic simulation, time is a variable that is taken into account in the model so that variations of process variables with time are analysed allowing the prediction and control of chemical processes in real time. On the other hand, steady-state simulation can be used for applications where time is not considered in the model and thus the variation of process variables with time is not taken into account. They are particularly useful for process development and optimization as a result of the mass and energy balances estimations. If these tools are used by an experienced engineer, they can provide an accurate estimate for process equipment and raw materials needs as well as process heating, cooling and electricity requirements (Dimitriou, 2012).

Steady-state simulation software generally models a chemical process as a group of unit operations interconnected by material streams. Unit operations can be also interconnected by heat and/or work streams (Aspen Technology, 2013d). The unit operations may include distillation columns, absorbers, heat exchangers, reactors, compressors, pumps, etc., which are represented by material/energy balances and thermodynamic principles (Dimitriou, 2012).
There are two types of steady-state simulation software: sequential-modular and simultaneous or equation oriented simulation programs. In sequential-modular simulation programs, such as Aspen Plus, the entire flow sheet is solved by solving the process units in the same order as they appear in the process; therefore, the results streams of a given unit operation become the input data for the next one, up to the last unit (Aspen Technology, 2013d). By contrast, simultaneous or equation oriented simulation programs, e.g. IPSEpro, represent the flow sheet as an equation system containing the total number of equations and variables; thus, the system is solved in one step avoiding the need of having to calculate the output of a given unit operation to be able to solve the one that precedes it (Dimitriou, 2012).

4.1.1 Process simulation with Aspen Plus

The material and energy balances as well as the utility requirements necessary for the techno-economic assessments carried out in this thesis have been calculated using the commercial software Aspen Plus. AspenPlus® is a sequential-modular simulator developed by Aspen Tech that is commonly used by the world's leading chemical and speciality chemical organizations to design and optimize their process plants (Aspen Technology, 2013c). The different types of process simulation software highlighted in section 4.1 offer a number of advantages as well as disadvantages; however, Aspen Plus has been chosen over other options because it holds the following advantages:

- It provides a vast database of components and physical properties for both pure components and mixtures. If a component is not present in the database, Aspen Plus enables the user to develop a new database for the new component.
- Although its modelling approach usually involves longer calculation times, this is off-set by the fact that the calculation path can be followed, which helps troubleshoot convergence issues.
- It possesses a user-friendly interface that clearly exposes all the program’s features. Furthermore, already built process simulation examples as well as equipment technical data are accessible from the user interface.
- Simulation of a vast range of unit operations is possible from the user-interface.
- The process flowsheet with the mass and energy balances calculations can be integrated with in other software developed by Aspen Tech such as Aspen Process Economic Analyzer, Aspen Energy Analyzer, etc.

4.1.2 General conditions

Ambient conditions and the characteristics of the feedstock (biogas) are given in the following sections. In order to make the results from the different process concepts comparable, both ambient conditions and biogas characteristics were kept constant in all cases.

4.1.2.1 Ambient conditions

Ambient conditions of all processes and unit operations considered in this study were set by default in Aspen Plus to 15°C and 1 atm (Aspen Technology, 2013d).

4.1.2.2 Characteristics of the feedstock

The biogas is generated from anaerobic digestion of sewage sludge under mesophilic conditions in a Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) at atmospheric pressure and 35 °C. The WWTP considered in this study is based on the Minworth Sewage Treatment Works in West Midlands (UK) (Source). This facility was chosen because it is a large WWTP, which allows economies of scale. In addition, the WWTP has been recently retrofitted with a water scrubber to produce upgraded biomethane (95 vol. % CH₄), which allows comparability with some of the
CDU process concepts included in this thesis (biogas upgrading using ionic liquids). The composition of the “raw” biogas is 35 mol. % CO\textsubscript{2} and 65 mol. % CH\textsubscript{4} (Appels et al., 2011). It is assumed that neither NH\textsubscript{3} nor H\textsubscript{2}S are present in the biogas since ammonia is not produced when sewage sludge is employed as the feedstock and hydrogen sulphide is produced only in trace amounts (Dimitriou et al., 2015). Although biogas produced at WWTPs is usually saturated with water, it is assumed that a drying pre-treatment has been carried out prior to feeding it to CO\textsubscript{2} utilisation plant. The biogas is produced by the WWTP’s anaerobic digester at a rate of 3,775 kg·h\textsuperscript{-1} (Severn Trent Water, 2015).

4.1.3 Base Case Models

As discussed in the previous chapter, the CO\textsubscript{2} utilisation system considered in this thesis is fulfilled in seven different process design configurations (Base Case Models) which are grounded on typical biogas valorisation technologies, i.e. combined heat and power (CHP) and biogas upgrading to bio-methane). They consist of five sections: CO\textsubscript{2} capture from biogas, heat and power generation, syngas production, conversion of CO\textsubscript{2} to CO and fuel synthesis. It must be emphasised that only the best available technology (high technology readiness level (TRL)) is considered in each section within the different base case models studied. The anaerobic digester that produces the biogas from sewage sludge is not included in the process designs since it is not a specific unit operation of the CO\textsubscript{2} utilisation plant, but it is already a part of the Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP). The WWTP uses anaerobic digestion to reduce the volume of secondary sludge by converting it into biogas and solid digestate. The following sections will describe in detail the technology involved in the different process steps as well as the modelling methodology followed to represent each of them. It should be noted that this section of the work (Base Case Models) consists of a novel implementation of Aspen Plus
standard features to get data which had not been published before. A full summary of the stream results and unit operations (for PD-CHP2 chosen as an example) can be found in the Supporting information (enclosed CD). The results (technical and economic) from the Base Case Models using the methodology described in the following sections were published in *Energy and Environmental Science* (Dimitriou et al., 2015). When data were obtained as a result of collaboration, it is appropriately stated.

### 4.1.3.1 CO₂ capture using monoethanolamine (MEA)

The flow diagram of the CO₂ capture unit is shown in Fig. 4.1. To convert CO₂ into a liquid fuel, a concentrated stream of CO₂ needs to be generated by isolating it from biogas. As discussed previously in this thesis, among the available technologies to capture CO₂ from a gas stream, amine-based regenerative systems have been identified as the most suitable technology that has achieved commercial success. This technology has been used by the natural gas industry for over 60 years to remove CO₂ from natural gas to produce food and beverage grade CO₂; the most common amine used is MEA due to its low cost (Spigarelli & Kawatra, 2013). Furthermore, as it was highlighted in section 2.5, post-combustion technologies present the greatest near term potential for reduction of CO₂ emissions because they can be retrofitted to existing industrial emitters. Among the post-combustion capture alternatives, amine-based reactive absorption is currently the most mature technology on the market (Notz et al., 2012; Zhu et al., 2013).
In the packed absorption column, the biogas (PD-MEA1, PD-MEA2, PD-CHP2, PD-CHP2-OXY) or the CHP exhaust stream (PD-CHP1-POST) is fed counter-currently with an MEA aqueous solution which reacts with and absorbs CO$_2$ to form an MEA carbamate soluble salt. The reaction mechanism related to the process can be seen in Fig. 4.2 (Xie et al., 2010).

As one can see, 2 moles of MEA will be needed to absorb (to react with) 1 mole of CO$_2$. The absorption (forward) reaction will be
exothermic while the regeneration (backward) reaction will be endothermic.

The gas stream lean in CO₂ is released from the top of the absorber while the MEA solution rich in CO₂ is pumped to a heat exchanger in which the solution is heated to its bubble point (about 120 °C) and then fed into the stripping column. MEA is regenerated in the stripper and recycled to the absorber for re-use (“LEANOUT” stream, Fig. 4.1). The regeneration conditions are maintained by the reboiler which uses medium-pressure steam as the heat source. Steam which acts as stripping gas in the column, is recovered in the condenser and fed back to the stripper, while the concentrated CO₂ stream is released from the top of the stripper for downstream processing.

The Aspen Plus features called “Design specifications” are used to obtain the desired molar split fractions in both the absorber and the stripper. In the absorber, a design specification measured the CH₄ concentration in the stack stream and adjusted the lean MEA flow rate to ensure that a target CH₄ concentration of 95 mol.% in the biomethane is achieved. The 95 mol. % value is a common set point in biogas upgrading plants (DECC, 2014b; Rajendran et al., 2014). In the case of the post-combustion CO₂ capture (PD-CHP1-POST), design specification measured the CO₂ flow rate in the stack stream and adjusted the lean MEA flow rate to ensure that a target of 90% absorption efficiency (mole basis) is met. In the stripper, a design specification measured the CO₂ molar concentration in the CO₂ product stream and adjusted the reflux ratio to achieve a 98 % vol. purity target (Sonderby et al., 2013).

A parametric study on the technical and economic performance of a CO₂ capture plant that uses MEA carried out by Abu-zahra et al. (2007) found that the optimum concentration of MEA in the amine solution was 30 wt. % at a temperature of 30 °C, which also avoided equipment corrosion problems associated with higher concentrations of MEA. The
optimum operating pressure of both the absorber and stripper was found to be 1.013 bar and 2.1 bar respectively (Abu-zahra et al., 2007). As for the CO\textsubscript{2} lean solvent loading (which is a measure of the degree of regeneration of the solvent in the stripper) an optimum value of 0.32 mol CO\textsubscript{2}/mol MEA was taken from the same reference as above.

In the CO\textsubscript{2} capture plant, the absorber and stripper columns are modelled using the RadFrac subroutine which is suitable for modelling all types of multistage vapour-liquid fractionation operations (Aspen Technology, 2013d). The rigorous “rate-based” calculation option was used in the RadFrac model so that mass transfer rates can be calculated at each stage. The other calculation option available, equilibrium calculation, assumes that equilibrium is achieved at each stage, which was not appropriate in the systems studied in this thesis.

The thermodynamic and physical properties are estimated using the ENRTL-RK (Electrolyte Non-Random Two-Liquid-Redlich–Kwong) method which is suitable for mixed electrolyte systems containing water up to medium pressures. This method is based on the Unsymmetric Electrolyte NRTL property model. It uses the Redlich–Kwong equation of state for estimating the vapour phase properties, the unsymmetric reference state (infinite dilution in aqueous solution) for ionic species, the Henry's law for solubility of supercritical gases and the unsymmetric Electrolyte NRTL method of handling zwitterions. The ENRTL-RK uses a single thermodynamics framework to calculate the activity coefficients, Gibbs free energy and enthalpy, instead of using separate models as in the ELECNRTL method, which reduces calculation times while increasing simulation flexibility. This method is coupled with an electrolyte calculation option which models the electrolyte solution chemistry as well as the reactions that take place in both the absorber and the stripper. The electrolyte solution chemistry has been modelled with a “CHEMISTRY” option in Aspen Plus, which is used as the global electrolyte calculation option in the simulation model. The five equilibrium reactions implemented in the “CHEMISTRY” option in
Aspen Plus are highlighted in Fig. 4.3, according to the Aspen MEA rate-based model (AspenTech, 2012c).

**Reaction 1**  \( MEAH^+ + H_2O \rightleftharpoons MEA + H_3O^+ \)

**Reaction 2**  \( MEACOO^- + H_2O \rightleftharpoons MEA + HCO_3^- \)

**Reaction 3**  \( 2H_2O \rightleftharpoons H_3O^+ + OH^- \)

**Reaction 4**  \( CO_2 + 2H_2O \rightleftharpoons HCO_3^- + H_3O^+ \)

**Reaction 5**  \( HCO_3^- + H_2O \rightleftharpoons CO_3^{2-} + H_3O^+ \)

Fig. 4.3 Equilibrium reactions implemented in the “CHEMISTRY” option in Aspen Plus

The equilibrium constants are computed by Aspen Physical Property System from the Gibbs free energies of the reaction.

In addition to the electrolyte solution chemistry, two reaction models, called ABSORBER and STRIPPER respectively, have been created. In both the absorber and stripper, all reactions are assumed to be in chemical equilibrium except those of CO\(_2\) with OH\(^-\) and CO\(_2\) with MEA, according to the Aspen MEA rate-based model (AspenTech, 2012c). The reactions implemented in the ABSORBER and STRIPPER reactions models in Aspen Plus are highlighted in Fig. 4.4.
Reaction 1 (equilibrium) \( MEAH^+ + H_2O \rightleftharpoons MEA + H_3O^+ \)

Reaction 2 (equilibrium) \( 2H_2O \rightleftharpoons H_3O^+ + OH^- \)

Reaction 3 (equilibrium) \( HCO_3^- + H_2O \rightleftharpoons CO_3^{2-} + H_3O^+ \)

Reaction 4 (kinetic) \( CO_2 + OH^- \rightarrow HCO_3^- \)

Reaction 5 (kinetic) \( HCO_3^- \rightarrow CO_2 + OH^- \)

Reaction 6 (kinetic) \( MEA + CO_2 + H_2O \rightarrow MEACO^- + H_3O^+ \)

Reaction 7 (kinetic) \( MEACO^- + H_3O^+ \rightarrow MEA + CO_2 + H_2O \)

Fig. 4.4 Reactions implemented in the ABSORBER and STRIPPER reactions models in Aspen Plus

Power law expressions are used for the rate-controlled reactions (reactions 4-7 in Absorber/Stripper). The general power law expression is given by Eq. 4.1.

\[
r = k(T/T_0)^n \exp \left[ \left( \frac{-E}{R} \right) \left( \frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{T_0} \right) \right] \prod_{i=1}^{N} (x_i \gamma_i)^{a_i} \quad \text{Eq. 4.1}
\]

where \( r \) is the rate of reaction, \( k \) the pre-exponential factor, \( T \) the absolute temperature, \( T_0 \) the reference temperature, \( n \) the temperature exponent, \( E \) the activation energy, \( R \) the universal gas constant, \( N \) the number of components in the reaction, \( x_i \) the mole fraction of component \( i \), \( \gamma_i \) the activity coefficient of component \( i \), and \( a_i \) the stoichiometric coefficient of component \( i \) in the reaction equation.

In Aspen Plus \( T_0 \) is not specified; therefore the reduced power law expression is used, as defined by Eq. 4.2.

\[
r = kT^n \exp \left( \frac{-E}{RT} \right) \prod_{i=1}^{N} (x_i \gamma_i)^{a_i} \quad \text{Eq. 4.2}
\]

In Eq. 4.2, the temperature exponent \( n \) is zero whereas \( k \) and \( E \) are given in Table 4.1 (AspenTech, 2012).
Table 4.1 Parameters $k$ and $E$ in Eq. 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction number</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$E$ ($\text{cal} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1.33 \times 10^{17}$</td>
<td>13249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$6.63 \times 10^{16}$</td>
<td>25656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$3.02 \times 10^{14}$</td>
<td>9856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (Absorber)</td>
<td>$5.52 \times 10^{23}$</td>
<td>16518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (Stripper)</td>
<td>$6.50 \times 10^{27}$</td>
<td>22782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The packed absorber and stripper characteristic used in the process designs PD-MEA1, PD-MEA2, PD-CHP2 and PD-CHP2-OXY as implemented in Aspen Plus are summarised in Table 4.2. It should be noted that in these process designs the CO$_2$ is separated from the biogas stream.

**Table 4.2** Specification of the packed absorption and stripping columns (PD-MEA1, PD-MEA2, PD-CHP2 and PD-CHP2-OXY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Absorber</th>
<th>Stripper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of theoretical stages</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculation type</td>
<td>Rate-based</td>
<td>Rate-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condenser</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Kettle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reboiler</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Partial-vapour-liquid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflux ratio (molar)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.47002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boilup ratio (molar)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.05575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergence algorithm</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packing type</td>
<td>Pall rings (25 mm)</td>
<td>Pall rings (25 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column diameter (m)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packing height (m)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The packed absorber and stripper characteristic used in the process design PD-CHP1-POST as implemented in Aspen Plus are summarised in Table 4.3. It should be noted that in this process design the CO$_2$ is separated from CHP exhaust stream.
Table 4.3 Specification of the packed absorption and stripping columns (PD-CHP1-POST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Absorber</th>
<th>Stripper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of theoretical stages</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculation type</td>
<td>Rate-based</td>
<td>Rate-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condenser</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Kettle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reboiler</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Partial-vapour-liquid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflux ratio (molar)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.50001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boilup ratio (molar)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.06525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergence algorithm</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packing type</td>
<td>Pall rings (25 mm)</td>
<td>Pall rings (25 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column diameter (m)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packing height (m)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of theoretical stages was chosen as the minimum that made the model converge. Any further increase in the number of theoretical stages did not result in any improvements in performance. The rate-based calculation method was chosen since it is a fundamental, rigorous approach which avoids the approximations of efficiency and Height Equivalent to a Theoretical Plate (HETP). Rate-based distillation calculations directly account for the mass and heat transfer rate processes in the system of equations representing the separation unit (Aspen Technology, 2013d).

The height of the absorption column was specified as the one to achieve the desired CH₄ purity in the upgraded bio-methane (95 mol. % CH₄) or the desired 90% absorption efficiency (PD-CHP1-POST) with a minimum lean MEA solution flow-rate. As for the stripping column, its height was specified as the one to achieve the desired regeneration of the MEA solution (0.32 mol CO₂/mol MEA).
The diameter of both the absorber and the stripper were chosen as the minimum that complied with the Aspen Plus default column flooding condition (a vapour velocity value 80% of that which would cause flooding).

Although random packings are characterised by lower mass transfer rates than structured packing they offer lower costs and achieve better liquid distribution (Sonderby et al., 2013); therefore, pall rings were used in the absorber and stripper as the type of packing. The liquid and vapour phase binary mass transfer coefficients as well as the total interfacial area for mass transfer were estimated using the Billet & Schulte’s correlation, which provides good estimates of mass transfer-related parameters over a wide range of packing types, sizes and operating conditions (Billet & Schultes, 1993).

The liquid and vapour phase binary mass transfer coefficients $k_{i,k}^L$ and $k_{i,k}^V$ are defined respectively by Billet & Schulte as:

$$k_{i,k}^L = C_L \left( \frac{g \rho_L^L}{\mu_L} \right)^{0.167} \left( \frac{D_{i,k}^L}{d_h} \left( \frac{u_s^L}{a_p} \right) \right)^{0.333}$$

$$k_{i,k}^V = C_V \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon - h_t}} \right) \left( \frac{a_p}{d_h} \right) D_{i,k}^V Re_V^{0.75} Sc_V^{0.333}$$

where $C_L$ and $C_V$ are the mass transfer coefficient parameters for liquid and vapour respectively, characteristic of the shape and structure of the packing, $g$ the gravitational gravity, $\rho_L^L$ the density of the liquid, $\mu_L$ the viscosity of the liquid, $D_{i,k}^L$ and $D_{i,k}^V$ the diffusivity of the liquid and vapour respectively, $d_h$ the hydraulic diameter, $u_s^L$ the superficial velocity of the liquid, $a_p$ the specific area of the packing, $\varepsilon$ the void fraction of the packing, $h_t$ the fractional holdup and $Re_V$ and $Sc_V$ the Reynolds and Schmidt number for the vapour, respectively.

The total interfacial area for mass transfer $a^I$ is defined as:
\[ a^l = a_e A_t h_p \]  \quad \text{Eq. 4.5}

where \( A_t \) is the cross-sectional area of the column, \( h_p \) the height of the packed section and \( a_e \) the effective surface area per unit volume of the column, which is calculated using:

\[
a_e = a_p \sqrt[1.5]{\frac{d_h}{d_p}} \left( \frac{\rho_p^L}{\mu^L} \right)^{-0.2} \left( \frac{(u_x^L)^2 \rho_t^L d_h}{\sigma} \right)^{0.75} \left( \frac{(u_z^L)^2}{g d_h} \right)^{-0.45} \]  \quad \text{Eq. 4.6}

where \( \sigma \) is the liquid surface tension.

As depicted in Fig. 4.1, a centrifugal pump is used in order to pressurize the rich MEA solution to the stripper’s operating pressure (2.1 bar). The centrifugal pump is modelled using the Aspen Pump subroutine. The pump efficiency is set to 0.7, which is assumed to be a reasonable value for centrifugal pumps (Coulson et al., 1995).

A heat exchanger is also used to preheat the rich MEA solution to its bubble point thanks to the heat provided by the lean MEA solution, which is heated in the stripper by means of medium-pressure steam. The heat exchanger is modelled using the Aspen HeatX subroutine assuming a constant value of the overall heat transfer coefficient, \( U=0.85 \text{ kW} \cdot \text{K}^{-1} \cdot \text{m}^2 \) (default value in Aspen Plus) and a short-cut calculation method, which is able to provide accurate results at this stage of development (Aspen Technology, 2013d).

Table 4.4 shows the specifications of all other equipment not included in Tables 3.3-3.4 for the process designs PD-MEA1, PD-MEA2, PD-CHP2 and PD-CHP2-OXY and PD-CHP1-POST as implemented in Aspen Plus.
Table 4.4 Specifications of the CO₂ capture plant equipment of the process designs PD-MEA1, PD-MEA2, PD-CHP2, PD-CHP2-OXY, PD-CHP1-POST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit operation</th>
<th>Aspen Plus block</th>
<th>Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pump</td>
<td>Pump</td>
<td>Discharge pressure: 3.1 bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat Exchanger</td>
<td>HeatX</td>
<td>Hot stream outlet temp.: 51 °C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stripper pre-heater</td>
<td>Heater</td>
<td>Vapour fraction a: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorber pre-cooler</td>
<td>Heater</td>
<td>Hot stream outlet temp.: 30 °C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vapour fraction value of zero corresponds in Aspen Plus to the mixture bubble point

The CO₂ capture model accounts for any solvent evaporative losses from both the absorber and stripper, which are a consequence of the relatively high vapour pressure of the MEA. In addition to the evaporative losses, degradation of the solvent occurs during the stripping/regeneration of the MEA, mainly through thermal and oxidation pathways (Strazisar et al., 2003; Zoannou et al., 2013); however, due to the complexity inherent to the MEA degradation mechanism, the solvent losses due to degradation are not calculated by the model. Instead, a MEA top-up rate of 175 mmol of MEA per mol of CO₂ captured is specified in order to account for the degradation and evaporation losses (Zhu et al., 2013), which was taken into account in the economic assessment presented in Chapter 6. This is a key issue regarding operation of amine-based CO₂ capture plants since the cost of the solvent may represent up to 75% of the operating costs of the plant (Strazisar et al., 2003).

The thermal energy required by the reboiler to regenerate the solvent (per tonne of CO₂ captured) and the amount of MEA solution needed (also per tonne of CO₂ captured) were the parameters chosen to assess the performance of the CO₂ capture plant. The results from the capture
plant used in the process designs PD-MEA1, PD-MEA2, PD-CHP2 and PD-CHP2-OXY are summarised in Table 4.5. It should be noted that in these process designs the CO₂ is separated from the biogas stream.

Table 4.5 Performance indicators of the CO₂ capture plant (PD-MEA1, PD-MEA2, PD-CHP2 and PD-CHP2-OXY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reboiler thermal energy (GJ·h⁻¹)</th>
<th>CO₂ captured (tCO₂·h⁻¹)</th>
<th>GJ/tCO₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.9360</td>
<td>2.1906</td>
<td>4.0792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvent circulation (m³·h⁻¹)</td>
<td>75.1315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0792</td>
<td>34.2968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from the capture plant used in the process design PD-CHP1-POST are summarised in Table 4.6. It should be noted that in this process design the CO₂ is separated from CHP exhaust stream.

Table 4.6 Performance indicators of the CO₂ capture plant (PD-CHP1-POST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reboiler thermal energy (GJ·h⁻¹)</th>
<th>CO₂ captured (tCO₂·h⁻¹)</th>
<th>GJ/tCO₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.0506</td>
<td>5.7985</td>
<td>3.9753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvent circulation (m³·h⁻¹)</td>
<td>164.9478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9753</td>
<td>28.4468</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to put the above results in context, they will be compared against the results given in the parametric study by Abu-zahra et al. (2007). The authors obtained a value of 3.29 GJ/tCO₂ for the thermal energy required by the reboiler and 27.8 m³/tCO₂ for the amount of solvent circulated to achieve 90% absorption efficiency. As one can see, the results shown in Tables 3.6 and 3.7 above compare well with the benchmark values. As for the capture plants that absorb the CO₂
from the biogas streams, the deviations can be explained by the higher amount of CO\(_2\) removed in the cases studied in this thesis (97% CO\(_2\) removed from the biogas streams against 90% in the study by Abu-zhara et al. The 97% CO\(_2\) removal efficiency corresponds to the desired CH\(_4\) concentration in the upgraded bio-methane (95 mol. %).

4.1.3.2 Combined heat and power generation

Biogas produced from the anaerobic digestion of waste is, in most cases, utilised in a Combined Heat and Power unit (CHP unit) for the combined generation of heat and electricity, in one single, highly efficient process. These installations typically offer an electrical efficiency of 33% and a thermal efficiency of 45% while the emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) are very limited (Smet et al., 1999). CHP systems are often divided into different categories, depending on the energy output of the unit. The largest units are found in industrial complexes and are able to produce up to several thousand kW of electric power. On the other extreme, micro-CHP units are used in individual households and small businesses and can produce up to about 2 kW of electric power (ADE 2015). In a typically sized waste water treatment plant (40,000 m\(^3\) waste water per day), CHP systems can produce over 200 kW of electric power (EPA, 2011).

In addition to the combined generation of heat and electricity, the CHP combustion process considered in this work will also provide a flue gas containing CO\(_2\), which is processed downstream and eventually converted into a liquid fuel. This provides the opportunity to consider not only a biogas stream but also flue gases, which broadens the relevance of the work to a much wider range of circumstances.

A representation of the CHP plant considered in this study is shown in Figs. 4.5 and 4.6. The CHP model is based on a previous model developed by Aspen Plus (Aspen Technology, 2012a) that was adapted to the specific requirements of this work (flowrates, temperatures, split
ratios, etc.). Firstly, the biogas or the upgraded bio-methane (depending on the process configuration) is compressed from 1 bar to 8 bar. It is then mixed with steam (8 bar) and compressed air and then burned in the combustor to produce hot gas at 750 °C. Steam is used to lower the combustion temperature (below 750 °C) to minimise NO\textsubscript{X} formation (Aspen Technology, 2012a). The combustor is modelled using a Gibbs reactor block (\textit{RGibbs}) which models single-phase chemical equilibrium by minimizing Gibbs free energy, subject to atom balance constraints. The amount of air/oxygen fed into the combustor is maintained by a calculator block that varies its flowrate depending on the amount of CH\textsubscript{4} coming into the combustor. The hot gas is first passed through a gas turbine for electricity generation and then to the steam generation area to recover heat. In the steam generation area, the gas passes through five heat exchangers (modelled using the \textit{HeatX} subroutine) and is cooled down by water or steam. As a result, electricity is produced in the steam turbine as well as three different grade steams: low-pressure (LP) steam at 1.013 bar, medium-pressure (MP) steam at 5 bar and high-pressure (HP) steam at 24 bar. All the compressors and turbines used in the CHP plant were modelled using the \textit{Compr} model in Aspen Plus. For the compressors, an isentropic efficiency of 72% was assumed while for the turbines a value of 60% was used (Hanlon, 2001).
Fig. 4.5 Schematic representation of the gas turbine section in the CHP plant (Aspen Technology, 2012a)

Fig. 4.6 Schematic representation of the steam turbine section in the CHP plant (Aspen Technology, 2012a)
Fig. 4.5 and 4.6 depict in fact a combined cycle gas turbine (CCGT). The CHP plant was chosen to be modelled as a CCGT due to the availability of model units in the Aspen library to model such system. According to a report by Aspen Tech (Aspen Technology, 2012a), the result from the model depicted in Figs. 4.5 and 4.6 are comparable to those obtained from a gas engine-based CHP plant. At the scale considered in this work for the CHP plant (5-10 MWe) a number of issues could arise regarding the operation of a small scale CCGT; however, it is considered that an analysis of such issues would be outside the scope of this study.

The process concepts evaluated in this study that consider a CHP unit to utilise the biogas (or upgraded bio-methane), namely PD-CHP1, PD-CHP1-OXY, PD-CHP1-POST, PD-CHP2, PD-CHP2-OXY, produce a flue gas (exhaust stream) that is fed into the RWGS reactor for CO₂ hydrogenation to syngas. As discussed in section 3.1.1, additional process concepts are considered in this study, which use oxy-combustion of the biogas instead of combustion with air, in order to assess the effect that reducing the volume of the CHP exhaust stream could have on process performance and thus on overall costs.

A cryogenic air separation unit (ASU), which is a mature technology, was considered to supply the oxygen to the oxy-combustor. Cryogenic distillation has been the predominant air separation technology for large-scale operations for over 75 years (NETL, 2012). Its use is recommended when volumes of oxygen higher than 100 tons per day are required (which is the case of the processes considered in this thesis) (Rao & Muller, 2007). The cryogenic ASU delivers oxygen (99.9 mol. %) at 8 bar since this is the pressure that we need in the burner. The ASU plant was not modelled in this study. Alternatively, since ASU is a well-established and mature technology, the production costs of O₂ at 99.9 mol. % and 8 bar were retrieved from the literature with a value of $35_{1994}/tonne of oxygen, considering that the ASU is located next to
the CO₂ utilisation plant and therefore no transport costs are involved (Rao & Muller, 2007).

Since high temperatures and pressures are involved in the CHP plant, the property method called Peng-Robinson with Boston-Mathias (PR-BM) modification has been used to estimate the thermodynamic and physical properties of the all pure and binary systems involved. The PR-BM property method uses the Peng Robinson cubic equation of state with the Boston-Mathias alpha function for all thermodynamic properties (Aspen Technology, 2013). The Peng-Robinson equation-of-state is the basis for the PR-BM property method. The model has been implemented with choices of different alpha functions and has been extended to include advanced asymmetric mixing rules, if needed (Aspen Technology, 2013b). The default PR-BM property method uses the Boston-Mathias alpha function and standard mixing rules. These default property methods are recommended for gas processing applications such as the CHP plant.

Table 4.7 shows the electrical power and steam produced by the CHP plant in each process concept.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Concept</th>
<th>Total Power (kW)</th>
<th>Steam C @ 1.01 bar (kg·h⁻¹)</th>
<th>Steam B @ 5 bar (kg·h⁻¹)</th>
<th>Steam A @ 24 bar (kg·h⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PD-CHP1</td>
<td>7096</td>
<td>11346</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>1589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD-CHP1-OXY</td>
<td>8364</td>
<td>9420</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>1319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD-CHP2</td>
<td>7179</td>
<td>11152</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD-CHP2-OXY</td>
<td>8443</td>
<td>9228</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>1292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD-CHP1-POST</td>
<td>7096</td>
<td>11346</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>1589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of electricity generation, the CHP plants employing oxy-combustion are able to produce more electrical power than the ones using combustion with air. This increased electricity generation is a consequence of the lower volume of oxidant (oxygen) being compressed in the oxy-combustion cases, what translates in a lower electricity consumption by the compressor and then a higher net electricity output in the plant. As for the CHP plants of the process concepts PD-CHP2 and PD-CHP2-OXY (CHP plants employing upgraded bio-methane as the feedstock), they produce electricity at a higher rate than their equivalent process using raw biogas as the feedstock, PD-CHP1 and PD-CHP1-OXY. Once again, this is explained by the lower volume to be compressed in the CHP plants using upgraded bio-methane, since in these cases most of the CO\textsubscript{2} in the biogas had been removed.

As for the steam, its production rate is directly proportional to the amount of hot flue gases coming into the steam generation area as well as to the temperature of the hot flue gases. Since the combustion temperature is controlled by injecting low pressure steam so that the hot flue gases are below 750 °C (in all cases considered), the difference between the steam production rates of the process designs are solely a consequence of the different flowrate of hot flue gases coming into the steam generation area.

4.1.3.3 Syngas production

The main process for producing syngas currently used in Fischer-Tropsch synthesis is steam reforming of methane which is a well-understood and proven technology (Wang et al., 1996). The steam methane reforming is by far the most widely used technology for the industrial synthesis of hydrogen, amounting to nearly 40% of the global hydrogen production (Muradov, 2009). It is a mature technology that
has been in use for decades and that allows flexibility in terms of scale, from small units producing less than 1 t·h⁻¹ to large manufacturing units producing several hundred of tones per hour (Muradov, 2009). The steam methane reformer employed in this study is depicted in Fig. 4.7.

As one can see from Fig. 4.7, the upgraded bio-methane from the CO₂ removal section is utilised either in a methane steam reformer (PD-MEA1 concept, Fig. 3.2) or in the CHP plant (PD-CHP2 and PD-CHP2-OXY concepts, Figs. 3.6 and 3.7). In the process concept using a methane steam reformer (PD-MEA1), the CH₄-rich gas stream leaving the MEA absorption column is mixed with steam (2.6 MPa) and the resulting mixture is compressed to 25 bar, modelled using the Compr subroutine in Aspen Plus with an isentropic efficiency of 72% (Hanlon 2001), and then preheated to 850 °C before it is fed to the catalytic reforming reactor (Muradov, 2009). The steam/methane mixture is passed through a set of externally heated reformer tubes filled with nickel catalyst. Even though nickel shows less catalytic activity than some noble metals and it is more prone to deactivation (e.g. by coking), its use is justified by its relatively low cost (Muradov, 2009). The
steam/methane mixture is converted to CO and H\textsubscript{2} at 850 °C and 25 bar according to the following reaction:

\[ CH_4 + H_2O \rightarrow CO + 3H_2 \quad \Delta H^0 = 206 \text{kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1} \]

As one can see, the reaction is highly endothermic and it is favoured by low pressures since there is a net increase in the moles of gas produce during the reaction (from 2 mol of gas to 4 mol of gas). However, in most industrial application areas, hydrogen is required at high pressures; therefore, the reformers are operated at pressures between 20 a 26 bar (Muradov, 2009). In addition, elevated pressures allow for more compact reactor designs, which increases the reformer’s efficiency and decreases capital costs related to the reactor materials.

Although the theoretical molar ratio of steam to methane is 1:1, an excess of steam (H\textsubscript{2}O:CH\textsubscript{4} = 1.2:1) is used to prevent deactivation of the catalyst owing to carbon deposition on its surface (Muradov, 2009). The amount of steam that is fed into the reformer is varied by a calculator block so that the H\textsubscript{2}O:CH\textsubscript{4} molar ratio remains fixed at H\textsubscript{2}O:CH\textsubscript{4} = 1.2:1. A pressure swing adsorption (PSA) system is used after the reformer to recover the excess of H\textsubscript{2} which is recycled back to the RWGS reactor. The steam reformer is modelled using a stoichiometric reactor block, known as RStoic in Aspen Plus, with a fractional conversion of CH\textsubscript{4} set to 80 % (Muradov, 2009). The unconverted CH\textsubscript{4} remains in the syngas stream.

As in the CHP plant, the Peng-Robinson with Boston-Mathias (PR-BM) modification property method has been used to estimate the thermodynamic and physical properties of all pure and binary systems involved.

4.1.3.4 CO\textsubscript{2} conversion

**Reverse water gas shift (RWGS) process**

The water-gas-shift reaction has attracted significant attention for the last several decades in order to adjust H\textsubscript{2}/CO ratio in the syngas for
Fischer-Tropsch applications and also to oxidise CO to CO\textsubscript{2} during production of H\textsubscript{2} by steam reforming of methane (Muradov, 2009). By contrast, the reverse-water-gas-shift reaction has not attracted much attention due to low demand.

\[
\text{CO}_2 + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{CO} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \quad \Delta H^0 = 41.2 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}
\]

The CO\textsubscript{2} conversion technology evaluated in this study is a RWGS reaction process based on the CAMERE pilot plant operated by the Korean Institute of Energy and Research (KIER) and Korea Gas Corporation (KOGAS) (Park \textit{et al.}, 2004). The CAMERE process produces methanol from CO\textsubscript{2} in two steps: (1) conversion of CO\textsubscript{2} to CO and water in a RWGS reactor and (2) methanol synthesis after an intermediate water removal. Similar to the CAMERE process, the shift reactor in this study is operated over a ZnAl\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{4} catalyst at 650 °C and atmospheric pressure with a feed gas mixture of CO\textsubscript{2} and H\textsubscript{2} preheated before the reactor. The CO\textsubscript{2} conversion process (RWGS reactor) evaluated in this thesis is shown in Fig. 4.8.

![Fig. 4.8 Process flow diagram of the RWGS reactor as implemented in Aspen Plus](image)

An excess of hydrogen (H\textsubscript{2}:CO\textsubscript{2} = 3:1) is used to prevent carbon (coke) deposition on the catalyst surface. Similarly to the SMR, the amount of hydrogen that is fed into the RWGS reactor is varied by a calculator block so that the H\textsubscript{2}:CO\textsubscript{2} molar ratio remains fixed at H\textsubscript{2}:CO\textsubscript{2} = 3:1. The
feed CO$_2$-rich gas is produced by the MEA plant in the process concepts PD-MEA1, PD-MEA2, PD-CHP2 and PD-CHP2-OXY while in PD-CHP1 and PD-CHP1-OXY the CO$_2$ is generated in the CHP plant. In PD-CHP1-POST, the RWGS reactor is fed with the CO$_2$-rich produced by the post-combustion CO$_2$ capture plant.

Although the CAMERE process described above is not a technology that has been implemented commercially at a global scale (as SMR has), it is used in this study because it fulfils the requirement for best available technology regarding CO$_2$ hydrogenation to syngas.

As with the steam methane reformer, the RWGS reactor is modelled using a stoichiometric reactor block, known as $R_{Stoic}$ in Aspen Plus, with a fractional conversion of CO$_2$ set to 65% (Park et al., 2004). The Peng-Robinson with Boston-Mathias (PR-BM) modification property method has been used to estimate the thermodynamic and physical properties of the all pure and binary systems involved in this process.

**Hydrogen recovery**

A pressure swing adsorption (PSA) system is used after the reformer (PD-MEA1) or the RWGS reactor (PDMEA-2, PD-CHP1, PD-CHP2, PD-CHP1-OXY, PD-CHP2-OXY and PD-CHP1-POST) to recover the excess H$_2$, which is recycled to the RWGS reactor for re-use. In the PSA process, highly volatile components with low polarity, such as hydrogen, are practically non-adsorbable as opposed to other molecules like N$_2$, CO, CO$_2$, hydrocarbons and water vapour. PSA is an established industrial process used extensively for gas or liquid separation and therefore its use is justified in this study as “best available technology”. Fig. 4.9 shows a representation of the Pressure Swing Adsorption (PSA) process.
In this study, the adsorption step is operated at moderate pressure (10 bar) until the equilibrium loading is reached, similarly to the Linde PSA technology (Linde, 2014). The adsorbent is regenerated by lowering the pressure to slightly above atmospheric.

As explained in section 4.1.3.5, the FT synthesis process should be operated at H$_2$:CO molar ratios of around 2 in order to achieve a high FT liquid production. The H$_2$/CO ratio in the syngas stream before the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis is well above 2 in all process concepts considered; therefore a pressure swing adsorption (PSA) process is employed to isolate the excess hydrogen. Since only a fraction of hydrogen needs to be separated from the syngas stream, a certain percentage of the syngas is directed to the PSA unit. This percentage is varied by a design specification, which measures the H$_2$/CO molar ratio in the syngas coming from the SMR and the RWGS reactor and
modifies the split fraction to the PSA process so that the H₂/CO molar ratio in the stream fed to Fischer-Tropsch reactor remains at 2. After the PSA, the syngas re-joins the main gas line and enters the FT reactor. The PSA unit was modelled using the Sep subroutine in Aspen Plus where an 85% hydrogen recovery was set according to Lau et al. (2002). The hydrogen leaves the PSA unit with a purity of 99.999 mol. % in H₂ (Linde, 2014).

The Peng-Robinson with Boston-Mathias (PR-BM) modification property method has been used to estimate the thermodynamic and physical properties of all pure and binary systems involved in this process.

### 4.1.3.5 Fuel synthesis

Discovered by Franz Fischer and Hans Tropsch in 1923, the Fischer–Tropsch (FT) process converts a mixture of CO and H₂ (syngas) into a variety of organic compounds, mainly hydrocarbon products of variable chain length, in the presence of a catalyst. The FT reactions are highly exothermic and can be represented by the following general reaction:

\[
CO + 2H_2 \rightleftharpoons CH_2 = CH_2 + H_2O \quad \Delta H^0 = -165 \, \text{kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}
\]

The general reaction describes the formation of linear alkanes (\(-CH_2-\)) which are the main products of FT synthesis. Alkenes, aromatic compounds and oxygenates, such as alcohols and ethers, can be also produced although in much lower quantities than alkanes (Dimitriou et al., 2015).

Depending on the operating temperature of the process, two types of FT synthesis can be distinguished: low-temperature Fischer–Tropsch (LTFT) and high-temperature Fischer–Tropsch synthesis (HTFT). LTFT operates at temperatures between 200-250 °C which favour the production of liquid fuels up until middle distillates (Dry, 2002; Spath and Dayton, 2003). On the other hand, high-temperature Fischer–
Tropsch synthesis (HTFT) is operated at 300–350 °C, which results in higher gas and lower distillate yields (Dry, 2002). The FT process is generally operated at pressures ranging from 20–40 bar (Tijmensen et al., 2002). In general, optimal operation of the FT synthesis process consists of low temperatures, high operating pressures and H₂:CO molar ratios of around 2 in order to achieve a high proportion of liquid fuels (De Klerk et al., 2013).

Two types of catalysts are commercially used for FT fuel synthesis: iron-based and cobalt-based catalysts. Cobalt-based catalysts have a higher selectivity for the production of alkanes and do not promote the water-gas-shift (WGS) reaction (Dimitriou, 2012). By contrast, the use of iron-based catalysts results in a higher WGS activity and lower liquid selectivity than cobalt catalysts (Jager & Espinoza, 1995). For this reason, the use of a cobalt-based catalyst is assumed in this thesis.

There are three main types of FT reactors: fluidised bed, fixed bed and slurry phase reactor (Bergman et al., 2005; van der Drift & Boerrigter, 2006). In this study, the FT reactor is assumed to be equivalent to the Sasol Slurry phase reactor, the latest development of FT reactor technology by Sasol (Fleisch et al., 2002), which represents the best available technology needed in this study.

The Fischer-Tropsch synthesis is a well-developed technology. The first and most widely known company that produces Fischer-Tropsch-derived fuels is the South African organisation, Sasol. The company developed the first FT reactors, the Arge reactors, back in the 1950s and has developed and commissioned improved reactor designs since then. The company's last development, the Sasol Slurry Phase Distillate (SSPD) reactor, was commercialised in the early 1990s and is able to produce 2,500 barrels of synthetic fuels per day (Dimitriou, 2012). Other major petrochemical companies like Shell have demonstrated commercial operation of FT plants in Qatar and Malaysia (Dimitriou, 2012).
Fischer-Tropsch synthesis is not the only commercial technology that allows the conversion of syngas to a hydrocarbon mixture. The petrochemical company Mobil (today ExxonMobil) developed in the 1970s the methanol-to-gasoline (MTG) technology. This technology consists of two process steps. The first step is the methanol synthesis from syngas which takes place at temperatures of 300–400 °C and pressures of 30 - 40 bar, over a zinc chromite (ZnO/Cr₂O₃) catalyst (LeBlanc et al., 1994). The second step is the MTG process itself whereby crude methanol is first dehydrated to form a mixture of DME, methanol and water and then the mixture is directly converted to C₅-C₁₀ hydrocarbons by synthetic zeolite catalysts (ZSM-5) (Allum & Williams, 1988; Maiden 1988).

In addition to the MTG technology developed by Mobil, there is at least one more synthetic fuel technology that has achieved commercial success. This process is called Topsoe Integrated Gasoline Synthesis (TIGAS) and was developed by Topsoe in the 1980s (Dimitriou, 2012). It mainly differs from the MTG technology in the incorporation of the methanol synthesis and the DME synthesis into a combined methanol and DME synthesis process, thus eliminating the intermediate methanol production step.

Although the other fuel synthesis technologies could have been considered in this study, it was decided that the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis will be the fuel synthesis technology of choice in every process concept evaluated. The main reason for this is that the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis is more developed and proven technology than the other two. Furthermore, it was anticipated that both the MTG and TIGAS technologies would result in higher production costs of the fuel manufactured since they are more complex in nature due to the increased number of reaction steps involved (as opposed to the direct syngas to hydrocarbons conversion carried out by the Fischer-Tropsch reaction). This anticipation is supported by a recent techno-economic
study on Biomass-to-liquids (BTL) processes by Dimitriou (2012), which concludes that the conversion of biomass into liquid fuels through both the MTG and TIGAS technologies results in higher fuel production costs in all the cases considered.

The Fischer-Tropsch synthesis is not a selective process since it produces a wide range of products. Nevertheless, this high variability of products can be seen as a positive aspect since FT products cover the entire range of petrochemical products, such as gasoline, jet fuel and diesel provided that adequate process control exists in the process (Dimitriou et al., 2015). FT fuels are high quality, free of sulphur and aromatic compounds and, unlike other fuels such as oxygenates, they can be easily assimilated in the existing transport infrastructure.

Because the FT synthesis is not a selective process, i.e. it produces a wide range of products, mainly paraffins, an upgrading plant is often placed after the FT reactor so that the FT liquid products (FT “syncrude”) meets market requirements. Seven major unit operations are involved in the FT product upgrading: distillation, hydrogen production, wax (C_{20+}) hydrocracking, naphtha (C_{5-10}) hydrotreating, middle distillate (C_{11-19}) hydrotreating, C_5/C_6 isomerization, and catalytic reforming (C_{7-10}) (Becker et al., 2012). As one can see from a report by Bechtel (1998), the modelling effort to accurately represent the upgrading unit is considerable. Given the main objectives of this thesis it was decided that an upgrading unit will not be considered and therefore the main product of all process concepts will be FT syncrude. This decision does not compromise the achievement of the thesis objectives since this work will help identify the most promising routes for the conversion of carbon dioxide into a synthetic fuel. It is assumed that the upgrading unit would be nearly identical in each process concept and thus its consideration would not affect, in terms of comparability, the overall process efficiencies and production costs.

The FT synthesis employed in this study is depicted in Fig. 4.10.
The syngas with H₂:CO molar ratio of 2:1 is fed to a multistage compressor (MCompr subroutine in Aspen Plus with an isentropic compression efficiency of 72% (Hanlon, 2001) where it is compressed to 30 bar. The FT reactor is modelled using a yield reactor block (RYield subroutine in Aspen Plus). In order to use the RYield block in Aspen Plus, the mass yields (mass fractions) of all products (hydrocarbons, water, unreacted CO and unreacted hydrogen) need to be determined first. These mass yields were calculated in a separate spreadsheet as a result of a collaboration with Dr Ioanna Dimitriou at The University of Sheffield and subsequently implemented in Aspen Plus. The ASF distribution model was employed to calculate the FT product stream mass yields.

As mentioned earlier in the section, the FT synthesis is not a selective process and thus a wide range of products are obtained. As a consequence, a quantitative approximation of product distribution is necessary. The most widely used approach to quantitatively
approximate the FT product distribution is the Anderson–Schulz–Flory (ASF) method. According to this method, the produced carbon chain can either undergo further addition of a –CH$_2$– group or the chain can terminate. The ASF-product distribution model is represented by Eq. 4.7:

$$C_n = \alpha^{n-1}(1 - \alpha)$$ Eq. 4.7

where $C_n$ is the molar fraction of a hydrocarbon product consisting of $n$ carbon atoms and $\alpha$ the chain growth probability which determines the hydrocarbon product distribution. The chain growth probability $\alpha$ is influenced by a number of factors, such as the type and age of catalyst, the H$_2$:CO molar ratio in the feed gas, reactor type and operating condition (Dimitriou et al., 2015). In this study, the ASF hydrocarbon distribution was taken up to a carbon number of 30 due to the negligible amount of parafins of longer chain (Dimitriou et al., 2015). The production of aromatic compounds, oxygenates and olefins is assumed to be negligible since the presence of these compounds is typically small for low-temperature Fischer-Tropsch (Kaneko et al., 2000).

A chain growth probability of 0.85, which favours the production of middle distillates, was chosen for the estimation of the product composition based on reported literature values (Swanson et al., 2010a). The single-pass CO conversion was set to 80% (Dimitriou et al., 2015).

As for the property method, the Peng-Robinson with Boston-Mathias (PR-BM) modification property method has been used to estimate the thermodynamic and physical properties of the all pure and binary systems involved in the FT process.

The mass yields needed by the FT reactor block in Aspen (RYield) for all the process concepts considered are shown in Table 4.8. It must be noted that N$_2$ and CO$_2$ are considered as inert components in the FT synthesis; therefore these components are not included in the mass
yield basis shown in Table 4.8. In all cases the FT reactor operates at a temperature of 220 °C and 30 bar of pressure.

Table 4.8 Component mass yield implemented in the FT reactor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>0.1309</td>
<td>0.1106</td>
<td>0.1076</td>
<td>0.1115</td>
<td>0.1086</td>
<td>0.1111</td>
<td>0.1108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂</td>
<td>0.0130</td>
<td>0.0110</td>
<td>0.0107</td>
<td>0.0111</td>
<td>0.0108</td>
<td>0.0111</td>
<td>0.0110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂O</td>
<td>0.5225</td>
<td>0.6503</td>
<td>0.6618</td>
<td>0.6497</td>
<td>0.6580</td>
<td>0.6500</td>
<td>0.6517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>0.0073</td>
<td>0.0079</td>
<td>0.0056</td>
<td>0.0058</td>
<td>0.0063</td>
<td>0.0065</td>
<td>0.0057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHANE</td>
<td>0.0108</td>
<td>0.0091</td>
<td>0.0089</td>
<td>0.0092</td>
<td>0.0090</td>
<td>0.0092</td>
<td>0.0092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPANE</td>
<td>0.0135</td>
<td>0.0114</td>
<td>0.0111</td>
<td>0.0115</td>
<td>0.0112</td>
<td>0.0114</td>
<td>0.0114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTANE</td>
<td>0.0151</td>
<td>0.0128</td>
<td>0.0124</td>
<td>0.0129</td>
<td>0.0125</td>
<td>0.0128</td>
<td>0.0128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENTANE</td>
<td>0.0159</td>
<td>0.0135</td>
<td>0.0131</td>
<td>0.0136</td>
<td>0.0132</td>
<td>0.0135</td>
<td>0.0135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEXANE</td>
<td>0.0162</td>
<td>0.0137</td>
<td>0.0133</td>
<td>0.0138</td>
<td>0.0134</td>
<td>0.0137</td>
<td>0.0137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPTANE</td>
<td>0.0160</td>
<td>0.0135</td>
<td>0.0131</td>
<td>0.0136</td>
<td>0.0133</td>
<td>0.0136</td>
<td>0.0135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTANE</td>
<td>0.0155</td>
<td>0.0131</td>
<td>0.0127</td>
<td>0.0132</td>
<td>0.0129</td>
<td>0.0132</td>
<td>0.0131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONANE</td>
<td>0.0148</td>
<td>0.0125</td>
<td>0.0122</td>
<td>0.0126</td>
<td>0.0123</td>
<td>0.0126</td>
<td>0.0125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECANE</td>
<td>0.0139</td>
<td>0.0118</td>
<td>0.0115</td>
<td>0.0119</td>
<td>0.0116</td>
<td>0.0118</td>
<td>0.0118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECANE</td>
<td>0.0130</td>
<td>0.0110</td>
<td>0.0107</td>
<td>0.0111</td>
<td>0.0108</td>
<td>0.0111</td>
<td>0.0110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DOD-01</td>
<td>0.0121</td>
<td>0.0102</td>
<td>0.0099</td>
<td>0.0103</td>
<td>0.0100</td>
<td>0.0102</td>
<td>0.0102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-01</td>
<td>0.0111</td>
<td>0.0094</td>
<td>0.0091</td>
<td>0.0094</td>
<td>0.0092</td>
<td>0.0094</td>
<td>0.0094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TET-01</td>
<td>0.0101</td>
<td>0.0086</td>
<td>0.0083</td>
<td>0.0086</td>
<td>0.0084</td>
<td>0.0086</td>
<td>0.0086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-01</td>
<td>0.0092</td>
<td>0.0078</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
<td>0.0079</td>
<td>0.0077</td>
<td>0.0078</td>
<td>0.0078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-01</td>
<td>0.0084</td>
<td>0.0071</td>
<td>0.0069</td>
<td>0.0071</td>
<td>0.0069</td>
<td>0.0071</td>
<td>0.0071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-01</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
<td>0.0064</td>
<td>0.0062</td>
<td>0.0064</td>
<td>0.0063</td>
<td>0.0064</td>
<td>0.0064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-01</td>
<td>0.0068 0.0057 0.0056 0.0058 0.0056 0.0058 0.0058</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-01</td>
<td>0.0061 0.0051 0.0050 0.0052 0.0051 0.0052 0.0052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-EIC-01</td>
<td>0.0055 0.0046 0.0045 0.0046 0.0045 0.0046 0.0046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEN-01</td>
<td>0.0049 0.0041 0.0040 0.0041 0.0040 0.0041 0.0041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DOC-01</td>
<td>0.0043 0.0037 0.0036 0.0037 0.0036 0.0037 0.0037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-02</td>
<td>0.0038 0.0032 0.0032 0.0033 0.0032 0.0033 0.0033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TET-02</td>
<td>0.0034 0.0029 0.0028 0.0029 0.0028 0.0029 0.0029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-02</td>
<td>0.0030 0.0026 0.0025 0.0026 0.0025 0.0026 0.0026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-02</td>
<td>0.0027 0.0023 0.0022 0.0023 0.0022 0.0023 0.0023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-02</td>
<td>0.0024 0.0020 0.0019 0.0020 0.0020 0.0020 0.0020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-02</td>
<td>0.0021 0.0018 0.0017 0.0018 0.0017 0.0018 0.0018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-02</td>
<td>0.0018 0.0015 0.0015 0.0016 0.0015 0.0016 0.0015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-03</td>
<td>0.0107 0.0090 0.0088 0.0091 0.0089 0.0091 0.0091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 shows that a fairly large amount of water is produced in all process concepts. This was expected mainly due to: a) water present in the syngas; b) one mole of water is produced per mole of CO fed into the reactor (assuming full conversion of CO), given the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis general reaction: \( CO + 2H_2 \rightarrow -CH_2 - +H_2O \).
The FT reactor’s gas effluent is fed into a three phase separator (modelled with the Flash3 subroutine in Aspen Plus) to remove water and heavy hydrocarbons from the residual vapour. The FT off-gas which mainly consists of light hydrocarbons (C$_1$–C$_4$) and unconverted syngas is combusted to generate low pressure steam which is utilised by the anaerobic digesters, whereas the liquid products are sent to a central refinery plant for further upgrading. The FT off-gas combustor is depicted in Fig. 4.11.

![Fig. 4.11 Process flow diagram of the FT off-gas combustor](image)

The FT off-gas combustor is modelled using the RGibbs subroutine in Aspen Plus which models single-phase chemical equilibrium by minimizing the Gibbs free energy, subject to atom balance constraints. The hot flue gas produced by the combustion is passed through a heat exchanger (HeatX block in Aspen), which is fed with water on the cold side to produce low pressure steam.

### 4.1.4 Processes using ionic liquids for CO$_2$ capture

This section reviews the simulation methodology developed in order to model the ionic liquid-based CO$_2$ capture processes described in
section 3.2.1. It consists of a novel modelling approach, which produces data hitherto not calculable, e.g. plant efficiencies, capital costs, operating and maintenance costs, etc. When data were obtained as a result of a collaboration, it is appropriately stated.

The process flowsheets of the three studied biogas upgrading plants have been developed using Aspen Plus as the process simulation software, which enabled the estimation of mass and energy balances as well as utility requirements. These calculations were then used as the inputs for the techno-economic assessments.

The COSMO-SAC property method has been used in Aspen Plus to model the different unit operations present in this study. This model is regarded as a robust preliminary tool for fast screening and design of ILs for CO₂ capture as it readily provides relevant information on gas-liquid interaction without having to rely on either binary interaction parameters or experimental data (Lee & Lin, 2015; Palomar et al., 2011; Sumon & Henni, 2011; Zhang et al., 2008), which often consume time and resources. COSMO-SAC is a solvation model (COnductor-like Screening Model with Segment Activity Coefficient) that describes the electrical interactions in the molecular surface of polarizable species (Aspen Technology, 2013b). Although it requires complex quantum mechanics calculations, they only have to be done once for a particular molecule, after which the results can be stored. Unlike other activity coefficient models such as UNIFAC or UNIQUAC, individual atoms are used for phase equilibria as the building blocks instead of functional groups. This enables the COSMO-SAC model to be more flexible as it can be applied to a wider range of systems, for instance complex molecules such as the ionic liquids considered in this study which are not present in the Aspen Plus database.

The solubility of a gas in a solvent is determined assuming identical fugacity of the gas in both the vapour and liquid phases (Lee & Lin, 2015),
where \( x_i \) and \( y_i \) are the mole fraction of the gas in the vapour and liquid phases respectively, \( P \) the total pressure of the system, \( P_i \) the partial pressure of the gas, \( \bar{\phi}_i \) the fugacity coefficient in the vapour phase, \( \gamma_i \) the activity coefficient in the liquid phase and \( f_i \) the fugacity of the gas molecule (CO\(_2\) and CH\(_4\) in this study) in a hypothetical liquid state at pressure \( P \) and temperature, \( T \). Given the extremely low vapour pressure of the liquids considered in this study (Brennecke & Gurkan, 2010; Zhang et al., 2012) and the nature of the gaseous species (CO\(_2\) and CH\(_4\)), it can be assumed that the vapour phase has an ideal behaviour (i.e. \( \bar{\phi}_i = 1 \)) and thus the solubility of the gas in the liquid phase \( (x_i) \) can be calculated at a given pressure \( P \) and temperature \( T \) and partial pressure of the gas \( P_i \) using:

\[
P_i = x_i \gamma_i(T, P, x) f_i(T, P) \tag{4.9}
\]

The COSMO-SAC model calculates the liquid activity coefficient \( \gamma_i \) following Eq. 4.10:

\[
\ln \gamma_i = \frac{A_i}{a_{eff}} \sum \sigma_m p_i(\sigma_m)[\ln \Gamma_S(\sigma_m) - \ln \Gamma_i(\sigma_m)] + \ln \gamma_i^{SG} \tag{4.10}
\]

where \( A_i \) is the molecular surface area of component \( i \), \( a_{eff} \) the standard segment surface area, \( p_i(\sigma_m) \) the sigma profile of component \( i \), \( \Gamma_S(\sigma_m) \) the segment activity coefficient of segment \( \sigma_m \) in the solvent mixture, \( \Gamma_i(\sigma_m) \) the segment activity coefficient of segment \( \sigma_m \) in component \( i \) and \( \gamma_i^{SG} \) the Staverman-Guggenheim model for combinatorial contribution to \( \gamma_i \).

In the COSMO-SAC model, the probability distribution of surface charge density, called the sigma profile \( p_i(\sigma_m) \), describes the electronic nature of the molecule of study as:
\[ p_i(\sigma_m) = \frac{A_i(\sigma_m)}{A_i} \quad \text{Eq. 4.11} \]

It must be noted that in Aspen Plus, the COSMO-SAC model does not require binary parameters in order to account for the interaction between components but it requires six input parameters that are genuine of the COSMO-SAC model for each component. The first parameter called \( CSACVL \) is the component volume parameter which is always defined in cubic angstroms. The remaining parameters \( SGPRF1 \) to \( SGPRF5 \) are five molecular component sigma profile parameters. All six input parameters are obtained using the COSMO-RS (COnductor-like Screening Model for Real Solvents) methodology. In this study the COSMOtherm\textsuperscript{X} program (COSMOlogic, 2015) is used to perform the COSMO-RS calculations and thus obtain the parameters needed by the COSMO-SAC property method in Aspen Plus. A detailed explanation on how the COSMOtherm\textsuperscript{X} program was used can be found in section 4.1.4.8 In addition to these genuine six parameters, the COSMO-SAC property method in Aspen needed a set of pure component physical properties as detailed in section 4.1.4.7.

The following sections describe in detail the Aspen Plus implementation of the different unit operations that are included in the biogas upgrading plant.

4.1.4.1 Biogas compressor

Biogas is produced by the anaerobic digester plant at atmospheric pressure. Since the packed absorber operates at 30 bar in order to enhance the absorption process, biogas needs to be compressed to the absorber’s operating pressure. A multistage centrifugal compressor with intercooling was used for the compression of the biogas, which was modelled using the Aspen \textit{Compr} subroutine. The specifications of the compressor are shown in Table 4.9.
### Table 4.9 Biogas compressor specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of stages</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compression type</td>
<td>Isentropic using ASME method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge pressure (bar)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isentropic efficiency (default)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercooling outlet temperature (°C)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlet temperature from last stage (°C)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The compression type was chosen to be isentropic with an isentropic efficiency of 0.72, which is the default value in Aspen Plus. The rigorous ASME calculation method was used since it provides the most accurate results (Aspen Technology, 2000). Once the isentropic calculations were carried out, the process flowsheet was implemented in Aspen Process Economic Analyzer (APEA), which calculated the compressor driver efficiency, given the compression conditions and compressor type. APEA calculates then the electrical power of the compressor driver using both the isentropic efficiency and the driver efficiency. This actual compressor electrical consumption was the value used for the estimation of the total electrical power consumption in the plant. Intercooling was required to decrease the temperature of the gas being compressed to the absorber operating temperature (15 °C).

#### 4.1.4.2 Absorption column

The actual absorption process takes place in the absorption column. This packed absorber is fed with biogas from the bottom and the ionic liquid from the top, which flow in a counter-current pattern. At the given operating conditions, the ionic liquid solution absorbs the most soluble gas, in this case CO₂, leaving the bottom of the column as a CO₂-
enriched solution. The gas stream lean in CO$_2$ leaves the absorber from the top. The absorption column was modelled in Aspen Plus with the *RadFrac* subroutine, which is suitable for modelling a wide range of vapour-liquid fractionation processes (Aspen Technology, 2000). The packed absorber characteristic as implemented in Aspen Plus are summarised in Table 4.10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of theoretical stages</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculation type</td>
<td>Rate-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condenser</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reboiler</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergence algorithm</td>
<td>Sum-rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packing type</td>
<td>Pall rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column diameter (m)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packing height (m)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once more, the number of theoretical stages was chosen as the minimum that made the model converge. Any further increase in the number of theoretical stages did not result in any improvements in performance. A design specification is used to obtain the desired CH$_4$ concentration of 95 vol. % in the upgraded bio-methane stream by adjusting the flowrate of ionic liquid fed into the column.

As in the capture plant used in the Base Case Models (MEA-based CO$_2$ capture plant detailed in section 4.1.3.1), the rate-based calculation method was chosen to model the absorption column since it is a fundamental, rigorous approach which avoids the approximations of efficiency and Height Equivalent to a Theoretical Plate (HETP). Rate-based distillation calculations directly account for the mass and heat
transfer rate processes in the system of equations representing the separation unit (Aspen Technology 2013d).

The height of the absorption column was specified as the one to achieve the desired CH$_4$ purity in the upgraded bio-methane (95 mol. % CH$_4$) with a minimum solvent (ionic liquid) flow-rate.

The diameter of both the absorber and the stripper were chosen as the minimum that complied with the Aspen Plus default column flooding condition (a vapour velocity value 80% of that which would cause flooding).

As in the MEA-based capture process, pall rings were used in the absorber as the type of packing, which has been considered by other authors in similar CO$_2$ capture processes using ionic liquids as physical absorbents (Basha et al., 2013; Basha et al., 2014). Random packing was chosen due to its lower costs and better liquid distribution (Sonderby et al., 2013), especially when using high viscosity liquids such as the ionic liquids studied in this work. The liquid and vapour phase binary mass transfer coefficients as well as the total interfacial area for mass transfer were estimated using the Billet & Schulte’s correlation, as in the MEA process, which provides good estimates of mass transfer-related parameters over a wide range of packing types, sizes and operating conditions (Billet & Schultes, 1993).

4.1.4.3 Upgraded bio-methane turbine

The upgraded bio-methane stream lean in CO$_2$ that leaves the top of the packed absorber at high pressure (29.5 bar, assuming 0.5 bar pressure drop across the column) is fed into a turbine, which extracts energy from the stream at high pressure and converts it into useful work. The turbine was modelled in Aspen Plus using the Compr model with the turbine calculation type. As with the biogas compressor, the compression type was chosen to be isentropic with an isentropic efficiency of 0.72, which is the default value in Aspen Plus. Similarly,
the electrical output of the generator coupled to the turbine was calculated by Aspen Process Economic Analyzer (APEA), given the process conditions and turbine type.

4.1.4.4 Regeneration flash evaporator

The process concepts considered in this work employ pressure swing solvent regeneration option whereby physical absorption is carried out at high pressure, while the regeneration of the solvent (desorption of the gases) takes place at pressures below the atmospheric pressure. The IL-rich solution leaves the bottom of the packed absorber at high pressure and is fed into the adiabatic flash evaporator (flash drum) where the solution undergoes a reduction in pressure (from 29.5 bar to 0.01 bar). In the vessel, the liquid settles to the bottom of the vessel due to gravity while the vapour escapes through the top of the vessel.

4.1.4.5 Solvent recirculation pump

As explained in the previous sections, the regenerated IL-lean solution leaves the bottom of the flash evaporator at low pressure (0.01 bar) and needs to be brought back to the column operating pressure of 30 bar. A centrifugal pump is therefore used in order to pressurize the IL-lean solution back to the absorption column, which was modelled using the Aspen Pump subroutine. The pump efficiency was set to 0.7, which is assumed to be a reasonable value for centrifugal pumps (Coulson et al., 1995). Then, the process flowsheet was implemented in Aspen Process Economic Analyzer (APEA), which calculated the driver efficiency, given the liquid conditions and pump type. APEA calculates then the electrical power of the pump motor using both the pump efficiency and the driver efficiency. This actual motor electrical power was the value used for the estimation of the total electrical power consumption in the plant.
4.1.4.6 Pre-absorber solvent cooler

A pre-absorber solvent cooler is included in the biogas upgrading plant to cool down the IL-lean solution back to 15 °C. This cooler needs to be used because the IL solution undergoes an increase in temperature due to the enthalpy of solution when the gases (mostly CO₂) are absorbed into the liquid in the packed absorber. Moreover, following the adiabatic flash evaporation stage, the IL-lean solution is pressurized back to 30 bar from 0.01 bar what further increases the temperature of the IL-lean solution. The cooler is modelled in Aspen Plus using the Heater block.

4.1.4.7 Pure component physical properties

Since the ionic liquids studied in this work are not included in the Aspen Plus component database, pure ionic liquid physical properties were retrieved from the literature and implemented in Aspen Plus. Data regression was used in order to represent accurately important properties in the desired range of pressure and temperature. It is based on maximum likelihood estimation and processes raw data to determine parameters for physical property models. The estimated parameters and their corresponding models and physical properties are shown in Table 4.11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Property model</th>
<th>Physical property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPIG</td>
<td>Ideal gas heat capacity polynomial</td>
<td>Ideal gas heat capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNLDIP</td>
<td>DIPPR equation</td>
<td>Liquid molar volume (liquid density)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULAND</td>
<td>Andrade equation</td>
<td>Liquid viscosity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all cases, the Britt-Luecke algorithm was used with the Deming initialization method (Britt & Luecke, 1973). It must be noted that the PLXANT parameter needed by the extended Antoine equation for the
estimation of the liquid vapour pressure was set to the minimum allowable value in Aspen Plus of $1 \times 10^{-18}$ due to the negligible vapour pressure inherent to ionic liquids (Brennecke & Gurkan, 2010; Zhang et al., 2012). The data sources of the ionic liquid’s ideal gas heat capacity, liquid density and liquid viscosity are given in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12 Data sources of the ionic liquids physical properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[C₂MIm][Tf₂N]</th>
<th>[C₆MIm][Tf₂N]</th>
<th>[P₆6614][Tf₂N]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal gas heat</td>
<td>(Paulechka et al., 2007)</td>
<td>(Blokhin et al., 2006)</td>
<td>(Ferreira et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid density</td>
<td>(Jacquemin et al., 2007)</td>
<td>(Widegren &amp; Magee, 2007)</td>
<td>(Neves et al., 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid viscosity</td>
<td>(Schreiner et al., 2010)</td>
<td>(Widegren &amp; Magee, 2007)</td>
<td>(Neves et al., 2011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from the data regressions of the ionic liquids’ physical properties are discussed. The experimental values included in Figs. 4.12-4.14 were retrieved from the literature as described in Table 4.12.

Fig. 4.12 shows the experimental values of the ideal gas heat capacity, $C_p$, at different temperatures as well as the results from the data regression in Aspen Plus. As one can see, the results predicted by Aspen Plus compare well with experimental temperature.
Similarly, the viscosity of the three ionic liquids reported in the literature at different temperatures, $\mu$ along with the predicted values from Aspen Plus are included in Fig. 4.13.

The predicted viscosity of the ionic liquid correlates well with the experimental data reported in the literature. Finally, the density of the
ionic liquids within a range of temperatures is shown in Fig. 4.14 along with the predicted values.

![Fig. 4.14 Density of the selected ionic liquids as a function of temperature. Solid lines represent Aspen predictions](image)

In addition to the properties shown in Table 4.12, a range of scalar physical properties, *i.e.* non-temperature or pressure dependent, are shown in Tables 4.13-4.15. The molecular weights of the ionic liquids were retrieved from the Sigma-Aldrich catalogue (SIGMA-ALDRICH, 2015). The boiling point, critical temperature, critical pressure, critical volume and acentric factor of the ionic liquids were estimated using the modified Lydersen-Joback-Reid group contribution method proposed by Valderrama & Rojas (2009), which is considered the most robust and common technique for ionic liquid’s critical properties estimation. Finally, the volume parameter of the COSMO-SAC model was calculated using the COSMOtherm® software (COSMOlogic, 2015).
Table 4.13 Scalar properties of [C$_2$MIm][Tf$_2$N] ionic liquid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Molecular weight, g · mol$^{-1}$</td>
<td>391.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiling point, K</td>
<td>805.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical temperature, K</td>
<td>1244.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical pressure, bar</td>
<td>32.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical volume, cm$^3$ · mol$^{-1}$</td>
<td>892.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acentric factor</td>
<td>0.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSMO-SAC volume parameter, Å$^3$</td>
<td>376.700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14 Scalar properties of [C$_6$MIm][Tf$_2$N] ionic liquid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Molecular weight, g · mol$^{-1}$</td>
<td>447.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiling point, K</td>
<td>897.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical temperature, K</td>
<td>1287.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical pressure, bar</td>
<td>23.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical volume, cm$^3$ · mol$^{-1}$</td>
<td>1121.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acentric factor</td>
<td>0.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSMO-SAC volume parameter, Å$^3$</td>
<td>464.670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.15 Scalar properties of [P₆₆₆₁₄][Tf₂N] ionic liquid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Molecular weight, g·mol⁻¹</td>
<td>764.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiling point, K</td>
<td>1310.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical temperature, K</td>
<td>1586.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical pressure, bar</td>
<td>8.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical volume, cm³·mol⁻¹</td>
<td>2423.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acentric factor</td>
<td>0.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSMO-SAC volume parameter, Å³</td>
<td>973.494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.4.8 Sigma profiles

As part of a collaboration with Dr Johan Jacquemin at Queen’s University Belfast (QUB), the 3D molecular structure optimisation of each investigated ion and gas and the generation of their COSMO file were performed using TURBOMOLE quantum chemistry package (Ahlrichs et al., 1989) and were then visualised using COSMOthermX® program (version C30_1501, COSMOlogic 2015). The structures were optimized at QUB with a convergence criterion of 10⁻⁸ Hartree in the gas phase. The TURBOMOLE 6.0 program package was used for all the density functional theory (DFT) calculations using the Resolution of Identity approximation (Weigend & Häser, 1997). The B3LYP functional (Talaty et al., 2004) was chosen for geometry optimization and all calculations were finished with the def-TZVP basis set (Talaty et al., 2004), combining the RI technique calculations as recommended by COSMOlogic (COSMOlogic, 2015). The σ-profile for each ion or gas was generated at QUB from its COSMO file using COSMOthermX® (COSMOlogic 2015), and the σ-profile for each ionic liquid was determined as the sum of the cation and anion σ-profiles. These sigma profiles were then implemented in Aspen Plus within the COSMO-SAC property method.
To test the functionality of the modified Aspen databank, the CH₄ and CO₂ solubility data in selected ionic liquids were firstly modelled. This choice was made for a number of reasons: firstly, the single gas solubility in solvent can be relatively easily calculated in Aspen Plus by simulating a flash simulator. Secondly, CO₂ and CH₄ solubility data are already reported in the literature for the three selected ionic liquids at elevated pressures (Carvalho et al., 2009; Liu et al., 2013; Zubeir et al., 2015; Kumelan et al., 2007; Carvalho et al., 2010). Thirdly, the COSMO-RS model has previously been used at QUB for predicting data of the gas solubility in ionic liquids (Manan et al., 2009). Figs. 4.15-4.19 show how the solubility data predictions from Aspen Plus correlates with experimental data (when available) for both CO₂ and CH₄ in the three ionic liquids. In general, the Aspen predictions compare reasonably well, in terms of Average Relative Deviation (ARD), with experimental data (10.35%-27.23% ARD for CO₂ and 26.72%-36.14% ARD for CH₄). These ARD values are in the range of those reported by other authors using COSMO calculations for gas solubility predictions in ionic liquids (Lee & Lin, 2015). Only at elevated pressure (above the ionic liquid’s critical pressure) the COSMO-SAC model predictions start to deviate considerably from the experimental values.
Fig. 4.15 P-x solubility data for CO$_2$ in [C$_6$MIm][Tf$_2$N]. Experimental data from Carvalho et al. (2009). Solid line represents Aspen predictions.

Fig. 4.16 P-x solubility data for CO$_2$ in [C$_6$MIm][Tf$_2$N]. Experimental data from Liu et al. (2013). Solid line represents Aspen predictions.
Fig. 4.17 P-x solubility data for CO$_2$ in [P$_{66614}$][Tf$_2$N]. Experimental data from Zubeir et al. (2015). Solid line represents Aspen predictions.

Fig. 4.18 P-x solubility data for CH$_4$ in [C$_2$MIm][Tf$_2$N]. Experimental data from Kumelan et al. (2007). Solid line represents Aspen predictions.
Fig. 4.19 P-x solubility data for CH$_4$ in [C$_6$MIm][Tf$_2$N]. Experimental data from Carvalho et al. (2010). Solid line represents Aspen predictions.

Tables E.11-E.15 in Appendix E show the sigma profiles (SGPRF1, SGPRF2, SGPRF3, SGPRF4 and SGPRF5) obtained from the COSMO calculations in COSMOtherm$^\circledR$. 
5. SIMULATION RESULTS

5.1 Introduction

In this section, the results of the process performance of each process concept are presented. The process performance will be assessed in terms of biogas-to-liquids mass yield, energy yield and overall energy efficiency. In addition, the flow sheets of the different process concepts are presented along with a comparison of the process performance between concepts. The results presented in this chapter as well as in Chapter 6 provided the basic input data for the sustainability assessments carried out by collaborators of the 4CU Project based at The University of Manchester. These results were measured on environmental, economic and social impacts using a whole life cycle, whole-system approach that assessed the different options from ‘cradle to grave’ and identify opportunities for improvements. As a result of this collaboration, the team was able to identify sustainability “hotspots” and to provide recommendations for improvement in terms of environmental impacts. The results were published in Computer Aided Chemical Engineering (Cuéllar-Franca et al., 2015) along with other publications in the progress of being published.

5.2 Definition of process performance

The feedstock-to-product mass yield, energy yield and overall energy efficiency are widely used indicators to measure the technical performance and the economic feasibility of chemical plants. The mass yield of a plant, \( Y_M \) is a measure of the mass of the feedstock (biogas in this study) that remains in the product (FT syncrude). Similarly, the energy yield of a plant, \( Y_E \) is a measure as to what extent the feedstock energy, on a Lower Heating Value (LHV) basis, remains in the products (FT-syncrude in this thesis). The LHV (also known as net calorific value) of a fuel is defined as the amount of heat released by combusting a specified quantity (initially at 25°C) and returning the temperature of the combustion products to 150°C, which assumes the latent heat of
vaporization of water in the reaction products is not recovered. LHV is used as the basis in all energy yields and overall energy efficiencies presented in this thesis. It should be noted that the Lower Heating Value (LHV) of FT-syncrude is calculated using the built-in Aspen HYSYS Refining Correlation Manager (Corman) in Aspen Plus. Perhaps more importantly, the overall plant energy efficiency, $\eta_{\text{plant}}$ takes into account the total energy input (biogas, hydrogen, natural gas and electricity) and total energy output (FT syncrude, hydrogen and electricity). In order to allow comparability between process concepts, all hot utilities (steam and natural gas) have been normalised to total natural gas consumption, *i.e.* steam consumption is regarded as natural gas necessary to produce the required steam. In this thesis, the mass yield, energy yield and overall plant energy efficiency are defined by Eqs. 5.1-5.3, respectively.

$$Y_M = \frac{\dot{M}_{\text{FT Syncrude}}}{\dot{M}_{\text{biogas}}} \quad \text{Eq. 5.1}$$

where $\dot{M}_{\text{FT Syncrude}}$ is the mass flowrate of FT syncrude produced by the plant and $\dot{M}_{\text{biogas}}$ is the mass flowrate of biogas fed to the plant (3,775 kg·h⁻¹ in all cases).

$$Y_E = \frac{\dot{M}_{\text{FT Syncrude}} \cdot LHV_{\text{FT Syncrude}}}{\dot{M}_{\text{biogas}} \cdot LHV_{\text{biogas}}} \quad \text{Eq. 5.2}$$

where $LHV_{\text{FT Syncrude}}$ is the is the lower heating value of FT syncrude and $LHV_{\text{biogas}}$ is the lower heating value of biogas.

$$\eta_{\text{plant}} = \frac{\dot{M}_{\text{FT Syncrude}} \cdot LHV_{\text{FT Syncrude}} + \dot{M}_{H_2} \cdot LHV_{H_2} + \text{Electricity produced}}{\dot{M}_{\text{biogas}} \cdot LHV_{\text{biogas}} + \dot{M}_{H_2} \cdot LHV_{H_2} + \dot{M}_{NG} \cdot LHV_{NG} + \text{Electricity consumed}^{0.39}} \quad \text{Eq. 5.3}$$
where $\dot{M}_i$ is the mass flow and $LHV_i$ is the lower heating value of the product (FT syncrude, hydrogen) or raw material (biogas, hydrogen, natural gas). The electricity consumed by the plant (taken from the grid) is divided by the overall efficiency of the power cycle assumed to be 39% (Haro et al., 2013). It should be noted that the steam production by the Fischer-Tropsch off-gas combustor and/or the CHP plant (in those process designs that incorporate one) is not considered in the overall plant energy efficiency since this considers high value streams such as hydrogen, fuels or electricity unlike the low grade steam produced in the different process designs. Given said that, some of the process designs are able to produce surplus steam (after considering the heating requirements of the digesters); therefore, this surplus steam production should also be taken into account when drawing conclusions on process efficiency.

### 5.3 Base Case Models

As described in Section 1.2.1, the aim of this thesis is to compare the feasibility of different CO$_2$ capture and utilisation processes in order to identify the most promising routes for the conversion of Carbon Dioxide into a synthetic fuel. Initially the methodology will consider only the best available and proven technology (Base Case Models), which will then be adapted to consider a developing technology such as CO$_2$ capture using ionic liquids.

In the following sections, the results from the Base Case Models regarding process performance are presented. In all cases, the main plant input, in terms of energy (LHV), is the biogas produced the anaerobic digestion of sewage sludge. Other plant inputs include hydrogen for the CO$_2$ hydrogenation to syngas, natural gas for heating and electricity. The main plant output is, in all cases, FT syncrude. In some base case models, surplus heat is produced in the form of steam. The surplus steam is calculated as the remaining steam available after
deducting the heating requirements of the anaerobic digester, which were 11,338 kW in all cases, as reported by Dimitriou et al. (2015).

5.3.1 PD-MEA1 concept

As described in section 3.1.1, the PD-MEA1 process concept incorporates a monoethanolamine (MEA) gas treatment unit, which is often used to upgrade biogas to the same standards as natural gas by removing CO₂ and other trace constituents. The upgraded bio-methane is fed into a methane steam reformer for the production of syngas, which will be converted into FT syncrude via the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis. Fig 5.1 shows PD-MEA1 process concept implemented in Aspen Plus. Table 5.1 shows the results of the Aspen Plus simulation of the PD-MEA1 concept.
Fig. 5.1 Flow sheet of the PD-MEA1 process concept
Table 5.1 Summary of inputs, outputs and results of the PD-MEA1 concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PLANT INPUTS</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biogas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV biogas</td>
<td>MJ-kg⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg-h⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV biogas</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hydrogen</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV hydrogen</td>
<td>MJ-kg⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg-h⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV hydrogen</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural gas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV natural gas</td>
<td>MJ-kg⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg-h⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV natural gas</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electricity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total electricity consumption</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PLANT OUTPUTS</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FT-syncrude</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV FT-syncrude</td>
<td>MJ-kg⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg-h⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV FT-syncrude</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUEL MASS YIELD</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUEL ENERGY YIELD</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL PLANT EFFICIENCY</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.2 PD-MEA2 concept

Similarly to the PD-MEA1 process concept, the PD-MEA2 concept incorporates a monoethanolamine (MEA) gas treatment unit to capture the CO₂ in the biogas; however, PD-MEA2 does not incorporate a steam methane reformer for syngas production since it is assumed that
the upgraded bio-methane is sold for natural gas grid injection. The CO₂-rich stream produced by the MEA plant is fed to the RWGS reactor and converted into syngas, which will be further converted into liquid syncrude via the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis. The PD-MEA2 process concept implemented in Aspen Plus is shown in Fig. 5.2. Table 5.2 shows the results of the Aspen Plus simulation of the PD-MEA2 concept.
Fig. 5.2 Flow sheet of the PD-MEA2 process concept
### Table 5.2 Summary of inputs, outputs and results of the PD-MEA2 concept

#### PLANT INPUTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>LHV biogas: MJ·kg⁻¹</th>
<th>Mass flow: kg·h⁻¹</th>
<th>LHV biogas: kW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biogas</td>
<td>20.20</td>
<td>3,774.45</td>
<td>21,181.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV hydrogen: MJ·kg⁻¹</td>
<td>119.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow: kg·h⁻¹</td>
<td>195.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV hydrogen: kW</td>
<td>6,516.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural gas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV natural gas: MJ·kg⁻¹</td>
<td>48.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow: kg·h⁻¹</td>
<td>450.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV natural gas: kW</td>
<td>6,109.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total electricity consumption: kW</td>
<td>1,164.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PLANT OUTPUTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>LHV FT-synrude: MJ·kg⁻¹</th>
<th>Mass flow: kg·h⁻¹</th>
<th>LHV FT-synrude: kW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FT-synrude</td>
<td>32.10</td>
<td>244.76</td>
<td>2,192.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio-methane (95 vol. % CH₄)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV FT-synrude: MJ·kg⁻¹</td>
<td>43.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow: kg·h⁻¹</td>
<td>1,645.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV FT-synrude: kW</td>
<td>19,959.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Efficiency              | %                        |                   |                     |
| FUEL MASS YIELD         | 6.5                      |                   |                     |
| FUEL ENERGY YIELD       | 10.4                     |                   |                     |
| OVERALL PLANT EFFICIENCY| 6.0                      |                   |                     |
5.3.3 *PD-CHP1 concept*

The PD-CHP1 process concept is based on another biogas application: combustion of untreated biogas in a combined heat and power (CHP) unit to produce electricity and heat. In this process, raw biogas is fed directly to a CHP plant, which produces heat, electricity and an exhaust stream rich in CO\(_2\). This exhaust stream is fed to the RWGS reactor, along with a hydrogen stream, where syngas is produced via the reverse water-gas shift reaction. Finally, the syngas is converted into FT syncrude in the Fischer-Tropsch reactor. The PD-CHP1 process concept implemented in Aspen Plus is shown in Fig. 5.3. Table 5.3 shows the results of the Aspen Plus simulation of the PD-CHP1 concept.
Fig. 5.3 Flow sheet of the PD-CHP1 process concept (see section 4.1.3.2 for full details of “CHP”)
Table 5.3 Summary of inputs, outputs and results of the PD-CHP1 concept

**PLANT INPUTS**

**Biogas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LHV biogas</th>
<th>Mass flow</th>
<th>LHV biogas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LHV biogas</td>
<td>MJ·kg(^{-1})</td>
<td>20.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h(^{-1})</td>
<td>3,774.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV biogas</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td>21,181.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hydrogen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LHV hydrogen</th>
<th>Mass flow</th>
<th>LHV hydrogen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LHV hydrogen</td>
<td>MJ·kg(^{-1})</td>
<td>119.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h(^{-1})</td>
<td>575.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV hydrogen</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td>19,171.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Natural gas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LHV natural gas</th>
<th>Mass flow</th>
<th>LHV natural gas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LHV natural gas</td>
<td>MJ·kg(^{-1})</td>
<td>48.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h(^{-1})</td>
<td>598.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV natural gas</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td>8,124.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Electricity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total electricity consumption</th>
<th>kW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,664.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANT OUTPUTS**

**Electricity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total electricity production</th>
<th>kW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,096.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Steam**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Surplus steam production(^a)</th>
<th>kW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,411.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FT-syncrude**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LHV FT-syncrude</th>
<th>Mass flow</th>
<th>LHV FT-syncrude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LHV FT-syncrude</td>
<td>MJ·kg(^{-1})</td>
<td>29.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h(^{-1})</td>
<td>587.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV FT-syncrude</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td>5,259.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FUEL MASS YIELD</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUEL ENERGY YIELD</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL PLANT EFFICIENCY</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Saturated steam at 1.01 bar allowed to condense
5.3.4 PD-CHP1-OXY concept

The PD-CHP1-OXY process design is equivalent to PD-CHP1, although PD-CHP1-OXY employs oxygen for oxy-combustion of the untreated biogas in the CHP unit instead of air. The PD-CHP1-OXY process concept implemented in Aspen Plus is shown in Fig. 5.4. Table 5.4 shows the results of the Aspen Plus simulation of the PD-CHP1-OXY concept. It should be noted that the electricity consumed by the cryogenic oxygen plant (Air Separation Unit, ASU) has been taken into account for the calculation of the overall plant energy efficiency. A value for the electricity consumed by the ASU of 0.32 kWh per kg of O₂ produced was assumed (Aneke & Wang, 2015).
Fig. 5.4 Flow sheet of the PD-CHP1-OXY process concept (see section 4.1.3.2 for full details of “CHP”)
Table 5.4 Summary of inputs, outputs and results of the PD-CHP1-OXY concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANT INPUTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biogas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV biogas</td>
<td>MJ·kg(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV biogas</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hydrogen</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV hydrogen</td>
<td>MJ·kg(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV hydrogen</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural gas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV natural gas</td>
<td>MJ·kg(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV natural gas</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electricity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total electricity consumption</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANT OUTPUTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electricity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total electricity production</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steam</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus steam production(^{a})</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FT-syncrude</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV FT-syncrude</td>
<td>MJ·kg(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV FT-syncrude</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUEL MASS YIELD</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUEL ENERGY YIELD</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL PLANT EFFICIENCY</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)Saturated steam at 1.01 bar allowed to condense
5.3.5 PD-CHP2 concept

The PD-CHP2 process design incorporates, as the PD-CHP1 design, a CHP plant to produce heat and electricity; however in this case an MEA CO$_2$ capture system is placed before the CHP plant which is fed with the upgraded bio-methane \textit{(i.e.} more concentrated in CH$_4$) rather than untreated biogas as in PD-CHP1; thus, this is a pre-combustion CO$_2$ capture system. The PD-CHP2 process concept implemented in Aspen Plus is shown in Fig. 5.5. Table 5.5 shows the results of the Aspen Plus simulation of the PD-CHP2 concept.
Fig. 5.5 Flow sheet of the PD-CHP2 process concept (see section 4.1.3.2 for full details of “CHP”)
Table 5.5 Summary of inputs, outputs and results of the PD-CHP2 concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANT INPUTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biogas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV biogas</td>
<td>MJ·kg(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV biogas</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Hydrogen</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LHV hydrogen</td>
<td>MJ·kg(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV hydrogen</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Natural gas</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LHV natural gas</td>
<td>MJ·kg(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV natural gas</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Electricity</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total electricity consumption</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANT OUTPUTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Electricity</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total electricity production</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Steam</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surplus steam production(^a)</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FT-syncrude</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LHV FT-syncrude</td>
<td>MJ·kg(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV FT-syncrude</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **FUEL MASS YIELD** | 15.5 |
| **FUEL ENERGY YIELD** | 24.8 |
| **OVERALL PLANT EFFICIENCY** | 15.9 |

\(^a\)Saturated steam at 1.01 bar allowed to condense
5.3.6  PD-CHP2-OXY concept

The PD-CHP2-OXY process configuration is similar to PD-CHP2 but PD-CHP2-OXY employs oxygen for oxy-combustion of the upgraded bio-methane in the CHP unit instead of air. The PD-CHP2-OXY process concept implemented in Aspen Plus is shown in Fig. 5.6. Table 5.6 shows the results of the Aspen Plus simulation of the PD-CHP2-OXY concept. In the same way that with PD-CHP1-OXY, the electricity consumed by the cryogenic oxygen plant (Air Separation Unit, ASU) has been taken into account for the calculation of the overall plant energy efficiency.
Fig. 5.6 Flow sheet of the PD-CHP2-OXY process concept (see section 4.1.3.2 for full details of “CHP”)
Table 5.6 Summary of inputs, outputs and results of the PD-CHP2-OXY concept

**PLANT INPUTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>LHV biogas MJ·kg⁻¹</th>
<th>Mass flow kg·h⁻¹</th>
<th>LHV biogas kW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biogas</td>
<td>20.20</td>
<td>3,774.46</td>
<td>21,181.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>LHV hydrogen MJ·kg⁻¹</th>
<th>Mass flow kg·h⁻¹</th>
<th>LHV hydrogen kW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen</td>
<td>119.90</td>
<td>573.17</td>
<td>19,089.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>LHV natural gas MJ·kg⁻¹</th>
<th>Mass flow kg·h⁻¹</th>
<th>LHV natural gas kW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural gas</td>
<td>48.85</td>
<td>633.55</td>
<td>8,596.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Total electricity consumption kW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>5,724.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANT OUTPUTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Total electricity production kW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>8,442.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Surplus steam production kW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steam</td>
<td>2,738.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>LHV FT-syncrude MJ·kg⁻¹</th>
<th>Mass flow kg·h⁻¹</th>
<th>LHV FT-syncrude kW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FT-syncrude</td>
<td>31.80</td>
<td>705.45</td>
<td>6,319.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUEL MASS YIELD % 18.7
FUEL ENERGY YIELD % 29.8
OVERALL PLANT EFFICIENCY % 23.2

aSaturated steam at 1.01 bar allowed to condense
5.3.7 PD-CHP1-POST concept

The PD-CHP1-POST is similar to PD-CHP1 but an MEA unit is incorporated after the CHP plant so that this process design is based on post-combustion CO₂ capture. In this case, the MEA unit also allows the removal of the excess air used in the CHP plant which acts as an inert diluent, decreasing the efficiency of the downstream processes and necessitating higher power consumption for the subsequent syngas compression. The PD-CHP1-POST process concept implemented in Aspen Plus is shown in Fig. 5.7. Table 5.7 shows the results of the Aspen Plus simulation of the PD-CHP1-POST concept.
Fig. 5.7 Flow sheet of the PD-CHP1-POST process concept (see section 4.1.3.2 for full details of “CHP”)
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Table 5.7 Summary of inputs, outputs and results of the PD-CHP1-POST concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANT INPUTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biogas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV biogas</td>
<td>MJ·kg⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV biogas</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hydrogen</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV hydrogen</td>
<td>MJ·kg⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV hydrogen</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural gas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV natural gas</td>
<td>MJ·kg⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV natural gas</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electricity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total electricity consumption</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANT OUTPUTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electricity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total electricity production</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steam</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus steam productionᵃ</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FT-syncrude</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV FT-syncrude</td>
<td>MJ·kg⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV FT-syncrude</td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUEL MASS YIELD</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUEL ENERGY YIELD</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL PLANT EFFICIENCY</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ᵃSaturated steam at 1.01 bar allowed to condense
5.3.8 Comparison between Base Case Models

Tables 5.1 to 5.7 show that the biogas is the major source of energy input (on a LHV basis) in all process concepts. Although this is true in all cases, hydrogen is a very important plant energy input (LHV basis). The high H\textsubscript{2} requirements are the result of the 3:1 H\textsubscript{2}:CO\textsubscript{2} molar ratio required in the RWGS reactor to achieve 65% conversion of CO\textsubscript{2}. In terms of FT-syncrude production rate, the PD-MEA1 process design, which incorporates a CO\textsubscript{2} capture plant and a steam methane reformer, results in the highest syncrude production rate with a value of 831.7 kg·h\textsuperscript{-1} (7,450.5 kW [LHV]). The fact that PD-MEA1 incorporates the steam methane reformer also significantly affects the hydrogen requirements of the process, since it requires much less extra hydrogen (imported to the fuel synthesis plant) than the other concepts. The higher FT-syncrude production of the PD-MEA1 design can be explained by the higher amount of syngas fed to the FT synthesis as a result of the upstream methane steam reforming unit which converts methane to syngas instead of simply burning it in a CHP plant. The syngas production rate is also the reason why PD-MEA2, which does not include a steam methane reformer (upgraded bio-methane is injected into the gas grid), results in the lowest FT-syncrude output. It can be then concluded that hydrogen imports to the plant should be minimised by generating hydrogen within the plant. One approach is using steam methane reforming, as it is case in PD-MEA1. Additionally, the RWGS reactor, which require a H\textsubscript{2}:CO\textsubscript{2} molar ratio of 3 (see section 4.1.3.4) could be replaced by a process that generates H\textsubscript{2} \textit{in situ}. One of the most advanced examples of such technology is the CO\textsubscript{2}/H\textsubscript{2}O co-electrolysis process that uses electricity and heat to co-reduce CO\textsubscript{2} and H\textsubscript{2}O to syngas (CO + H\textsubscript{2}) (Becker \textit{et al.}, 2012; Fu \textit{et al.}, 2010; O'Brien \textit{et al.}, 2010). This would not only reduce drastically any H\textsubscript{2} imports to the plant but also would potentially increase the syngas production.
The design PD-CHP1, which involves direct biogas combustion in a CHP plant without biogas upgrading, results in a lower fuel production of 587.1 kg·h⁻¹ (5,259.1 kW [LHV]). The PD-CHP2 concept, which involves upgraded bio-methane combustion in a CHP plant, produces almost the same FT-syncrude output as PD-CHP1 (586.2 kg·h⁻¹ or 5,251.4 kW [LHV]). The process concepts employing oxy-combustion in the CHP plant (PD-CHP1-OXY and PD-CHP2-OXY are able to produce 705.9 kg·h⁻¹ and 705.5 kg·h⁻¹ of syncrude respectively (6,323.7 kW [LHV] and 6,319.7 kW [LHV] respectively). The reason for the higher FT-syncrude output of the oxy-combustion concepts than the air-combustion concepts is that in the designs employing air-combustion, the CHP exhaust stream that is processed downstream has a high content of N₂ (approx. 29 wt. %). This, results in a higher vapour pressure of the product stream coming from the FT reactor. When the FT product stream is fed into the FT Flash drum for vapour-liquid separation, some of the hydrocarbons are lost in the off-gas stream due to the higher vapour pressure of the FT product stream. PD-CHP1-OXY, PD-CHP2-OXY and PD-CHP1-POST are the only designs that are net producers of electricity, whereas the amount of electricity produced in the other designs is insufficient to cover their electricity requirements and thus electricity has to be imported from outside the plants. As for PD-CHP1 and PD-CHP2, this is due to the excessive N₂ that has to be processed downstream, which increases the electricity usage, in particular for compression. The process incorporating a post-combustion CO₂ capture plant, PD-CHP1-POST, produces 648.0 kg·h⁻¹ of FT-syncrude (5,805.2 kW [LHV]). This FT-syncrude output is higher than the one from PD-CHP1 since the post combustion CO₂ capture is able to isolate most of the N₂ from the CHP exhaust stream, which prevents the loss of some hydrocarbons in the FT off-gas stream. On the contrary, PD-CHP1-POST results in a lower FT-syncrude production than PD-CHP1-OXY due to the fact that the capture plant only scrubs 90% of the CO₂ in the CHP exhaust stream, which results in less CO₂ being processed
downstream. Fig. 5.8 shows a comparison between the FT-syncrude productions from each process design.

As for the mass yields and fuel energy yield, increased hydrocarbon production leads to higher yields; therefore, the greatest mass yield and energy yield are achieved by PD-MEA1 (22.0% and 35.2% respectively). Fig. 5.9 shows a comparison of the mass yield and energy yield achieved by each process concept.
Regarding the overall plant energy efficiency, which takes into account the total energy input (biogas, hydrogen, natural gas and electricity) and total energy output (FT syncrude and electricity), the highest efficiency is achieved by PD-CHP1 OXY (25.0%), followed by PD-CHP2-OXY (23.2%), PD-CHP1-POST (22.3%), PD-MEA1 (17.9%), PD-CHP1 (16.9%), PD-CHP2 (15.9%) and finally PD-MEA2 (6.0%). PD-CHP1-OXY results in the greatest efficiency since, although it produces slightly less FT-syncrude and consumes more H$_2$ than PD-MEA1 and, this is outweighed by the fact that PD-CHP1-OXY generates more electricity than it consumes and also the natural gas consumption (for heating purposes) is lower than that of PD-MEA1. PD-CHP2-OXY results in a similar efficiency as PD-CHP1-OXY, although slightly lower. This is due to the extra heat and electricity usage in the CO$_2$ capture plant, which is exacerbated in PD-CHP1-POST.
(post-combustion capture) due to the larger volume of flue gas processed and lower CO₂ concentration in the CHP exhaust stream compared to the pre-combustion cases (biogas upgrading); 3,775 kg·h⁻¹ biogas, 35 vol. % CO₂ versus 30,618 kg·h⁻¹ fluegas, 15 vol. % CO₂. As for PD-CHP1, it achieves a lower efficiency due to the lower FT-syncrude production; this is the result of the N₂ present in the FT effluent, which causes some of the hydrocarbons to be lost in the FT off-gas. Another reason for the low efficiency of PD-CHP1 is the higher electricity and natural gas consumption than those of CHP1-OXY. This is the result of the higher volume processed in the air-combustion cases. PD-CHP1’s efficiency is also lower than that of PD-MEA1 due to the higher hydrogen requirements and lower FT-syncrude production rate. The efficiency of PD-CHP2 is slightly lower than that of PD-CHP1 due to the extra heat and electricity usage in the CO₂ capture plant, which suggest that combustion of upgraded bio-methane in a CHP plant does not benefit the overall process performance. Fig. 5.10 shows a comparison of the overall plant energy efficiencies achieved by each process design.

![Overall plant energy efficiencies achieved by each process design](image)

**Fig. 5.10** Overall plant energy efficiencies achieved by each process design
5.4 Process employing CO$_2$ capture with ionic liquids

In this section, a developing technology such as CO$_2$ capture with ionic liquids is employed instead of CO$_2$ capture with monoethanolamine. The aim is to assess the effect that this developing technology could have on process performance. Aiming at presenting results in a clear way, the ionic-liquid based CO$_2$ capture plants will be compared with the MEA-base capture plant (Base Case Model) in terms of energy requirements, solvent capacity and cost.

As discussed in section 4.1.4.1, the target application is biogas upgrading (up to 95 mol. % CH$_4$) using, on one hand, ionic liquids which selectively absorb CO$_2$ physically and, on the other hand, an MEA solution (30 wt. % MEA).

The mass and energy flows as well as the mass yields, $Y_M$, energy yields, $Y_E$ and plant energy efficiencies, $\eta_E$ for the four process concepts considered (three ionic liquids and MEA) are presented in Tables 5.8-5.11. In order to allow a fair comparison between the different concepts, the mass flow and energy content of the biogas are identical in all cases. Similarly, the CH$_4$ concentration in the bio-methane product stream is set to 95 mol. % in all cases.

The mass yield, $Y_M$, which is a measure of the amount of raw biogas that ends up in the upgraded bio-methane, is defined as:

$$Y_M = \frac{M_{\text{bio-methane}}}{M_{\text{biogas}}} \quad \text{Eq. 5.4}$$

The energy yields and efficiencies of the evaluated processes are also presented in Tables 5.8-5.11. The energy yield, $Y_E$ is a measure of the energy content of the biogas that ends up in the upgraded bio-methane on a LHV basis and is given by,

$$Y_E = \frac{M_{\text{bio-methane}} \cdot \text{LHV}_{\text{bio-methane}}}{M_{\text{biogas}} \cdot \text{LHV}_{\text{biogas}}} \quad \text{Eq. 5.5}$$
On the other hand, the energy efficiency, $\eta_E$ takes into account the total energy input to the plant, \textit{i.e.} biogas (LHV), electricity and heat, the later for the MEA process only. $\eta_E$ also takes into account the total energy output from the plant, \textit{i.e.} bio-methane and electricity, the later for the ionic liquid-based processes only. The energy efficiency is given by:

$$\eta_E = \frac{(M_{\text{bio-methane}} \cdot LHV_{\text{bio-methane}}) + \text{electricity produced}}{(M_{\text{biogas}} \cdot LHV_{\text{biogas}}) + \text{heat consumed} + \frac{\text{electricity consumed}}{0.39}}$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{Eq. 5.6}

As in the base case models, the electricity consumed (grid electricity) is divided by the overall efficiency of the power cycle assumed to be 39\% (Haro \textit{et al.}, 2013).

As for energy flows, Tables 5.8-5.11 include both the lower heating value of the raw biogas and upgraded bio-methane coming in and out of the processes respectively, as well as the electricity inputs and outputs. In the processes using ionic liquids, biogas and electricity are the only plant inputs since no other energy inputs, \textit{e.g.} heat, are fed into these plants. On the other hand, the plant based on the MEA solution has heat inputs (expressed in natural equivalents LHV) for the solvent regeneration. It should be noted that while the in ionic liquid-based plants the solvent is regenerated by pressure-swing, in the MEA-based plant the solvent is regenerated by temperature swing.
Table 5.8 Summary of inputs, outputs and results of the [C$_2$MIm][Tf$_2$N] concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANT INPUTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solvent: [C$_2$MIm][Tf$_2$N]</td>
<td>kg·h$^{-1}$</td>
<td>56,997.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biogas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV biogas</td>
<td>MJ·kg$^{-1}$</td>
<td>20.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h$^{-1}$</td>
<td>3,774.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV biogas</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td>21,181.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electricity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total electricity consumption</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td>545.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANT OUTPUTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bio-methane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV bio-methane</td>
<td>MJ·kg$^{-1}$</td>
<td>43.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h$^{-1}$</td>
<td>1,522.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV bio-methane</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td>18,477.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUEL MASS YIELD</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUEL ENERGY YIELD</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANT EFFICIENCY</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IL capacity</strong></td>
<td>kg IL/kg BM</td>
<td>37.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.9 Summary of inputs, outputs and results of the $[\text{C}_6\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]$ concept

### PLANT INPUTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solvent: $[\text{C}_6\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]$</th>
<th>kg·h$^{-1}$</th>
<th>52,744.93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biogas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV biogas</td>
<td>MJ·kg$^{-1}$</td>
<td>20.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h$^{-1}$</td>
<td>3,774.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV biogas</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td>21,181.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electricity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total electricity consumption</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td>575.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANT OUTPUTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bio-methane</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LHV bio-methane</td>
<td>MJ·kg$^{-1}$</td>
<td>43.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h$^{-1}$</td>
<td>1,454.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV bio-methane</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td>17,660.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUEL MASS YIELD</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUEL ENERGY YIELD</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANT EFFICIENCY</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IL capacity</strong></td>
<td>kg IL/kg BM</td>
<td>36.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.10 Summary of inputs, outputs and results of the [$P_{66614}$][Tf$_2$N] concept

#### PLANT INPUTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solvent: [$P_{66614}$][Tf$_2$N]</td>
<td>kg·h$^{-1}$</td>
<td>44,182.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biogas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV biogas</td>
<td>MJ·kg$^{-1}$</td>
<td>20.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h$^{-1}$</td>
<td>3,774.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV biogas</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td>21,181.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electricity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total electricity consumption</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td>595.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PLANT OUTPUTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bio-methane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV bio-methane</td>
<td>MJ·kg$^{-1}$</td>
<td>43.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h$^{-1}$</td>
<td>1,263.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV bio-methane</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td>15,338.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUEL MASS YIELD</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUEL ENERGY YIELD</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANT EFFICIENCY</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IL capacity</strong></td>
<td>kg IL/kg BM</td>
<td>34.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.11 Summary of inputs, outputs and results of the MEA concept

#### PLANT INPUTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solvent: MEA&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>kg·h&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>22,619.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Biogas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LHV biogas</td>
<td>MJ·kg&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3,774.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV biogas</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td>21,181.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Natural gas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LHV natural gas</td>
<td>MJ·kg&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>48.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>359.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV natural gas</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td>4,880.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Electricity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total electricity consumption</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PLANT OUTPUTS

#### Bio-methane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LHV bio-methane</td>
<td>MJ·kg&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>43.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>kg·h&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,645.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHV bio-methane</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td>19,959.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FUEL MASS YIELD</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUEL ENERGY YIELD</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANT EFFICIENCY</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| MEA capacity<sup>b</sup>     | kg MEA/kg BM | 13.76 |

<sup>a,b</sup> Both the MEA requirements and absorption capacity are referred to pure MEA.

The process using the MEA solution produces 1,644.3 kg·h<sup>-1</sup> of bio-methane at 95 mol. %, followed by the process using [C<sub>2</sub>MIm][Tf<sub>2</sub>N] ionic liquid, which produces 1522.14 kg·h<sup>-1</sup>, 1454.91 kg·h<sup>-1</sup> produced by the second concept (based on [C<sub>6</sub>MIm][Tf<sub>2</sub>N] ionic liquid) and 1263.60 kg·h<sup>-1</sup> produced by the third concept (based on [P<sub>66614</sub>][Tf<sub>2</sub>N] ionic liquid). The
difference in the bio-methane output produced by the MEA-based concept and the ionic liquid-based concepts relies on the CO₂ absorption selectivity. The MEA has a very low affinity for CH₄ compared to the affinity that it has for CO₂, while in the case of the ionic liquids the CH₄ affinity is higher. This causes a significant proportion of the CH₄ in the biogas to end up in the CO₂-rich ionic liquid solution. The difference in the bio-methane production rate from the ionic-liquids concepts can be explained by the fact that, although the [C₆MIm][Tf₂N] and [P₆6614][Tf₂N] ionic liquids have a higher CO₂ absorption capacity, as shown in Tables 5.8-5.10, they also absorb more CH₄ than [C₂MIm][Tf₂N]. To produce these amounts of bio-methane, 56,997.63 kg·h⁻¹ of the [C₂MIm][Tf₂N] ionic liquid, 52,744.93 kg·h⁻¹ of [C₆MIm][Tf₂N] and 44,182.20 kg·h⁻¹ of [P₆6614][Tf₂N] are needed, respectively. These results demonstrate that the [P₆6614][Tf₂N] has the highest CO₂ absorption capacity, followed by [C₆MIm][Tf₂N] and [C₂MIm][Tf₂N], which is in agreement with experimental data (Carvalho et al., 2010; Zubeir et al., 2015; Carvalho et al., 2009). As for MEA, 22,619.64 kg·h⁻¹ of pure MEA are needed to produce the reported bio-methane rate. These results are expectable since MEA reacts with the CO₂ while the ionic liquids only absorb CO₂ physically.

As for the electricity flows, it should be noted that the values presented in Tables 5.8-5.10 account for both the biogas compressor and the pump recirculation in the case of the ionic liquid-based plants. In all ionic liquid cases the biogas compressor consumed 500.20 kW. The pump in the first process concept needs 45.02 kW of electricity, while the pumps in the second and third concepts request up to 75.30 kW and 95.04 kW, respectively; therefore, the biogas compressor accounts for the vast majority of the plant electricity consumption. These results show that the viscosity of the ionic liquid has a predominant effect on the electricity used by the recirculation pump. As for the MEA, the recirculation pump only consumes 6 kW of electricity.
Taking into account Eq. 5.4-5.5, increasing bio-methane production will increase both the mass yield and the energy yield and thus the highest mass yield is achieved by MEA (44%), followed by [C₂MIm][Tf₂N] (40%), [C₆MIm][Tf₂N] (39%) and [P₆₆₆₁₄][Tf₂N] (34%). In this study, the theoretical maximum value of \( Y_M \) is 69%. This is the maximum achievable if the solvent did not absorb CH₄ at all for upgraded bio-methane production at 95 mol. %. As for the energy yields, the highest is achieved by MEA (94%), followed by [C₂MIm][Tf₂N] (87%), [C₆MIm][Tf₂N] (83%) and [P₆₆₆₁₄][Tf₂N] (72%).

The process using [C₂MIm][Tf₂N] has the highest energy efficiency, achieving a value of 82%. The process using [C₆MIm][Tf₂N] also achieves 82% plant energy efficiency, followed by MEA (77%) and [P₆₆₆₁₄][Tf₂N] (71%). The reason why [C₂MIm][Tf₂N] and [C₆MIm][Tf₂N] result in higher efficiencies than MEA relies on the energy savings that the pressure-swing processes (ionic liquids) offer in contrast with the temperature-swing process (MEA). This is true despite the lower absorption capacity (kg of ionic liquid needed per kg of bio-methane produced) of the processes using [C₂MIm][Tf₂N] and [C₆MIm][Tf₂N]; therefore, it becomes clear that every energy inputs/outputs must be considered before making conclusions based solely on bio-methane production rates or solvent absorption capacity. Fig. 5.11 summarises the mass yields, energy yields and plant energy efficiencies of all process concepts considered.
Fig. 5.11 Mass yields, energy yields and plant energy efficiency of the evaluated biogas upgrading processes
6. ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT

6.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the methodology used to economically assess the selected process concepts which are compared in terms of capital, operating and production costs. The main aim is to identify the most cost-competitive CO$_2$ utilisation process concept. The software package Aspen Process Economic Analyzer (APEA), licensed by Aspen Tech (Aspen Technology, 2012b), with the UK set as the base country, was used to estimate the purchase cost of the equipment involved in every process concept. APEA is grounded in the Icarus Systems technology, which is based on the mathematical modelling technology developed by Icarus Corporation since 1969. Aspen Technology purchased Icarus Corporation in 2000. Stored in Icarus Systems are design and cost models for (Aspen Technology, 2012b):

- Over 250 kinds of liquid, gas and solids handling and processing equipment
- More than 60 kinds of plant bulk items
- Approximately 70 kinds of site preparation work
- Nearly a dozen types of buildings

Using the equipment costs, a cost model was developed in MS Excel, which allowed the estimation of the capital, operating and production costs of the evaluated process designs. Sensitivity analyses are carried out in order to evaluate the effect of different process parameters on fuel production costs.

6.2 General economic parameters

The assumptions for the economic evaluation of the different process designs are summarised in Table 6.1.
Table 6.1 General economic parameters assumed in the economic assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General economic parameters</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base year</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant life, years</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant annual operating hours</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan interest rate</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The base year for the economic evaluation was chosen to be 2013 according to Aspen Process Economic Analyzer v8.4. The Bank of England inflation calculator (Bank of England, 2014) was used when prices needed to be inflated to 2013 values. Whenever US dollars ($US) needed to be converted to British pounds (£) a conversion factor of £1 <> 1.6 $US was used, according to the 2013 exchange rates (XEcurrency, 2015).

The life of the plant, i.e. the time that the plant is expected to be fully operational, was chosen to be 20 years which is a common value in techno-economic assessments of chemical processes at an early stage of development (Dimitriou, 2012; Swanson et al., 2010a). The plant is designed to operate 8,000 hours per year, which means that a downtime of 760 hours per year is assumed (Dimitriou, 2012; Hamelinck et al., 2004).

As for the loan interest rate, it represents the interest at which any loaned money will have to be repaid to the investors. The rate at which interest will be paid is usually fixed at the time the capital is borrowed. The interest rate depends on many factors but is often proportional to the financial risk associated with the investment. In light with this, a project that involves somewhat simple and proven technology will benefit from a lower interest rate than one that involves complex and unproven systems. Although some can argue that an interest rate of 10% is high compared to interest
rates usually offered to the chemical industry, it is justified by the high financial risk associated with a developing technology such as CO\textsubscript{2} utilisation. In fact, others can argue that an interest rate of 10% is too low given the complex nature of the assessed CDU process designs as well as the lack of experience in the operation of such plants. Furthermore, it could be argued that not all process concepts assessed in this thesis are at the same technology readiness level (TRL) and therefore they would be offered different interest rates. At this point, there is not enough information on equivalent real plants to make an accurate decision about the interest rate. It was decided that a 10% interest rate would be used in this study since it is in agreement to the interest rate assumed in other studies that also considered immature technology for fuel synthesis (Dimitriou, 2012; Tijmensen \textit{et al.}, 2002). The interest rate will be included in the sensitivity analysis in order to assess the inherent uncertainty of this parameter.

6.3 Capital Expenditure (CAPEX)

In techno-economic assessments, it is required to determine the capital costs, which is the total investment needed to finance the project to the point at which the plant is ready to operate. In order for an industrial plant to become fully operational, a considerable investment must be supplied to acquire and install the necessary machinery and equipment (Peters \textit{et al.}, 2004). In addition, land and service facilities must be obtained, and the plant must be constructed with all piping, controls, and services (Peters \textit{et al.}, 2004). On top of that, the plant will incur in expenses associated with the plant operation.

The capital needed to supply the necessary manufacturing and plant facilities is called the \textit{fixed-capital investment} (FCI). The investment necessary for a period of operation is termed the \textit{working capital}, which include raw materials and supplies carried in stock, finished products in
stock and semi-finished products in the process of being manufactured, accounts receivable, cash kept on hand for monthly payment of operating expenses, such as salaries, wages, and raw-material purchases, accounts payable and taxes payable (Peters et al., 2004). The sum of the fixed-capital investment (FCI) and the working capital is known as the total capital investment (TCI). The fixed-capital investment (FCI) may be further subdivided into total direct cost (TDC) and total indirect cost (TIC) (Peters et al., 2004).

In this thesis, the total capital investment is calculated using an established method based on the percentage of Delivered-Equipment Cost (DEC), which is appropriate at the current (early) state of development of the processes considered in this study (Peters et al., 2004). This method requires determination of the DEC while the rest of the items included in the TCI are estimated as percentages of the DEC, as shown in Table 6.2. The software Aspen Process Economic Analyzer (APEA), licensed by Aspen Tech (Aspen Technology, 2012b), was used to determine the Delivered-Equipment Cost (DEC) of each modelled process concept.
Table 6.2 Ratio factors for Total Capital Investment estimation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Capital Investment (TCI)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Cost</strong></td>
<td>% of DEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased equipment</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment installation</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation and control</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piping</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and building services</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard improvements</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service facilities</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Direct Cost (TDC)</strong></td>
<td><strong>360</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Cost</strong></td>
<td>% of DEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction expenses</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal costs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor's fee</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Indirect Cost (TIC)</strong></td>
<td><strong>144</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed Capital Invest. (FCI) = TDC + TIC</strong></td>
<td><strong>504</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working capital(^a)</td>
<td>15% of TCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Invest. (TCI) = TDC + TIC + Working capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cost of purchasing the land is not included in the Fixed Capital Investment (FCI). This is because its value can be recovered at the end of the project and therefore it is not usually included in the estimation of the FCI (Peters et al., 2004).

In the absence of measured factors for CO₂-to-fuels plants, the percentage factors presented in Table 6.2 are average values for typical chemical
plants. The expected accuracy is in the ±30% range. Comparability between the different process designs is guaranteed since the same method is used throughout all of them. In addition, the sensitivity analysis presented in section 6.7 will explore the consequences of potential fluctuations in the estimation of the TCI.

In the case of the CHP plant, investment cost data was taken from the literature instead of using the method described in Table 6.2. Since investment cost data are taken from real plants, it is expected that they are more accurate than if they were calculated using the factorial method described in Table 6.2. A total investment cost value of $925·kW^{-1} (2013) was considered in this study (Darrow et al., 2015). This value refers to a gas engine generator in grid interconnected CHP applications. Although the CHP system considered in this thesis is in fact a combined cycle gas turbine (CCGT CHP), therefore not a gas engine (GE CHP), investment costs are comparable for both CHP systems at the scale considered in this work (Lako, 2010).

The capital investment needed to carry out a project is usually borrowed and then repaid annually over the lifetime of the plant at a given interest, which is the case of this study. The annuity method (Lauer, 2009) is used to calculate the payback of the investment by including the interest rate in the calculation of the annuity. The annuity is a fixed and constant annual payment usually over the lifetime of the investment, which comprises the capital payback and the interest. This method spreads the initial investment cost over the project lifetime using an assumed interest rate. It does not take into account any changes or diminution in the value of the incomes received or costs expended each year. Similarly, the method does not consider the inflation rate (and the rise of cost and of income over the lifetime). A 10% interest rate is assumed as discussed in section 6.2. The annual amount required to repay the loan on capital costs is given by:
\[
A = TCI \cdot \frac{r(1+r)^N}{(1+r)^N-1} \quad \text{Eq. 6.1}
\]

where \( A \) is the annuity of the capital investment, \( TCI \) the total capital investment, \( r \) the interest rate and \( N \) the lifetime of the project.

6.4 Operating and Maintenance costs (O&M)

The total annual costs consist of capital investment annuities (as calculated from Eq. 6.1) as well as O&M costs (also known as operating costs), \( i.e. \) fixed charges, direct production costs, general expenses and plant overhead. This section includes all expenses directly related to the manufacturing operation or the physical equipment of the different process designs (Peters et al., 2004). The plant operating costs were estimated using the method summarised in Table 6.3, which was adapted from (Peters et al., 2004). Once more, the percentage factors were taken as average values for typical chemical plants.
### Table 6.3 General assumptions for operating cost estimation

#### Operating costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Assumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed charge</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local taxes</td>
<td>2% of FCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>1% of FCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct prod. cost(^a)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalysts and PSA packing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance (M)</td>
<td>7% of FCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating labour (OL)(^b,c)</td>
<td>£20·h(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision (S)</td>
<td>15% of OL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating supplies</td>
<td>15% of M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory charges</td>
<td>15% of OL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plant overhead</strong></td>
<td>15% of (M + OL + S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative cost</td>
<td>15% of OL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution and marketing</td>
<td>2% of O&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D cost</td>
<td>2% of O&amp;M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Utility costs are also included in the direct production cost. \(^b\)Hourly wages taken from APEA. \(^c\)40 man-hours/day are assumed for the given plant capacity (Peters et al., 2004).

The price of the utilities used in the modelled process designs are shown in Table 6.4.
Table 6.4 Utility prices used for the estimation of operating costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility prices</th>
<th>Price (£·unit⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steam, £·t⁻¹</td>
<td>17.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural gas, £·kWh⁻¹</td>
<td>0.0270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling water, £·m⁻³</td>
<td>0.0317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerant, £·t⁻¹</td>
<td>0.1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, £·kWh⁻¹</td>
<td>0.0775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The steam, cooling water, refrigerant and electricity prices are Aspen Process Economic Analyzer’s default values for the UK and 2013. The natural gas price was retrieved from the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC, 2014a).

It must be noted that biogas, which is the feedstock for all evaluated process concepts, has no cost since it is assumed that the fuel synthesis plant is part of a large waste water treatment plant. The biogas produced from the anaerobic digestion of primary and secondary sludge would otherwise be flared or used to heat up the digester, which is not prevented by adding the fuel synthesis plant.

6.5 Production costs

Typically, the fuel production costs are calculated by dividing the total annual costs (which include both annual capital repayments and operating costs) by the amount of FT-syncrude produced in a year, on a LHV basis (Dimitriou et al., 2015). The fuel productions costs are then defined by Eq. 6.2 as,

\[
PROD_{\text{COST}} = \frac{\text{Total annual costs}}{\text{FT-syncrude (LHV)}} \quad (\text{£} \cdot \text{GJ}^{-1}) \quad \text{Eq. 6.2}
\]

The annual basis is chosen in order to ease any seasonal fluctuations caused by occasional disturbances in plant operation, e.g. start-up period, programmed maintenance downtime, etc. (Peters et al., 2004).
In this thesis, the effect of inflation on the total annual costs is not taken into consideration, i.e. constant prices are assumed throughout the life of the plant. This assumption can be made provided that it is kept consistently along all modelled process concepts, which is the case of this study (Sinnott, 2005).

In a typical industrial plant, operating costs are expected to be higher in the first years of operation mainly due to the reduced production output, which usually increase as the plant become more able to operate near the optimal point as years pass (Peters et al., 2004). In this study, all process concepts are at the same early stage of development and therefore variations of total annual costs along the life of the plant due plant performance will be equivalent in all cases. Government subsidies or CO₂ credits are not considered in this study.

6.6 Results

In this section, the economic evaluation of all process designs considered in this thesis is presented. As explained above, the comparison between all process concepts is made based on their capital investment, operating costs and fuel production costs. An in-depth profitability analysis was not carried out due to the immaturity of the assessed processes; however, income streams originated from surplus heat, surplus electricity and upgraded bio-methane are included in this chapter. First, an economic assessment of the Base Case Models is presented in section 6.6.1. It should be noted that these process designs are based on well-established, best available technology. Subsequently, section 6.6.2 includes the economic evaluation of the process concepts that use ionic liquids for CO₂ capture. Detailed cost results for each design are presented in detail in Appendix D.

6.6.1 Base Case Models

The seven Base Case Models which are assessed in this section are summarised in Table 6.5.
Table 6.5 Summary of the technologies involved in the different process designs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process sections</th>
<th>PD-MEA1</th>
<th>PD-MEA2</th>
<th>PD-CHP1</th>
<th>PD-CHP1-OXY</th>
<th>PD-CHP2-OXY</th>
<th>PD-CHP1-POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ capture&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHP&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air-combustion</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxy-combustion</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂ recovery&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syngas production&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ conversion&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel synthesis&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>MEA-based CO₂ capture. <sup>b</sup>Combined Heat and Power. <sup>c</sup>Pressure Swing Adsorption (PSA). <sup>d</sup>Steam reforming of methane. <sup>e</sup>Reverse Water-Gas-Shift (RWGS). <sup>f</sup>Fischer-Tropsch synthesis.

Income streams from surplus heat and surplus electricity are presented in Table 6.6. Surplus values are calculated using data from Tables 5.1-5.7 for a plant operating 8000 hours in a year. Unit prices for surplus steam and electricity were assumed at 4.82 p·kWh⁻¹ and 7.81 p·kWh⁻¹, respectively (Aaron, 2012; OFGEM, 2016).
Table 6.6 Income streams originated from surplus heat, surplus electricity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PD-MEA1</th>
<th>PD-MEA2</th>
<th>PD-CHP1-OXY</th>
<th>PD-CHP2-OXY</th>
<th>PD-CHP1-POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surplus Steam (kW)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,411</td>
<td>3,061</td>
<td>5,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus steam annual income (M£)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus electricity (kW)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2615.51</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus electricity annual income (M£)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6.1.1. Capital expenditure (CAPEX)

As discussed in section 6.3, the total capital investment (TCI) is calculated using a method based on the percentage of Delivered-Equipment Costs (DEC), which were estimated using Aspen Process Economic Analyzer (APEA). Fig. 6.1 shows the breakdown of the DEC for different areas of the CO₂-to-fuels plant and the resulting total DEC for the seven process designs.
The DEC ranges from £3.44 million (PD-MEA2) to £10.30 million (PD-CHP2). The process designs that are based on a Combined Heat and Power (CHP) plant (PD-CHP1, PD-CHP1-OXY, PD-CHP2, PD-CHP2-OXY and PD-CHP1-POST) result in higher DEC than PD-MEA1 and PD-MEA2 as a result of including a CHP unit, which increases the equipment costs and thus the total DEC of the plant. The lower DEC of the PD-MEA2 is mainly a consequence of the steam methane reformer that the PD-MEA2 does not include. The CHP unit contributes 40–59% to the total DEC. The fuel synthesis area is also a major contributor to the total DEC ranging from 22%–48%. The main reason for the high contribution of the fuel synthesis area to the total DEC is the high purchase cost of the FT plant compressor. This is in line with other techno-economic studies that considered FT synthesis technology (Dimitriou, 2012; Swanson et al., 2010). The steam reforming area, only present in PD-MEA1, represents...
37% of the total DEC. The PSA plant represents a very small fraction of the DEC in PD-MEA1 (0.3%) but has a much higher contribution in all the rest of the concepts (14%-34%). The lower contribution of the PSA plant in PD-MEA1 is due to the fact that in this design the PSA plant does not necessitate a compressor since the stream to be treated in the PSA unit comes already pressurised from the steam methane reformer. The CO₂ capture plant represents 5%-16% of the total DEC while the RWGS area represents 3%-6%.

Fig. 6.1 also shows that PD-CHP1 and PD-CHP2 result in similar DEC (£9.9 million and £10.3 million respectively). This is explained by the very similar nature of both designs which only differ in the CO₂ capture plant that PD-CHP2 includes and PD-CHP1 does not. It can be also noticed that the fuel synthesis, the PSA and the RWGS contribution to the total DEC is higher in these two designs than in all the other as a consequence of the higher gas processing involved in both processes.

As for the CO₂ capture contribution, its contribution to the total DEC is the largest of all in PD-CHP1-POST due to larger gas flowrate that the capture plant has to process in this design. It should be noted that the CO₂ capture plant in PD-CHP1-POST processes the exhaust stream from the CHP plant rather than raw biogas, as in PD-MEA1, PD-MEA2, PD-CHP2 and PD-CHP2-OXY.

Fig. 6.2 shows the total capital investment (TIC) of the evaluated Base Case Models, ranging £21 million to £61 million. Since the TIC is proportional to the DEC (see Table 6.2), one can expect that those process design with higher DEC will result in higher TIC too.
6.6.1.2. O&M costs

Fig. 6.3 shows the annual operating and maintenance costs as calculated using the method explained in section 6.4. The total O&M includes the expenditure in cooling, heating, electricity, hydrogen, oxygen (for the oxy-combustion CHP processes) and other charges (which represent all other charges). Under the “Other” category, the expenditure on maintenance, operating labour, supervision, operating supplies, laboratory charges, plant overhead, fixed charge and total general expenses are included. The “Other” category also includes the MEA make up cost which represents a very small fraction of the total O&M (0.01%-0.03%).
The O&M costs range from £13–£34 million. Similarly to the DEC, the process designs that are based on a Combined Heat and Power (CHP) plant (PD-CHP1, PD-CHP1-OXY, PD-CHP2, PD-CHP2-OXY and PD-CHP1-POST) result in higher O&M than PD-MEA1 and PD-MEA2. This is mainly a result of the higher hydrogen requirements as the processes based on a CHP plant do not produce any hydrogen within the plants, as PD-MEA1 do, thanks to the steam methane reforming. PD-MEA2 results in lower O&M than PD-MEA1 first due to the savings in heating and electricity as a consequence of not employing a steam methane reformer. Additionally, the cooling costs of PD-MEA2 are lower because of the lower gas volume to be processed downstream (upgraded bio-methane injected into the grid, i.e. not processed downstream of the CO₂ capture plant). The contribution of the supply of hydrogen to the O&M costs ranges from 4%
36%. The processes PD-CHP1 and PD-CHP2 result in higher heating, cooling and electricity than PD-CHP1-OXY and PD-CHP2-OXY due to the higher volume of gas that is processed in the designs employing air-combustion. The cost of the supplied oxygen for the oxy-combustion processes is £1.9 million in both PD-CHP1-OXY and PD-CHP2-OXY (6%-7% of total O&M costs). PD-CHP2 results in higher O&M than PD-CHP1 as a consequence of the extra cooling and heating required in the CO₂ capture plant. The O&M costs associated with PD-CHP1-POST are lower than those of PD-CHP1 and PD-CHP2 due to the net electricity production from PD-CHP1-POST and also due to the lower volume of gas to be processed downstream of the CO₂ capture plant. This decreases the cooling, heating and electricity consumption as well as catalyst and PSA packing requirements.

As for the catalyst and PSA packing, their cost is low compared to the other contributors to O&M as they only represent 2%-3% of the O&M. The details of how the catalyst and PSA packing costs were calculated for each process design can be found in Appendices B and C.

In all process designs, the cooling costs are higher than the heating costs and in all cases represent a significant contribution to the O&M (20%-38%). This is explained by the fact the cooling of a given stream is present in all areas of the different process designs except for the CHP plant. The main contributors to the cooling costs are, in this order, the stripping column condenser in the CO₂ capture plant, the FT compressor intercooling, the FT cooler and the FT reactor, representing 97%-98% of all cooling costs. One approach to tackle the high cooling costs could have been to perform heat integration throughout the plant. The process heat integration was attempted using the pinch analysis technique (Ebrahimi & Kawari, 2000), using the Aspen Energy Analyzer software, licensed by Aspen Tech (Aspen Technology 2013a). After performing the pinch analysis in all process concepts, it was revealed that the scope for heat integration was negligible and thus any savings in cooling/heating was
outweighed by the extra equipment cost (mainly heat exchangers). As an example of this situation, Table 6.7 shows the heating and cooling costs of the base case and integrated designs for PD-MEA1. Figs. 6.4-6.6 depict such designs as a heat exchanger network (HEN).

**Table 6.7 Results from Aspen Energy Analyzer for PD-MEA1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NETWORK COST INDEXES</th>
<th>PD-MEA1</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>Integrated Design 1</th>
<th>Integrated Design 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heating (Cost·s⁻¹)</td>
<td>7.95·10³</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling (Cost·s⁻¹)</td>
<td>5.02·10³</td>
<td>-5.25·10⁻⁴</td>
<td>-1.49·10⁻³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating (Cost·s⁻¹)</td>
<td>1.30·10²</td>
<td>-5.25·10⁻⁴</td>
<td>-1.49·10⁻³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital (Cost)</td>
<td>7.01·10⁵</td>
<td>2.51·10⁶</td>
<td>2.35·10⁶</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (Cost·s⁻¹)</td>
<td>2.01·10²</td>
<td>2.51·10⁻²</td>
<td>2.25·10⁻²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 6.4 Heat exchanger network of PD-MEA1 (base case)**
It should be noted that the hydrogen needed in the RWGS reaction is considered to be produced within the same WWTP-CCU plant complex by water electrolysis, which is a well-developed low carbon technology (Bhandari et al., 2014; Quadrelli et al., 2011). However, the water electrolysis plant has not been modelled in this study due to the availability of hydrogen production cost data in the literature. In this study, a production costs value of £2 per kg of hydrogen produced by a Polymer Electrolyte Membrane (PEM) electrolyser (US Department of Energy,
20014), was assumed and added to the fuel production cost. The assumed hydrogen production cost includes both capital and operating expenditure.

Similarly, the oxygen needed by the CHP plants with oxy-combustion is also considered to be produced within the same WWTP-CCU plant complex by an Air Separation Unit (ASU). As highlighted in section 3.3.4.2, the ASU plant was not modelled in this study. Alternatively, since ASU is a well-established and mature technology, the production costs of O₂ at 99.9 mol. % and 8 bar were retrieved from the literature with a value of $35_{1994}/\text{tonne of oxygen}$, considering that the ASU is located next to the CO₂ utilisation plant and therefore no transport costs are involved (Rao & Muller, 2007). The oxygen production cost includes both capital and operating expenditure and was added to the fuel production cost.

6.6.1.3. Fuel production costs

The production costs per GJ of FT-syncrude (LHV) for each evaluated process design are presented in Fig. 6.7, along with the contribution of capital costs (as capital annuity) and O&M expenditure.
The calculated production costs do not include tax, duties, producer and retailer profits, marketing expenditure and distribution costs. The fuel production costs range from £95.46·GJ$^{-1}$ to £298.73·GJ$^{-1}$.

O&M costs are a more important contributor to the fuel production costs than the capital investment as they represent 83-85% of the total production costs. PD-MEA1 has the lowest production costs at £95.46·GJ$^{-1}$ because of its lower capital and operating costs as well as higher fuel production compared to the other six cases. The next best option in terms of production costs is PD-CHP1-OXY (£178.32·GJ$^{-1}$), which has the lowest production costs among all CHP-based designs. PD-CHP2-OXY (£197.42·GJ$^{-1}$) results in slightly higher fuel production costs than PD-CHP1-OXY mainly due to the extra cost associated with the CO$_2$ capture plant. The next process design is PD-CHP1-POST, which produces fuels at £217.11·GJ$^{-1}$. This is followed by PD-MEA2 fuel production costs of £246.43·GJ$^{-1}$. In this case, the lower TCI and O&M of PD-MEA2 compared...
to those of PD-MEA1 are outweighed by the much lower fuel production rate. It should be noted that the upgraded bio-methane stream produced by PD-MEA2 could generate an annual income of 11.98 M£ assuming a bio-methane selling price of $7.5\cdot\text{kWh}^{-1}$ under the UK renewable heat initiative (DECC, 2014b).

Both process concepts that use an air-combustion CHP (PD-CHP1 and PD-CHP2) are associated with the highest fuel production costs at £278.81 and £298.73 per GJ, which is approximately 92% and 113% higher than for PD-MEA1, respectively. The main reason for this is that this concept produces a significantly lower amount of liquid fuels than PD-MEA1, as discussed in section 5.1.2.8. In addition, both TCI and O&M associated with PD-CHP1 and PD-CHP2 are considerably higher than those of PD-MEA1, as discussed in section 6.6.1.1 and 6.6.1.2. From these it is clear that the amount of fuel produced is a very important aspect of the production costs; thus, its effect is investigated in the sensitivity analysis later in this chapter (section 6.7).

6.6.1.4. Comparison with costs of conventional transport fuels

Several factors, such as fiscal regimes, debt/equity ratio, type of loans, and corporate return requirements as well as government subsidies and CO$_2$ credits may affect the selling prices of liquid fuels produced via the proposed CCU technologies. Another factor which significantly affects the fuel production costs of any industrial plant is the economies of scale in the sense that production costs are expected to decrease dramatically as production rates increase. This is the reason why the effect of the economies of scale is investigated in this section in order to assess the potential economic competitiveness of CCU against conventional, fossil fuel technologies. The effect of economies of scale will be investigated only for PD-MEA1, since it is the process design that achieved the highest plant efficiency as well as the lowest production costs of all evaluated CCU process designs. Eighteen plant capacities are evaluated, ranging from 18.3 tonne-day$^{-1}$ (base case) to 1670 tonnes of liquid fuels produced per
day. The latter capacity corresponds to the Shell Middle Distillate Synthesis (SMDS) Gas-to-Liquids (GTL) plant built in Bintulu (Malaysia), a large complex that produces naptha, kerosene and gas-oil from natural gas via an enhanced Fischer-Tropsch process (Eilers et al., 1991). The TCI of the scaled-up plants were estimated using the six-tenths factor rule, defined by Eq. 6.3,

\[ C_2 = C_1 \cdot \left( \frac{S_2}{S_1} \right)^{0.6} \quad \text{Eq. 6.3} \]

where \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) are the TCI of the PD-MEA1 base case and the 1670 tonne-day\(^{-1} \) plant, respectively, \( S_1 \) and \( S_2 \) are the capacities of the PD-MEA1 base case and the larger plant, respectively, and 0.6 is the scaling factor. The six-tenths factor equation is a rule of thumb developed over the years, which evolved in the public domain after large quantities of actual cost data were analysed retrospectively. The purpose of using such rule in this thesis is to explore the impact of the scale on the assessed processes; however, it should be noted that it is not intended to perform a rigorous analysis over the issues surrounding scale. The reader should be aware of the impracticality of building an AD reactor at the scale considered in the scaled-up case \( (C_2) \). As an alternative, the necessary flowrate of biogas could be transported from several waste water treatment plants to a centrally located CO\(_2\)-to-fuels plant.

The annual operating costs of PD-MEA1 are approximately 5.5 times the annualised cost of capital; therefore, the same percentage contribution was assumed in calculating the operating costs of the scaled-up plants. Using the six-tenths factor rule, the capital investment for the PD-MEA1 plant of the largest capacity considered here (1670 tonnes per day) is estimated at £405 million (£47.6 million annualised costs of capital). The annual O&M costs are estimated to be £260.5 million. The TCI of the scaled-up CCU plant is 51% lower than those of the Shell plant (£831 million), although the capital costs of the water electrolysis plant and the ASU of the CCU plant are not included in the TCI, as explained in section
6.6.1.2. On the other hand, the operating costs of the CCU plant are approximately 6 times higher than those of the Shell plant (£260.5 million). These results highlight the importance of the operating costs, which should be drastically reduced if successful implementation of the CCU technology is to be pursued (see section 6.6.1.5). It should also be noted that the Shell’s GTL plant was built in 1990 in Malaysia and therefore one must be careful when making any comparisons between the GTL plant and the CCU plant, which is a much less developed technology that has been considered to be built and operated in the UK in this study.

Fig. 6.8 shows the effect of scale on the costs of CCU fuels. For the largest plant capacity, the fuel production costs are approximately 6 times lower than for the PD-MEA1 base case (£15.67·GJ⁻¹ vs £95.46·GJ⁻¹).

![Cost of liquid fuels in £ per GJ (LHV) at different plant capacities for PD-MEA1](image)

**Fig. 6.8** Cost of liquid fuels in £ per GJ (LHV) at different plant capacities for PD-MEA1

As for the cost of producing conventional diesel and gasoline in 2013 and in the UK, their gate costs (composed of operating costs and capital amortisation) were £0.47 per litre for gasoline and £0.51 per litre for diesel.
(UKPIA, 2015), excluding tax, duty, profits, marketing and distribution costs. On an LHV basis, the gate costs of gasoline and diesel were £14.3·GJ⁻¹ and £14.6·GJ⁻¹, which are 7% and 9% lower than those of the CCU plant, respectively. Since the gate prices for gasoline and diesel are given in £ per litre, a volumetric energy density of 34 MJ per litre (LHV) and 32 MJ per litre (LHV) was assumed for diesel and gasoline, respectively (Edwards et al., 2013). These results, although positive must be interpreted very carefully and any conclusions drawn from must take into account the assumptions made in the case of the CCU plant. First, the CCU plant does not produce gasoline nor diesel but a mixture of hydrocarbons (C₅-C₃₀); although a LHV basis was chosen for the comparison between the conventional and the CCU fuels, one should be aware of this fact since the FT upgrading island would incur in extra costs related to further processing (cracking, distillation, etc.). Second, the CCU plant is based on best available technology but it is a synthetic route to fuels at a very early stage of development; therefore, one should take into account the uncertainties associated with a process of this kind. Third, the gate prices of conventional fuels are, of course, highly dependent on crude oil prices. With crude oil prices falling continuously since 2012 (UKPIA, 2015), the CCU fuel synthesis processes proposed in this study will become less financially attractive; thus, it is anticipated that increases in fossil fuel prices, governmental subsidies or environmental legislation such as carbon taxes will be needed in order to make CCU fuels competitive in the market. All in all, the reported results encourage further research in the area, which should be focussed on areas highlighted in the following section 6.6.1.5.

In this section, it has been demonstrated that the fuel production costs decrease dramatically when the plant capacity increases; therefore, the results showed in Fig. 6.8 suggest that such technology will only achieve commercial success if large amounts of CO₂ can be converted into fuels. In light with this, alternative sources of carbon dioxide must also be assessed. One potential candidate could be CO₂ capture from power
plants and subsequent conversion to fuels since in this case large amounts of CO$_2$ are guaranteed. For instance, a 600 MWe coal-fired power plant would provide CO$_2$ in the region of 120 kg·s$^{-1}$ (Abu-Zahra et al., 2007). This represents an increase of more than two orders of magnitude compared to the amount of CO$_2$ in the biogas processed in the base case models. To put this in context, about 3,512 t·day$^{-1}$ of FT syncrude could be produced, assuming a CO$_2$ to fuels mass yield of 37% (as in PD-MEA1). According to Fig. 6.8, these FT syncrude production rate could translate into a fuel production cost below conventional fuels (below £14·GJ$^{-1}$); however, a potential drawback of a power plant as the CO$_2$ source is the lack of endogenous production of the necessary H$_2$ as opposed to, for instance, PD-MEA1. This will require large imports of H$_2$, which would increase the OPEX substantially.

6.6.1.5. Identification of hotspots for CCU fuel production costs

The previous sections have set out the different contributors to the fuel production costs. At this stage, it is crucial to identify the hotspots for fuel production costs, which will be targeted for optimizing the process. Since PD-MEA1 is the process design that results in the lowest production costs, it will be targeted for hotspots identification.

As pointed in section 6.6.1.3, the TCI is one of the contributors to the fuel production costs and therefore the aim is to reduce them as much as possible. Fig 6.1 shows that the fuel synthesis area and the steam methane reformer are the main contributors to the DEC and therefore to the TCI with a share of 37% and 48%, respectively. As for the fuel synthesis area, which is based on Fischer-Tropsch synthesis, 66% of its DEC corresponds to the cost of the syngas compression equipment. This is in line with other studies that considered FT synthesis for fuel production (Swanson et al., 2010a). The main target for optimization here would be to increase the water removal in the syngas (unreacted water in steam methane reformer), which would result in lower compression equipment complexity (due to reduced compression volume and potential
condensation). Additionally, R&D developments on FT synthesis that increases fuel yields and selectivity at lower operating pressures are required.

As for the steam methane reformer, which is a mature and well developed technology, it is expected that further improvements in the technology will be of much less scale than those on FT synthesis; however, as in the FT synthesis area, the compression equipment represents a large share of the steam methane reformer DEC (77%). It is then clear that, as in the FT area, R&D developments should focus on achieving high conversions of CH₄ at lower operating pressures.

Section 6.6.1.3 highlights that the bulk of the fuel production costs come from the O&M expenditure. Within the O&M expenditure, the largest contributors are, in this order, cooling, other charges and heating, accounting for 83% of all O&M costs. As discussed in section 6.6.1.2, ‘other charges’ includes maintenance, operating labour, supervision, operating supplies, laboratory charges, plant overhead, fixed charge and total general expenses. Most of these charges are estimated as a percentage of the TCI, as defined by Peters et al. (2004); therefore, in order to reduce their contribution to the O&M, the TCI must be reduced first.

Cooling is the main contributor to O&M (38%) in PD-MEA1 and therefore it is crucial to reduce this contribution. 52% of the cooling costs comes from the ‘three-way’ condenser used in the FT synthesis to separate the off-gas, the FT liquids and the water fractions. An additional 32% of the cooling costs are generated by the stripping column condenser, which condenses any water vapours produced during the regeneration of the MEA solution (70 wt. % water). The main target here would be to develop CO₂-absorbing solutions that allow either regeneration at temperatures below the water boiling point or solutions that can be used at 100% purity so that they do not have to be mixed with water to prevent corrosion-related problems, e.g. ionic liquids.
As for the heating, the steam methane reformer contributes to 56% of all heating costs, due to the high (endothermic) enthalpy of reaction. Since this technology has been used at an industrial scale for decades, major breakthroughs are not likely to happen; therefore the steam methane reforming is an area of the CCU plant that shows little scope for improvement. On the hand, the CO$_2$ capture plant, which represents 31% of all total heating costs, has been targeted by active research in the last years, as highlighted in section 2.5. The main focus here would be to develop capture media with high CO$_2$ affinity while at the same time requiring less energy to release the absorbed CO$_2$.

The final target for fuel production costs reduction would be to maximise the fuel production rate. This is mainly affected by the fuel yields in the Fischer-Tropsch reactor, which are at the same time dependant on the syngas production rates; therefore the process improvements should seek to maximise syngas production and FT fuel yields under moderate conditions (temperature and pressure).

6.6.2 CO$_2$ capture using ionic liquids

This section includes the economic evaluation of the CO$_2$ capture plants that use ionic liquids as a solvent for CO$_2$ capture. These results are compared with an MEA-based CO$_2$ capture plant, which is considered a well-developed technology. Ionic liquid-based processes and the MEA process are totally comparable to the biogas upgrading plants using ionic liquids in terms of flowrate and conditions of the biogas (composition, temperature and pressure), dimensions of the absorber, type of packing and composition of the upgraded bio-methane (95 vol. %). Detailed costs results for each design are presented in detail in Appendix D.

The total capital expenditure (TCI) was estimated using the same method as in the case of the base case models (Peters et al., 2004). Table 6.8 shows the breakdown of the capital costs related to each process concept using the method described in Table 6.2.
Table 6.8 Summary of the total capital investment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>([\text{C}_2\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]) (£1000)</th>
<th>([\text{C}_6\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]) (£1000)</th>
<th>([\text{P}_{66614}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]) (£1000)</th>
<th>MEA (£1000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased equipment</td>
<td>1519.00</td>
<td>1550.80</td>
<td>1570.50</td>
<td>519.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment installation</td>
<td>713.93</td>
<td>728.88</td>
<td>738.14</td>
<td>244.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>546.84</td>
<td>558.29</td>
<td>565.38</td>
<td>187.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piping</td>
<td>1032.92</td>
<td>1054.54</td>
<td>1067.94</td>
<td>353.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>167.09</td>
<td>170.59</td>
<td>172.76</td>
<td>57.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building services</td>
<td>273.42</td>
<td>279.14</td>
<td>282.69</td>
<td>93.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard improvements</td>
<td>151.90</td>
<td>155.08</td>
<td>157.05</td>
<td>51.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service facilities</td>
<td>1063.30</td>
<td>1085.56</td>
<td>1099.35</td>
<td>363.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering expenses</td>
<td>501.27</td>
<td>511.76</td>
<td>518.27</td>
<td>171.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor’s fee</td>
<td>334.18</td>
<td>341.18</td>
<td>345.51</td>
<td>114.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>668.36</td>
<td>682.35</td>
<td>691.02</td>
<td>228.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working investment</td>
<td>1481.67</td>
<td>1502.685</td>
<td>1498.13</td>
<td>466.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL/MEA cost</td>
<td>740.97</td>
<td>685.68</td>
<td>574.37</td>
<td>22.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TCI</strong></td>
<td><strong>9878.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>10004.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>9987.82</strong></td>
<td><strong>3109.37</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total capital investment costs for the three process concepts that use ionic liquids are £9.878 million for \([\text{C}_2\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]\), £10.004 million for \([\text{C}_6\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]\) and £9.988 million for \([\text{P}_{66614}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]\). In all cases, the purchased equipment, piping, service facilities and working investment are the items that contribute more significantly towards the total capital investment. \([\text{C}_2\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]\) concept results in lower capital costs due to the
fact that the cost of the regeneration pump and the flash evaporator are considerably cheaper than in the other two concepts. It should be noted that only the biogas upgrading section is being considered, not the whole system as in the base case models.

As for the MEA-based process, it can be seen that its TCI, as well as its DEC, is approximately 3 times lower than those of the ionic liquid-based processes. Fig. 6.9 shows a breakdown of the DEC of each CO₂ capture process.

![Bar chart showing DEC breakdown of each biogas upgrading process](image)

**Fig. 6.9** Breakdown of the DEC of each biogas upgrading process

As one can see, the biogas compressor represents most of the DEC for the ionic liquid-based processes (76-79%). This is then the main reason of the high TCI associated with these processes compared with the MEA process. Following the biogas compressor, the second contributor to the DEC in the ionic liquid-based processes is the absorption column (13-14% of DEC). The contribution towards the DEC of the rest of the equipment is
as follows: high pressure turbine (4% in all cases), flash drum (2% in all cases), regeneration pump (1-4%), and absorber pre-cooler (0.5%).

As for the MEA process, the absorption column has a share of 38% of the DEC, followed by the stripper (including reboiler, condenser and related equipment) with a share of 27% of the DEC, the amine heat exchanger (24%), the pre-heater and pre-cooler (9%) and the recirculation pump with 2%.

The costs of the ionic liquid fluids are also included in Table 6.8 by using a selling price of £13·kg\(^{-1}\) for all the three ionic liquids considered, as already reported in the literature (Shiflett et al., 2010). In fact, \([\text{C}_2\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]\) results in the higher IL costs since it requires more fluid than \([\text{C}_6\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]\) and \([\text{P}_{66614}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]\) as this IL has a lower molar volume and CO\(_2\) uptake than the two other investigated ILs. MEA requirements are approximately three times lower than those of the ionic liquids. As discussed in section 5.1.3 this is due to the fact that MEA chemically reacts with CO\(_2\), as opposed to the ionic liquids which absorb the CO\(_2\) physically.

The annual operating and maintenance costs of the four CO\(_2\) capture processes considered are presented in Table 6.9. The operating costs range from £1.809 million to £2.256 million. As with the TCI, the process using MEA results in the lowest O&M costs.
Table 6.9 Summary of the O&M costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[C&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;MIm][Tf&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;N] (£1000)</th>
<th>[C&lt;sub&gt;6&lt;/sub&gt;MIm][Tf&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;N] (£1000)</th>
<th>[P&lt;sub&gt;66614&lt;/sub&gt;][Tf&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;N] (£1000)</th>
<th>MEA (£1000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed charge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local taxes</td>
<td>153.12</td>
<td>156.32</td>
<td>158.31</td>
<td>52.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>76.56</td>
<td>78.16</td>
<td>79.15</td>
<td>26.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct prod. cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>624.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling</td>
<td>53.34</td>
<td>58.58</td>
<td>57.80</td>
<td>65.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>292.16</td>
<td>313.24</td>
<td>331.23</td>
<td>73.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvent make-up</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>535.90</td>
<td>547.12</td>
<td>554.07</td>
<td>183.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating labour</td>
<td>266.40</td>
<td>266.40</td>
<td>266.40</td>
<td>266.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>39.96</td>
<td>39.96</td>
<td>39.96</td>
<td>39.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating supplies</td>
<td>80.39</td>
<td>82.07</td>
<td>83.11</td>
<td>27.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory charges</td>
<td>39.96</td>
<td>39.96</td>
<td>39.96</td>
<td>39.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plant overhead</strong></td>
<td>505.36</td>
<td>512.09</td>
<td>516.26</td>
<td>293.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative cost</td>
<td>39.96</td>
<td>39.96</td>
<td>39.96</td>
<td>39.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marketing</td>
<td>43.87</td>
<td>44.71</td>
<td>44.74</td>
<td>36.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D cost</td>
<td>42.18</td>
<td>43.09</td>
<td>45.02</td>
<td>36.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL O&amp;M</strong></td>
<td><strong>2169.14</strong></td>
<td><strong>2221.66</strong></td>
<td><strong>2255.98</strong></td>
<td><strong>1809.42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 6.10 summarises the O&M costs of each process as well as a breakdown of the O&M costs.

Among the processes using ionic liquids, the one employing \([\text{C}_2\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]\) results in the lowest operating costs as a result of its lower maintenance costs and plant overhead (both a function of TCI) as well as its lower electricity consumption. In fact, electricity consumption is one of the main contributors to the operating costs in the ionic liquid-based processes, representing 13%-15% of the total O&M. Other large contributors towards the O&M are the operating labour (around 12% in all cases), plant overhead (23%-24%) and maintenance (around 25% in all cases). The process using MEA results in the lowest O&M of the four. Heating for MEA regeneration is a major contributor towards O&M costs representing 35%.

The production costs per GJ [LHV] of bio-methane produced for all cases considered are shown in Table 6.10. The calculated production costs only
include the necessary investment to manufacture one GJ equivalent (LHV) of bio-methane, i.e. it does not include tax, duties, profits and marketing costs. As one can see from Table 6.10, the operating and maintenance costs play a significant role in the production costs, accounting for around 65% of the total production costs in all cases, while the capital annuity accounts for 35%. The lowest production cost is achieved by \([C_2\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]/, with a value of £6.26 per GJ (LHV), followed by \([C_6\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]/ and \([P_6\text{66614}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]/ with values of £6.68 per GJ (LHV) and £7.76 per GJ (LHV), respectively. The reasons for this are that both the capital costs and O&M of \([C_2\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]/ are the lowest of the three concepts considered and also that the production rate of bio-methane is the highest of all cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>([C_2\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]/</th>
<th>([C_6\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]/</th>
<th>([P_6\text{66614}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCI (£·GJ^−1)</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M (£·GJ^−1)</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (£·GJ^−1)</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>7.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contrary to the initial belief, \([C_2\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]/ has the lowest production costs despite the fact that, among the ionic liquids evaluated in this study, it is the one with the lowest absorption capacity. This demonstrates the need of holistic evaluations of ionic liquids for CO_2 capture. These results reveal that parameters such as physical properties of the ionic liquid (heat capacity, viscosity, etc.) and the effect of other gaseous species in the gas stream should also be taken into account.

6.6.2.1 Production costs: ionic liquids and MEA comparison
To put the above results in context, comparison with existing biogas upgrading processes is essential. Current best practice of biogas upgrading include a wide range of technologies such as, pressure swing adsorption (PSA), high pressure physical absorption with water or the Selexol® solvent, chemical absorption with amines, membrane separation and cryogenic processes (Person, 2003). Given the scope of this study, a fair comparison can be only made with absorption processes which involve either physical or chemical absorption. It was decided to compare the performance of the ionic liquids studied in this work with an MEA-based CO₂ capture process. This decision was based on the lack of data regarding the proprietary Selexol® solvent when used in biogas upgrading applications and also the fact that high pressure absorption with water is limited to lower flowrates of biogas/flue-gas due to the low CO₂ absorption capacity of water (Person, 2003). This last statement is relevant since this work aims to develop a methodology that is not only suitable to CO₂ removal from biogas but is also applicable to larger applications like post-combustion CO₂ capture from industrial sources, e.g. power plants, refineries, etc.

Fig. 6.11 shows the production costs of all ionic liquid-based processes as well as the MEA process. The lowest bio-methane production costs are achieved by the MEA process with a value of £3.78·GJ⁻¹ (LHV), which is 40%-51% lower than those of the processes using ionic liquids. These results encourage further research in the area specially taking into account that the ionic liquids evaluated in this work absorb the CO₂ physically as opposed to MEA, which absorbs the CO₂ mainly through chemical interactions. In addition, the current selling price of ionic liquids must be taken into consideration since as production and consumption of ionic liquids becomes more generalised their costs will be expected to decrease. In line with this, its effect is studied in the sensitivity analysis in section 6.7.2.
6.7 Sensitivity analysis

6.7.1 Base Case Models

In order to carry out the economic assessments included earlier in this chapter, assumptions for important technical and economic parameters (CO₂ conversion, electricity prices, etc.) had to be taken; therefore, the results of the economic evaluations are somewhat static, in the way that they only allow to draw conclusions for a given set of fixed parameters. This section discusses the sensitivity analysis study which investigates the effect of several important technical and economic parameters on the FT-syncrude production cost.

In section 6.6.1.5, some parameters were identified to play an important role on costs. In line with this, the parameters investigated in the sensitivity analysis are: CO₂ conversion, operating hours, capital investment, interest
rate, electricity price, plant life and H₂ production costs. The sensitivity analysis was carried out by varying each parameter at a time by ±30% of its base case value. In the case of the plant operating hours, the parameter was changed by ±9.5% from the base case value of 8,000 hours since it cannot exceed the number of hours in a year (8,760 hour in a year). The results from the six process concepts studied are shown in Fig. 6.12-6.18, where longer bars indicate a higher degree of deviation from the base case value.

In PD-MEA1, fuel production costs are most sensitive to plant operating hours since variations of just ±9.5% in this parameter results in higher variations of costs. Thus, this type of plants should be operated with the minimum periods of shutdown in order to achieve significantly lower biomethane production costs. Production costs are also highly sensitive to increases in CO₂ fractional conversion to CO. It can be seen that increasing the CO₂ conversion by 30% results in the production costs to be reduced to £89.41 per GJ from a base case value of £95.46 per GJ (6% reduction). On the other hand, a reduction of 30% in the CO₂ conversion
results in a fuel production costs increase of 1%. This is because the reduction in the fuel production rate as a result of the reduction in the CO\textsubscript{2} conversion is offset by the lower H\textsubscript{2} requirements in the RWGS reactor. The latter is a consequence of the higher proportion of unreacted H\textsubscript{2} in the syngas that is recovered in the PSA unit and recycle back to the RWGS inlet. As for the capital investment, a variation of ±30% results in the production costs to vary by ±5%. This is an important result since errors of up to ±30% are common in capital investment estimates at this stage of development (Peters et al., 2014).

The loan interest rate is the fourth more sensitive parameter and fluctuations of ±30% results in the production costs to vary by ±3%; interest rates affect the annuity of the capital investment and therefore, efforts should be made at the early stages of the project development to agree a fixed rate with lender throughout the lifespan of the project so that unexpected fluctuation can be avoided. Finally, the fuel production costs are less sensitive to fluctuation in the electricity price, the plant life of the project and the H\textsubscript{2} production cost. However, fluctuations in these parameters they should not be underestimated since they could affect the production costs significantly.

In the case of PD-MEA2, the sensitivity analysis results are similar to those of PD-MEA1, although with some differences as it can be seen from Fig. 6.13.
In this case, as the plant does not include a steam methane reformer, all of the H₂ must be imported to the plant. This, results in that fluctuations in the H₂ production costs have a greater impact on fuel production costs in PD-MEA2 than in PD-MEA1.

Figs. 6.14-6.18 show the sensitivity analysis results from the process concepts incorporating a CHP plant (PD-CHP1, PD-CHP1-OXY, PD-CHP2, PD-CHP2-OXY and PD-CHP-POST).
**Fig. 6.14** Sensitivity of fuel production (PD-CHP1) costs to variations of selected technical and economic parameters (green bars represent an increase in the parameter)

**Fig. 6.15** Sensitivity of fuel production (PD-CHP1-OXY) costs to variations of selected technical and economic parameters (green bars represent an increase in the parameter)
Fig. 6.16 Sensitivity of fuel production (PD-CHP2) costs to variations of selected technical and economic parameters (green bars represent an increase in the parameter)

Fig. 6.17 Sensitivity of fuel production (PD-CHP2-OXY) costs to variations of selected technical and economic parameters (green bars represent an increase in the parameter)
As one can see from Figs. 6.14-6.18, the results from the process incorporating a CHP plant are very similar. In all cases, the fuel production costs are most sensitive to CO$_2$ conversion and operating hours. In these cases, variations in the H$_2$ production costs has a more important effect on fuel production costs since all of the hydrogen consumed in these plants is imported (as opposed to PD-MEA1). As in PD-MEA1 and PD-MEA2, fuel production costs are somewhat less sensitive to variations in the capital investment, although this parameter is still important. The fuel production costs are less sensitive to interest rates, plant life and electricity prices. It should be noted that the sensitivity analysis of PD-CHP1-OXY, PD-CHP2-Oxy and PD-CHP1-POST do not include the electricity prices since these process designs are net exporters of electricity and thus electricity does not have to be purchased.
6.7.2 Ionic liquids

This section includes the sensitivity analysis of the CO₂ capture plants that use ionic liquids as a solvent for CO₂ capture. The effect of several important technical and economic parameters on the bio-methane production cost is considered. The parameters investigated are: absorber pressure, capital investment, plant operating hours, loan interest rate, plant lifespan, electricity price and ionic liquid cost. Fig. 6.19 shows how the absorber pressure affects the bio-methane production costs. When the absorber is operated at 20 bar, production costs decrease to £5.94·GJ⁻¹, £6.28·GJ⁻¹ and £7.52·GJ⁻¹ for [P₆₆₆₁₄][Tf₂N], [C₆MIm][Tf₂N] and [C₂MIm][Tf₂N], respectively; which represents a decrease between 3%-6%. If the operating pressure of the absorber is further reduced to 10 bar, productions costs of the bio-methane increase between 0.1%-10% with respect to the production costs at 20 bar. As a result, it can be concluded that, in all cases, a minimum production costs of the bio-methane is found when the absorber is operated at 20 bar. The reason for this minimum is that there is a trade-off between the higher absorption capacity of the ionic liquids at 30 bar, which reduces the amount of fluid needed, and the higher electricity consumption and equipment costs associated with operating the absorber at such high pressure. If the absorber pressure is further reduce to 10 bar the savings in electricity and equipment costs related to a high pressure operation are off-set by the dramatic increase in the ionic liquid fluid need to produce bio-methane at 95 mol. %.
For the other parameters, the sensitivity analysis was performed by changing each parameter at a time by ±30% of its base-case value. There is an exception with the plant operating hours which were varied by ±9.5% since the number of hours in a year (8,760 hours) cannot be exceeded. The results from the three process concepts studied are shown in Fig. 6.20, where longer bars indicate a higher degree of deviation from the base case value.

In all cases, bio-methane production costs are most sensitive to plant operating hours since variations of just ±9.5% in this parameter results in nearly identical effect than varying the capital costs by ±30%. Thus, this type of plants should be operated with the minimum periods of shutdown in order to achieve significantly lower bio-methane production costs.

Production costs are also highly sensitive to variations in the capital expenditure. A capital investment variation of ±30% results in the
production costs to vary by ±10% in all cases. This is an important result since errors of up to ±30% are common in capital investment estimates (Peters et al., 2004).

The loan interest rate is the third most sensitive parameter and fluctuations of ±30% results in the production costs to vary by up to 7% in all cases; interest rates affect the annuity of the capital investment and therefore, efforts should be made at the early stages of the project development to agree a fixed rate with lender throughout the lifespan of the project so that unexpected fluctuation can be avoided. Finally, the bio-methane production costs are less sensitive to the plant life of the project, the electricity price and the ionic liquid costs. However, fluctuations in these parameters they should not be underestimated since they could affect the production costs significantly.
Fig. 6.20 Sensitivity of bio-methane production costs to variations of selected technical and economic parameters (all parameters are varied by ±30%, except for the plant operating hours which are varied by ±9.5%). The vertical line in the graphs represents the production cost of the base case for the different ionic liquids. Green bars represent an increase in the parameter.
6.8 Closing review

In the previous chapters, several process concepts to produce a synthetic fuel from CO\textsubscript{2} were assessed. The process concepts evaluated in this work incorporate existing CCU technologies for the conversion of a carbon source, in this case biogas produced from the anaerobic digestion of sewage sludge. The first process configuration examined (PD-MEA1) comprises separation of CO\textsubscript{2} from biogas using MEA and steam reforming for conversion of methane to syngas. The second process concept (PD-MEA2) also incorporates a monoethanolamine (MEA) gas treatment unit; however PD-MEA2 does not include steam methane reforming since the upgraded bio-methane is assumed to be injected into the natural gas grid. The other five cases incorporate a CHP plant for co-generation of heat and power from biogas and the conversion of methane to CO\textsubscript{2}. All cases include a RWGS reactor for reducing CO\textsubscript{2} to syngas and its subsequent conversion to fuels via Fischer-Tropsch synthesis. Aspen Plus was employed to determine the mass and energy balances that allowed the estimation of overall process efficiencies and costs. This was the first attempt to compare different routes of similar TRL to manufacture a liquid fuel from CO\textsubscript{2}. Furthermore, the results from the mass and energy balances calculations were used by collaborators at The University of Manchester to perform cradle-to-grave sustainability assessments of the proposed CO\textsubscript{2}-to-fuels synthetic routes.

The synthetic route based on CO\textsubscript{2} capture and steam methane reforming, PD-MEA1, was the most promising CO\textsubscript{2}-to-fuels route since it was able to achieve the highest fuel production rate (831.68 kg·h\textsuperscript{-1}; 7,450.47 kW [LHV]) as well as the highest overall plant energy efficiency (17.9%). This is because of the ability to produce a larger amount of syngas as a result of the steam reforming of methane. As for the processes based on a CHP plant, oxy-combustion of biogas (or upgraded bio-methane) results in considerably higher fuel production rates and plant efficiencies than their equivalent processes using air in the combustion of biogas (or upgraded
bio-methane) in the CHP plant (20% increase in fuel production rates and 46-48% increase in overall plant efficiency). Although the air separation unit (ASU) consumes large amounts of electricity to produce pure O₂ from air, this is outweighed by the reduction of gas processing needed downstream due to the absence of N₂ in the CHP flue gas, which eventually reduces the heating, cooling and compression duties.

The economic assessment of the different process designs revealed that the process concept based on CO₂ capture and steam methane reforming (PD-MEA1) results in the lowest fuel production costs of all process concepts evaluated (£95.46 per GJ [LHV]). This is the result of its lower TIC and O&M as well as its higher fuel production rate. The process designs based on a CHP result in higher TIC in all cases due to the equipment costs related to the CHP plant. O&M costs associated with PD-MEA1 are lower due to its endogenous production H₂ via steam reforming of methane as well as lower heating, cooling and compression costs since the processes based on a CHP plant have to process large amounts of inert gas. It can be concluded then that CO₂ capture coupled with steam methane reforming is the most promising option for commercial production of liquid fuels from CO₂.

The most important outcome from the economic assessment is that, at the current stage of development, synthetic fuel production from biogas via CO₂ utilisation is very far from commercial viability. At its base scale, the fuel production costs associated with the best performing route (PD-MEA1) are nearly one order of magnitude higher than those of conventional fossil fuels. Section 6.6.1.5 elaborates a discussion on the necessary improvements to advance this technology towards commercial viability. These can be summarised as follows:

- Decrease TCI by reducing the size of compressors in the steam reforming of methane and fuel synthesis area. This can be achieved by minimising the amount of inert gases as much as possible as well as reducing the compression pressure.
• Lower O&M costs by reducing the cooling, heating and compression duties.

• Reduce or eliminate the cooling requirements of the CO₂ capture plant by developing CO₂ capture solutions that allow either regeneration at temperatures below the water boiling point or solutions that can be used at 100% purity so that they do not have to be mixed with water to prevent corrosion-related problems, e.g. ionic liquids.

• Develop capture media with high CO₂ affinity while at the same time requiring less energy to release the absorbed CO₂.

• Increase the CO₂ conversion rate to maximize the production of syngas. The co-electrolysis of H₂O and CO₂ to produce syngas is a technology that could improve the syngas production considerably as well as increasing the plant efficiency by producing H₂ within the plant.

• Increase fuel yields and selectivity in the Fischer-Tropsch reactor.

• Fig. 6.8 shows that economies of scale play a paramount role in the commercial viability of the assessed technology. In light with this, other sources of CO₂ should be considered so that much larger amounts of CO₂ can be converted into a synthetic fuel.

In this thesis, a developing technology such as CO₂ capture using ionic liquids was used in order to investigate its effect on plant efficiencies and costs. The simulation methodology developed in this study based on the COSMO-SAC property method in Aspen Plus was able to predict the ionic liquids' physical properties (heat capacity, density and viscosity) as well as the interaction between the gases (CO₂ and CH₄) with the liquids accurately, without having to reply on experimental data. This allowed for the first time simulation of biogas upgrading plants using ionic liquids as physical absorbents. The results prove that the methodology can be used for any combination of cation and anion as well as any gas species.
The results revealed that the processes using [C$_2$MIm][Tf$_2$N] and [C$_6$MIm][Tf$_2$N] were able to achieve the highest plant efficiency (82%), whereas the process based on MEA achieved 77% efficiency. These results highlight that ionic liquids can be more energetically efficient than MEA when used in biogas upgrading plants. This is due to the large energy penalty of the MEA regeneration process. The fact that [C$_2$MIm][Tf$_2$N] and [C$_6$MIm][Tf$_2$N] can be more efficient than MEA is true despite the lower absorption capacity (kg of ionic liquid needed per kg of bio-methane produced) of the processes using [C$_2$MIm][Tf$_2$N] and [C$_6$MIm][Tf$_2$N]; therefore, it becomes clear that these kind of processes must be evaluated using a “whole system” approach (simulation of actual biogas upgrading plant) rather making conclusions based solely on, for instance, solvent absorption capacity at equilibrium.

On the other hand, the bio-methane production costs associated with the process using ionic liquids are higher than those of the process using MEA. The upgrading process using [C$_2$MIm][Tf$_2$N] results in the lowest bio-methane production costs (£6.26 per GJ [LHV]), whereas the bio-methane production costs of the process using MEA were (£3.78 per GJ [LHV]), which are 40% lower. The higher bio-methane production costs of the ionic liquid-based process are due to the high unit cost of the biogas compressor as well as the large amount of electricity required to compress the biogas to 30 bar. These results encourage further research in the area specially taking into account that the ionic liquids evaluated in this work absorb the CO$_2$ physically as opposed to MEA, which absorbs the CO$_2$ mainly through chemical interactions.
7. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND FUTURE WORK

7.1 Conclusions

In line with the main objectives highlighted in section 1.2.1, this research has measured the technical and economic performance of seven Carbon Capture and Utilisation (CCU) process designs (Base Case Models) based on best available technology. The work was carried out in order to provide the necessary data to identify the most promising routes for the conversion of Carbon Dioxide into a synthetic fuel. In addition, this thesis also examined the techno-economic feasibility of selective CO$_2$ capture processes from biogas streams using ionic liquids as physical absorbents. This developing technology was considered in order to assess the potential improvements that it could have on process performance, compared to MEA-based CO$_2$ capture.

Since this thesis considered all the process designs to be based in the UK, the conclusions and future recommendations may not be relevant to other countries. It should be also noted that, in order to model the different CO$_2$-to-fuels synthetic routes, extensive use of publicly available data was made. This could affect the results which are highly dependent on the accuracy of available data.

As for the Base Case Models, the main results from the process simulation are summarised below:

- The synthetic route based on CO$_2$ capture and steam methane reforming, PD-MEA1, was the most promising CO$_2$-to-fuels since it was able to achieve the highest fuel production rate (831.68 kg·h$^{-1}$; 7,450.47 kW [LHV]) as well as the highest overall plant energy efficiency (17.9%).
- The synthetic route based on CO$_2$ capture and direct bio-methane grid injection resulted in the lowest fuel production rate (244.76 kg·h$^{-1}$; 2,192.67 kW [LHV]) and the lowest overall plant energy
efficiency (6.0%). This highlights the importance of an energy-rich stream such as the bio-methane stream in the CCU plants.

- The process design based on upgraded bio-methane combustion in a CHP plant, PD-CHP2, results in the lowest fuel production rate (586.20 kg·h⁻¹; 5,251.39 kW [LHV]) and overall plant energy efficiency of all evaluated CHP-based concepts. The process design based on direct biogas combustion in a CHP plant, PD-CHP1, results in similar results to those from PD-CHP2. It can be concluded that the extra investment in the CO₂ capture plant is not justified from an efficiency point of view.

- PD-CHP1-OXY and PD-CHP2-OXY, which employ oxygen, result in considerably higher fuel production rates and plant efficiencies than their equivalent processes using air in the combustion of biogas (or upgraded bio-methane) in the CHP plant (20% increase in fuel production rates and 46-48% increase in overall plant efficiency).

- The process incorporating a post-combustion CO₂ capture plant, PD-CHP1-POST results in higher fuel production rate and overall plant efficiency than the equivalent concept based on pre-combustion CO₂ capture (10% increase in fuel production rate and 32% increase in overall plant efficiency).

The results from the economic assessment of the Base Case Models showed the following:

- The process concept that results in the lowest Total Capital Investment (TIC) is PD-MEA2 (£21.05 million). The process concept that involves the highest TIC is PD-CHP2 (£61.07 million). In all cases, the designs employing a CHP plant resulted in higher TIC than the ones that did not employ CHP.

- The CHP plant is a major contributor towards the Delivered Equipment Cost (DEC) ranging 40-59%. The fuel synthesis area is also a major contributor to the TIC with a share 22-48%. In the
process considering steam methane reforming (PD-MEA1), the steam methane reformer represents 37% of the TIC.

- Similarly to the TIC, the designs employing a CHP plant results in higher Operating and Maintenance (O&M) costs mainly due to the hydrogen imports as these processes do not produce hydrogen within the plant, as PD-MEA1 does.

- The process concept that results in the lowest Operating and Maintenance (O&M) costs is PD-MEA2 (£13.02 million). The process concept that involves the highest O&M is PD-CHP2 (£33.87 million).

- The cost of H₂ is a major contributor to the O&M costs since it represents 4-36% of all O&M costs. Cooling costs also contribute significantly to the O&M with share of 20-38% of all O&M costs.

- The process concept based on CO₂ capture and steam methane reforming (PD-MEA1) results in the lowest fuel production costs of all process concepts evaluated (£95.46 per GJ [LHV]). This is the result of its lower TIC and O&M as well as its higher fuel production rate. The rest of the process concepts result in higher production costs by 87-192%. It can be concluded then that CO₂ capture coupled with steam methane reforming is the most promising option for commercial production of liquid fuels from CO₂.

- A scaling up study of PD-MEA1 was carried out so that eighteen plant capacities were evaluated, ranging from 18.3 tonne-day⁻¹ (base case) to 1,670 tonnes of liquid fuels produced per day. The latter capacity corresponds to the Shell Middle Distillate Synthesis (SMDS) Gas-to-Liquids (GTL) plant built in Bintulu (Malaysia). It was found that The TCI of the scaled-up CCU plant is 51% lower than those of the Shell plant (£831 million), although the capital costs of the water electrolysis plant and the ASU of the CCU plant are not included in the TCI. The O&M costs of the CCU plant are approximately 6 times higher than those of the Shell plant.
The scaling up study also revealed that for the largest plant capacity (1,670 t·day⁻¹), the fuel production costs are approximately 6 times lower than for the PD-MEA1 base case (£15.67·GJ⁻¹ vs £95.46·GJ⁻¹). At the base case, even the best performing process concept (PD-MEA1) is very far from being economically competitive. This highlights the importance of economies of scale in process such as the ones evaluated in this study.

In a LHV basis, the gate costs of gasoline and diesel were £14.3·GJ⁻¹ and £14.6·GJ⁻¹, which are 7% and 9% lower than those of the scaled up CCU plant, respectively. However, the impracticality of building such a large AD plant is a crucial drawback towards commercial implementation of this technology using biogas produced from the anaerobic digestion of sewage sludge.

The sensitivity analysis revealed that, in all cases, the fuel production costs are most sensitive to CO₂ conversion and operating hours; therefore efforts should be made towards increasing CO₂ conversion rates and operating the plants with a downtime as lowest as possible.

With crude oil prices falling continuously, the CCU fuel synthesis processes proposed in this study will become less financially attractive; thus, it is anticipated that increases in fossil fuel prices, governmental subsidies or environmental legislation such as carbon taxes will be needed in order to make CCU fuels competitive in the market.

In addition to the Base Case Models, a simulation methodology was developed in order to model three ionic liquid-based CO₂ capture processes. It consists of a novel modelling approach, which produces data hitherto not calculable without experimental data, e.g. plant efficiencies, capital costs, operating and maintenance costs, etc. The methodology was based on the COSMO-SAC property method in Aspen Plus, which
provides relevant information on gas-liquid interaction without having to rely on experimental data.

As for the ionic liquid-based CO₂ capture processes, the main results from the process simulation are summarised below:

- The capture process using [C₂MIm][Tf₂N] ionic liquid resulted in the highest bio-methane production rate (1522.14 kg·h⁻¹), followed by 1454.91 kg·h⁻¹ produced by the second concept (based on [C₆MIm][Tf₂N] ionic liquid) and 1263.60 kg·h⁻¹ produced by the third concept (based on [P₆₆₆₁₄][Tf₂N] ionic liquid). The process based on MEA produced 1,645.3 kg·h⁻¹.
- As for the plant energy efficiency, the processes using [C₂MIm][Tf₂N] and [C₆MIm][Tf₂N] respectively, were able to achieve the highest value (82%). The process using [P₆₆₆₁₄][Tf₂N] resulted in 71% plant energy efficiency. The process based on MEA achieved 77% efficiency.
- The process based on [C₂MIm][Tf₂N] resulted in the lowest TIC (£9.878 million), followed by [C₆MIm][Tf₂N] (£10.004 million) and [P₆₆₆₁₄][Tf₂N] (£9.988 million).
- As for the O&M costs, the process using [C₂MIm][Tf₂N] resulted in £2.169 million, followed by [C₆MIm][Tf₂N] (£2.222 million) and [P₆₆₆₁₄][Tf₂N] (£2.256 million).
- The process using [C₂MIm][Tf₂N] results in the lowest bio-methane production costs (£6.26 per GJ [LHV]) as a result of its lowest TCI and O&M as well as its higher bio-methane production. The bio-methane production costs of the process using MEA were (£3.78 per GJ [LHV]), which are 40% lower than those of [C₂MIm][Tf₂N].
- The sensitivity analysis revealed that the ionic liquid-based CO₂ capture plants are best operated at an intermediate pressure of 20 bar, since this results in the lowest bio-methane production costs. The sensitivity analysis also demonstrated that production costs are
most sensitive to the operating hours, capital expenditure and interest rate.

The presented results show that the simulation methodology developed in this study is a robust tool for predicting plant efficiencies and production costs of large scale CO$_2$ capture processes using ionic liquids without relying on gas solubility experimental data.

7.2 Recommendations for future work

The areas that are recommended for further work on this topic are as follows:

- Only biogas from the anaerobic digestion of sewage sludge has been considered in this thesis as the feedstock for synthetic fuel production. Other CO$_2$-rich streams with industrial importance could be investigated, *e.g.* flue gas from power plants, refineries, cement plants, *etc.* These stationary sources of CO$_2$ guarantee a much larger scale in terms of CO$_2$ converted to synthetic fuels, which is, as stated before in this thesis, of paramount importance if serious efforts are to be made towards commercial implementation of the technologies assessed in this study.

- The main product of the CCU plants evaluated in this research was FT-syncrude, which was assessed in terms of its LHV. An upgrading plant could be modelled in future work so that gasoline and diesel are the main products of the plants.

- In addition to the FT-syncrude, future work in the field could consider alternative CCU fuels such as methanol or formic acid.

- Sensitivity analyses were carried out in order to assess how variations in certain process and economic parameters affect production costs. This is important at the current early stage of
development of CO$_2$-to-fuels systems, where accurate assumptions are difficult to make. One step further could consist of performing Monte Carlo simulations so that probability distributions of the synthetic fuel production costs are generated.

- Fischer-Tropsch synthesis was the only fuel synthesis technology evaluated in this thesis, as it is a well-developed and mature technology. Other fuel synthesis technologies such as the Methanol to Gasoline (MTG) synthesis or the Topsoe Integrated Gasoline (TIGAS) synthesis could be assessed in the CCU plants.

- Since the feedstock for the CCU plant was biogas in all cases, Dry Methane reforming (DMR) is a technology that could be evaluated and modelled. However, it should be noted that the biogas production from the anaerobic digestion of sewage sludge is an industry of small scale, which could be a hindrance towards economic viability. DMR was not included in the Base Case Models since it is not a mature and proven technology.

- Ionic liquids that absorb CO$_2$ physically were considered in this study. Due to time and resources constraints, ionic liquids that absorb CO$_2$ mainly by chemical interactions could not be modelled. Ongoing collaboration between The University of Sheffield and QUB will aim to model CO$_2$ capture process using chemically absorbing ionic liquids. The modelling methodology will not require experimental data and these will only be required for model validation.

This thesis has evaluated different process designs, which convert biogas into a synthetic liquid fuel. The results showed that the CCU fuel synthesis processes are unlike to compete commercially with conventional fuels, mainly primarily due to the: low CO$_2$ conversion and high hydrogen consumption in the RWGS process, low selectivity of the Fischer–Tropsch synthesis and high MEA regeneration costs in the capture plant. This highlights the need for new CCU technologies, such as superbasic ionic
liquids for CO₂ capture, co-electrolysis of CO₂ and water to produce syngas or advanced FT processes. These technologies are currently being researched under the 4CU Project. The recommendation for future work is that they are considered in the process designs of this thesis to test the potential improvement that they could have on process performance and costs.
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## Appendix A. Summary of streams

### Table A.1 Input stream summary of PD-MEA1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD-MEA1</th>
<th>INPUTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mass Flow kg h⁻¹</strong></td>
<td><strong>BIOGAS (1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2O</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>2250.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2S</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3O⁺</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCCO⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO3⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA⁺</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEACOOK⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH4</td>
<td>1523.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGON</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEXANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DOD-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TET-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-EIC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DOC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TET-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-EIC-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Flow kg h⁻¹</td>
<td>3774.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A.2 Output stream summary of PD-MEA1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Flow</th>
<th>CONDENSATE</th>
<th>FLASH_COND</th>
<th>FT_COND</th>
<th>FT_SYNCR</th>
<th>REST</th>
<th>FLUEGAS</th>
<th>STEAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kg h⁻¹</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>(46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2O</td>
<td>1288.19</td>
<td>486.87</td>
<td>2385.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1916.39</td>
<td>17734.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2S</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2O</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCO3⁻</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S⁻-2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA+H⁺</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA⁺</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11483.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGON</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>195.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEXANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DOD-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TET-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-ELC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DOC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TET-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mass Flow | kg h⁻¹      | 1298.61    | 486.87   | 2395.05  | 831.68  | 4.17    | 17446.98 | 17734.01 |

257
### Table A.3 Input stream summary of PD-MEA2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD-MEA2 Mass Flow</th>
<th>INPUTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kg·h⁻¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂O</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>2250.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂S</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSO₃⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCO₃⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₃⁻²</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAH⁺</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEACOO⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>1523.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGON</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEXANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DOD-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TET-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-ERIC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DOC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TET-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Flow kg·h⁻¹</th>
<th>BIOGAS (1)</th>
<th>WATER MU (12)</th>
<th>MEA MU (13)</th>
<th>H₂ INPUT (16)</th>
<th>AIR (38)</th>
<th>WATER (40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3774.46</td>
<td>1305.56</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>195.67</td>
<td>3099.24</td>
<td>3706.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD-MEA2</th>
<th>CONDENSATE</th>
<th>CH4 OUT</th>
<th>FT COND</th>
<th>FT SYNCR</th>
<th>REST</th>
<th>FLUEGAS</th>
<th>STEAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass Flow</td>
<td>(kg·h^{-1})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2O</td>
<td>1288.19</td>
<td>65.26</td>
<td>1053.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>383.05</td>
<td>3706.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>59.82</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1439.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2S</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3O+</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCO3-</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO3-2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA+</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEACOO-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1520.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGON</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FENTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEXANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18.56</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECA NE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DOD-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TET-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-EIC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DOC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TET-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mass Flow | kg·h^{-1} | 1298.61 | 1645.30 | 1053.70 | 244.76 | 1.51 | 4206.50 | 3706.36 |

Table A.4 Output stream summary of PD-MEA1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Flow</th>
<th>BIOGAS (1)</th>
<th>AIR (2)</th>
<th>NOX STEAM (3)</th>
<th>WATER1 CHP (4)</th>
<th>WATER2 CHP (5)</th>
<th>H2 INPUT (10)</th>
<th>AIR OFFGAS (26)</th>
<th>WATER STEAM (30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kg h⁻¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂O</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>45521.15</td>
<td>10590.12</td>
<td>3054.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12285.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22754.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5337.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6973.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1635.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>2250.75</td>
<td>14.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGON</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>388.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>91.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>1523.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>675.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEXANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DOX-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TET-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NIC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-RED-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DOC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A.5** Input stream summary of PD-CHP1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Flow</th>
<th>kg h⁻¹</th>
<th>3774.46</th>
<th>30130.31</th>
<th>45521.15</th>
<th>10590.12</th>
<th>3054.84</th>
<th>575.63</th>
<th>7067.44</th>
<th>12285.40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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### Table A.6 Output stream summary of PD-CHP1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Flow</th>
<th>STEAM- A (6)</th>
<th>STEAM- B (7)</th>
<th>STEAM- C (8)</th>
<th>COND CHP (9)</th>
<th>FLASH COND (12)</th>
<th>FT COND (31)</th>
<th>FT SYNCR (36)</th>
<th>REST (35)</th>
<th>FLUEGAS (38)</th>
<th>STEAM (37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kg h⁻¹</td>
<td>1588.52</td>
<td>458.23</td>
<td>11345.79</td>
<td>252.43</td>
<td>48808.24</td>
<td>2877.68</td>
<td>1601.10</td>
<td>12285.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>28091.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>4820.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGON</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>479.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEXANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21.93</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>45.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OOD-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>46.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>44.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TET-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>41.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>37.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>34.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>30.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-EIC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OGC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TET-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>43.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table Footnote:**
- Mass Flow
- kg h⁻¹

- Mass Flow
- 1588.52
- 458.23
- 11345.79
- 252.43
- 48808.24
- 2877.68
- 507.07
- 0.99
- 34795.00
- 12285.40
### Table A.7 Input stream summary of PD-CHP1-OXY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD-CHP1-OXY</th>
<th>INPUTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mass Flow</strong></td>
<td><strong>OXYGEN (1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kg·h⁻¹</td>
<td>kg·h⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂O</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>2250.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGON</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>1523.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEXANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DOD-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TEL-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-ECI-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DOC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TEL-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mass Flow | **BIOGAS (8)** | **CO² (9)** | **H₂O (10)** | **WATER STEAM (10)** | **INPUTS** |
| kg·h⁻¹ | 3774.46 | 6842.75 | 55329.03 | 8792.83 | 2536.39 | 574.05 | 5792.98 | 10964.59 |
Table A.8 Output stream summary of PD-CHP1-OXY
PD-CHP1OXY
Mass Flow
-1

kg·h

H2O
N2
O2
CO
CO2
ARGON
CH4
ETHANE
PROPANE
H2
BUTANE
PENTANE
HEXANE
HEPTANE
OCTANE
NONANE
DECANE
UNDECANE
N-DOD-01
N-TRI-01
N-TET-01
N-PEN-01
N-HEX-01
N-HEP-01
N-OCT-01
N-NON-01
N-EIC-01
N-HEN-01
N-DOC-01
N-TRI-02
N-TET-02
N-PEN-02
N-HEX-02
N-HEP-02
N-OCT-02
N-NON-02
N-TRI-03
Mass Flow
kg·h-1

OUTPUTS
STEAMA (6)

STEAMB (7)

STEAMC (8)

1318.93
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00

380.46
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00

9420.25
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00

COND
CHP
(9)
209.59
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00

1318.93

380.46

9420.25

209.59

FLASH
COND
(12)
58727.83
0.00
0.07
0.00
3.87
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00

FT
COND
(31)
3055.19
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.04
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00

FT
SYNCR
(36)
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
3.15
9.76
23.62
41.08
51.46
53.89
52.05
48.77
45.03
41.24
37.55
34.03
30.72
27.63
24.78
22.16
19.78
17.60
15.64
13.87
12.28
10.85
9.57
8.44
7.43
43.53

58731.77

3055.22

705.91

263

REST
(35)

FLUEGAS
(38)

STEAM
(37)

0.81
0.00
0.08
0.04
1.64
0.00
0.00
0.05
0.22
0.00
0.88
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00

1126.84
4374.84
9.17
0.00
4231.16
74.62
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00

10964.59
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00
0.00

3.73

9816.64

10964.59


### Table A.9 Input stream summary of PD-CHP2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD-CHP2</th>
<th>INPUTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass Flow kg·h⁻¹</td>
<td>BIOGAS (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂O</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>2250.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂S</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₃O⁺</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCO₃⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₃²⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₂⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAH⁺</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEACOO⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>1523.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGON</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEXANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECANES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DOD-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A.9 (cont.) Input stream summary of PD-CHP2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD-CHP2</th>
<th>INPUTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass Flow</td>
<td>BIOGAS (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TET-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-EIC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DOC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TET-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mass Flow | 3774.46 | 1370.82 | 0.05 | 574.75 | 30060.13 | 46365.03 | 10409.39 | 3002.71 | 7125.36 | 12332.90 |
Table A.10 Output stream summary of PD-CHP2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD-CHP2 Mass Flow kg h⁻¹</th>
<th>CONDENSATE (6)</th>
<th>STEAM-A (21)</th>
<th>STEAM-B (22)</th>
<th>STEAM-C (23)</th>
<th>COND CHP (24)</th>
<th>FLASH COND (27)</th>
<th>FT COND (43)</th>
<th>FT SYNCR (47)</th>
<th>REST (46)</th>
<th>FLUEGAS (52)</th>
<th>STEAM (51)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂O</td>
<td>1288.19</td>
<td>1561.41</td>
<td>450.41</td>
<td>11152.17</td>
<td>248.12</td>
<td>49716.04</td>
<td>2883.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1606.41</td>
<td>12332.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>4623.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂S</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₃O⁺</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH⁻</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCO₃⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂-2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA⁺H⁺</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEACOO⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>28082.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGON</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>479.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEXANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>36.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>45.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>46.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DOD-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A.10 (cont.) Output stream summary of PD-CHP2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD-CHP2</th>
<th>CONDENSATE (6)</th>
<th>STEAM-A (21)</th>
<th>STEAM-B (22)</th>
<th>STEAM-C (23)</th>
<th>COND CHP (24)</th>
<th>FLASH COND (27)</th>
<th>FT COND (43)</th>
<th>FT SYNCR (47)</th>
<th>REST (46)</th>
<th>FLUEGAS (52)</th>
<th>STEAM (51)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass Flow kg·h⁻¹</td>
<td>1298.61</td>
<td>1561.41</td>
<td>450.41</td>
<td>11152.17</td>
<td>248.12</td>
<td>49716.46</td>
<td>2883.90</td>
<td>586.20</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>34794.56</td>
<td>12332.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>44.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TET-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>41.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>37.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>34.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>30.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-EIC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DOC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TET-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A.11 Input stream summary of PD-CHP2-OXY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD-CHP2-OXY</th>
<th>INPUTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass Flow</td>
<td>BIOMAS</td>
<td>WATER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kg h⁻¹</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>MU (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2O</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1370.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>2250.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂S</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3O⁺</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCO₃⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₃⁻²</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₅⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S⁻²</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA⁺</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEACOO⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>1523.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGON</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPAINE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEXANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DOD-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TET-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OXYGEN</th>
<th>NOX</th>
<th>WATER1</th>
<th>WATER2</th>
<th>AIR</th>
<th>WATER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INPUT</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2O</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂S</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3O⁺</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCO₃⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₃⁻²</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₅⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S⁻²</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA⁺</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEACOO⁻</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4549.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1394.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGON</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>77.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPAINE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEXANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DOD-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TET-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table A.11 (cont.) Input stream summary of PD-CHP2-OXY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD-CHP2-OXY</th>
<th>INPUTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass Flow kg·h⁻¹</td>
<td>BIOGAS (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-EIC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DOC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TET-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mass Flow kg·h⁻¹ | 3774.46 | 1370.82 | 0.05 | 573.17 | 6778.63 | 56175.54 | 2484.60 | 8613.26 | 6024.70 | 10999.30 |
Table A.12 Output stream summary of PD-CHP2-OXY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Flow</th>
<th>CONDENSATE (6)</th>
<th>STEAM- A (21)</th>
<th>STEAM- B (22)</th>
<th>STEAM- C (23)</th>
<th>COND CHP (24)</th>
<th>FLASH COND (27)</th>
<th>FT COND (43)</th>
<th>FT SYNCR (47)</th>
<th>REST (46)</th>
<th>FLUEGAS (52)</th>
<th>STEAM (51)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kg·h(^{-1})</td>
<td>MEA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2O</td>
<td>1288.19</td>
<td>1291.99</td>
<td>372.69</td>
<td>9227.87</td>
<td>205.31</td>
<td>59638.77</td>
<td>3061.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1131.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>4232.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2S</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3O+</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OH-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HCO3-</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO3-2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEA+</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEACOO-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4549.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CH4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARGON</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>77.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ETHANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROPANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PENTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HEXANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HEPTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NONANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNDECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-DOD-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-TRI-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-TET-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-PEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-HEX-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-HEP-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-OCT-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD-CHP2-OXY</td>
<td>OUTPUTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Flow</td>
<td>CONDENSATE (6)</td>
<td>STEAM-A (21)</td>
<td>STEAM-B (22)</td>
<td>STEAM-C (23)</td>
<td>COND CHP (24)</td>
<td>FLASH COND (27)</td>
<td>FT COND (43)</td>
<td>FT SYNCR (47)</td>
<td>REST (46)</td>
<td>FLUEGAS (52)</td>
<td>STEAM (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kg·h⁻¹</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-EIC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DOC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TET-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Flow</td>
<td>1298.61</td>
<td>1291.99</td>
<td>372.69</td>
<td>9227.87</td>
<td>205.31</td>
<td>3061.38</td>
<td>705.45</td>
<td>9995.73</td>
<td>10999.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kg·h⁻¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A.13 Input stream summary of PD-CHP1-POST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Flow kg·h⁻¹</th>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H₂O</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N₂</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22754.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O₂</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6973.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CO</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CO₂</strong></td>
<td>2250.75</td>
<td>14.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARGON</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>388.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CH₄</strong></td>
<td>1523.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETHANE</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPANE</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H₂</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUTANE</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PENTANE</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEXANE</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEPTANE</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCTANE</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NONANE</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DECANE</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDECANE</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-DOD-01</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-TRI-01</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-TET-01</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-PEN-01</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-HEX-01</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-HEP-01</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-OCT-01</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-NON-01</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-EIC-01</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-HEN-01</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-DOC-01</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-TRI-02</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-TET-02</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-PEN-02</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-HEX-02</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-HEP-02</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-OCT-02</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-NON-02</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-TRI-03</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-HEN-02</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H₂S</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEA</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H₃O⁺</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OH⁻</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HCO₃⁻</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CO₃⁻</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HS⁻</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S²⁻</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAH⁺</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEACOO⁻</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mass Flow kg·h⁻¹**  
3774.46 30130.31 45521.15 10590.12 3054.84 2644.09 0.60 517.92 7994.31 9633.35
### Table A.14 Output stream summary of PD-CHP1-POST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD-CHP1-POST</th>
<th>STEAM-A (7)</th>
<th>STEAM-B (8)</th>
<th>STEAM-C (9)</th>
<th>COND CHP (5)</th>
<th>CHP FG (15)</th>
<th>COND. (20)</th>
<th>FLASH (12)</th>
<th>FT COND (42)</th>
<th>FT SYNCR (45)</th>
<th>REST (44)</th>
<th>FG (50)</th>
<th>STEAM (49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass Flow kg\text{h}^{-1}</td>
<td>H2O</td>
<td>1588.52</td>
<td>458.23</td>
<td>11345.79</td>
<td>252.43</td>
<td>743.90</td>
<td>1989.88</td>
<td>48807.66</td>
<td>2789.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>992.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22746.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6045.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>894.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>644.13</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>3783.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARGON</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>387.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CH4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ETHANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROPANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PENTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HEXANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HEPTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCTANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NONANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>47.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>49.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNDECANE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>47.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-DOD-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>44.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-TRI-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-TET-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>37.21</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-PEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>33.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-HEX-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>30.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-HEP-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-OCT-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24.93</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-NON-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-EIC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-HEN-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-DOC-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A.14 (cont.) Output stream summary of PD-CHP1-POST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Flow</th>
<th>STEAM-A (7)</th>
<th>STEAM-B (8)</th>
<th>STEAM-C (9)</th>
<th>COND CHP (5)</th>
<th>CHP FG (15)</th>
<th>COND. (20)</th>
<th>FLASH (12)</th>
<th>FT COND (42)</th>
<th>FT SYNCR (45)</th>
<th>REST (44)</th>
<th>FG (50)</th>
<th>STEAM (49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TET-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-PEN-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEX-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEP-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OCT-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NON-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-TRI-03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>39.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-HEN-02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2S</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3O+</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCO3-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO3-2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAH+</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEACOO-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Flow</td>
<td>1588.52</td>
<td>458.23</td>
<td>11345.79</td>
<td>252.43</td>
<td>25417.09</td>
<td>2002.86</td>
<td>48808.24</td>
<td>2789.08</td>
<td>648.03</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>10924.57</td>
<td>9633.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**kg·h⁻¹**
Table A.15 Stream summary of upgrading process using [C$_2$MIm][Tf$_2$N]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[C$_2$MIm][Tf$_2$N]</th>
<th>INPUTS</th>
<th>OUTPUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass Flow (kg·h$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>BIOGAS (1)*</td>
<td>BIO-METHANE (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH4</td>
<td>1523.71</td>
<td>1330.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>2250.75</td>
<td>192.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2MIMNTF</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (kg·h$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>3774.46</td>
<td>1522.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.16 Stream summary of upgrading process using [C$_6$MIm][Tf$_2$N]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[C$_6$MIm][Tf$_2$N]</th>
<th>INPUTS</th>
<th>OUTPUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass Flow (kg·h$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>BIOGAS (1)</td>
<td>BIO-METHANE (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH4</td>
<td>1523.709</td>
<td>1271.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>2250.749</td>
<td>183.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6MIMNTF</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (kg·h$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>3774.46</td>
<td>1454.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.17 Stream summary of upgrading process using [P$_{66614}$][Tf$_2$N]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[P$_{66614}$][Tf$_2$N]</th>
<th>INPUTS</th>
<th>OUTPUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass Flow (kg·h$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>BIOGAS (1)</td>
<td>BIO-METHANE (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH4</td>
<td>1523.709</td>
<td>1104.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>2250.749</td>
<td>159.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6MIMNTF</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (kg·h$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>3774.46</td>
<td>1263.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Stream numbers refer to flowsheet shown in Fig. 3.9
Appendix B. Catalyst cost

The calculations described below refer to the PD-MEA1 process concept for illustrative purposes. The catalyst costs for the rest of the process concepts are calculated using the same methodology.

a) FT reactor

The volume of the catalyst bed, \( V \) is calculated using hourly space velocity, \( GHSV \) and actual volumetric flow rate, \( v_0 \); (Swanson, 2009).

\[
GHSV = \frac{v_0}{V}
\]

\[
GHSV_{FT}(STP) = 1,000 \text{ h}^{-1} \quad \text{(Assumed)}
\]

\( STP = \text{Standard Temperature and Pressure (IUPAC), i.e. 0°C and 1 bar} \)

\( v_{0,FT} = 562.44 \text{ m}^3 \cdot \text{h}^{-1} @ 220°C \text{ and } 30 \text{ bar} \) \quad \text{(From Aspen)}

Using,

(1) Charles’ Law: \( \frac{V_1}{T_2} = \frac{V_2}{T_2} \)

(2) Boyle’s Law: \( P_1 V_1 = P_2 V_2 \)

to convert \( v_{0,FT} \) to STP:

\[
V_{FT} = \frac{v_{0,FT} (STP)}{GHSV_{FT} (STP)}
\]

\[
V_{FT} = 9.35 \text{ m}^3
\]

Catalyst costs

\[
Cost_{CAT,FT} = 22 \text{ £} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1} \quad \text{(Swanson, 2010b)}
\]

\[
\rho_{CAT,FT} = 1025 \text{ kg} \cdot \text{m}^{-3} \quad \text{(Swanson, 2009)}
\]
\[
COST_{CAT\,BED,\,FT} = 9.35 \text{ m}^3 \cdot 22 \text{ £} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1} \cdot 1025 \text{ kg} \cdot \text{m}^{-3} = 210,747.36 \text{ £}
\]

b) RWGS reactor

\[
GHSV = \frac{V_0}{V}
\]

\[
GHSV_{RGWS} (STP) = 3,000 \text{ h}^{-1} \quad \text{(Park et al., 2004)}
\]

\[STP = \text{Standard Temperature and Pressure (IUPAC), i.e. } 0^\circ \text{C and 1 bar}\]

\[v_{0,\,RGWS} = 13,975.41 \text{ m}^3 \cdot \text{h}^{-1} \text{ at } 650^\circ \text{C and 1 atm} \quad \text{(From Aspen)}\]

Using,

(3) Charles’ Law: \(\frac{V_1}{T_2} = \frac{V_2}{T_2}\)

(4) Boyle’s Law: \(P_1V_1 = P_2V_2\)

to convert \(v_{0,\,RGWS}\) to STP:

\[
V_{RGWS} = \frac{v_{0,\,RGWS} (STP)}{GHSV_{RGWS} (STP)}
\]

\[V_{RGWS} = 1.40 \text{ m}^3\]

**Catalyst costs**

\[Cost_{CAT,\,RGWS} = 22 \text{ £} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1} \quad \text{(Swanson, 2010b)} \quad \rho_{CAT,\,RGWS} = 1025 \text{ kg} \cdot \text{m}^{-3} \quad \text{(Swanson, 2009)}\]

\[
COST_{CAT\,BED,\,RGWS} = 1.40 \text{ m}^3 \cdot 22 \text{ £} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1} \cdot 1025 \text{ kg} \cdot \text{m}^{-3} = 31,494.55 \text{ £}
\]
c) SMR reactor

\[ GHSV = \frac{V_0}{V} \]

\[ GHSV_{SMR} (STP) = 2,600 \text{ h}^{-1} \quad \text{(Swanson, 2009)} \]

\( STP = \text{Standard Temperature and Pressure (IUPAC), i.e. } 0^\circ \text{C and 1 bar} \)

\[ \nu_{0,SMR} = 797.29 \text{ m}^3 \cdot \text{h}^{-1} \text{ @ } 850^\circ \text{C and 25 bar} \quad \text{(From Aspen)} \]

Using,

(5) Charles’ Law: \[ \frac{V_1}{T_2} = \frac{V_2}{T_2} \]

(6) Boyle’s Law: \[ P_1 V_1 = P_2 V_2 \]

to convert \( \nu_{0,SMR} \) to STP:

\[ V_{SMR} = \frac{\nu_{0,SMR} (STP)}{GHSV_{SMR} (STP)} \]

\[ V_{SMR} = 1.86 \text{ m}^3 \]

Catalyst costs

\[ Cost_{CAT,SMR} = 22 \text{ £} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1} \quad \text{(Swanson, 2010b)} \]

\[ \rho_{CAT,SMR} = 1025 \text{ kg} \cdot \text{m}^{-3} \quad \text{(Swanson, 2009)} \]

\[ COST_{CAT,BED,SMR} = 1.86 \text{ m}^3 \cdot 22 \text{ £} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1} \cdot 1025 \text{ kg} \cdot \text{m}^{-3} = 42,042.94 \text{ £} \]
Appendix C. PSA bed cost

The calculations described below refer to the PD-MEA1 process concept for illustrative purposes. The PSA bed costs for the rest of the process concepts are calculated using the same methodology.

The PSA bed is assumed to be made of the molecular sieve (1/3) and activated carbon (2/3), according to the work by Swanson (2009). The adsorption capacity of the bed is estimated from Fig. C.1 as a function of the adsorbed gases’ partial pressure (Swanson, 2009).

![Fig. C.1 Molecular sieve adsorption capacity as a function of partial pressure](image)

The adsorption capacity estimated from Fig. C.1 is in Standard Cubic Feet per pound (SCF/lb); therefore P and T are corrected to the actual adsorption conditions (10 bar and 483 °C) using Charles‘ Law and Boyle’s Law.

Volumetric flowrate of syngas (from Aspen): \( v_{0\text{SYNGAS}}(10 \text{ bar and } 483 \degree \text{C}) = 709.40 \text{ m}^3 \cdot \text{h}^{-1} \)

Molar fraction of adsorbed gases (from Aspen): \( x_{\text{ads}} = 0.39 \)

Volumetric flowrate of adsorbed gases: \( v_{0\text{ads}} = 709.40 \text{ m}^3 \cdot \text{h}^{-1} \cdot 0.39 = 276.67 \text{ m}^3 \cdot \text{h}^{-1} \)

Assuming a adsorption/desorption cycle time of 5 minutes (Swanson, 2009), the mass of molecular sieve required is given by,
Mass\_{MolSieve} = \frac{v_{ads} \cdot Cycle\ time}{Ad\_Cap} = \frac{276.67 m^3 \cdot h^{-1} \cdot \left(\frac{5\ min}{60\ min}\right)}{0.0017 m^3 \cdot kg^{-1}} = 13,562.25 kg

Since the bed is 1/3 molsieve and 2/3 activated carbon,

Mass_{Bed} = 3 \cdot 13,562.25 kg = 40,686.77 kg

Assuming a packing bed cost of 3 £\cdot kg^{-1}; Swanson (2009),

\textit{COST}_{\text{Bed}} = 40,686.77 kg \cdot 3 \cdot \text{£} \cdot kg^{-1} = 122,060.31 \text{ £}
Appendix D. Cost results

Appendix D.1 Total Capital Investment (TCI) of the evaluated CCU process designs

PD-MEA1

Table D.1 TCI costs results of the PD-MEA1 design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>COST (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased equipment</td>
<td>4534725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment installation</td>
<td>2131321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation and control</td>
<td>1632501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piping</td>
<td>3083613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>498820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and building services</td>
<td>816251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard improvements</td>
<td>453473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service facilities</td>
<td>3174308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Direct Cost</strong></td>
<td>16325010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1496460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction expenses</td>
<td>1859238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal costs</td>
<td>181389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor's fee</td>
<td>997640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>1995279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Indirect Cost</strong></td>
<td>6530004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FCI</strong></td>
<td>22855014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working investment</td>
<td>4059143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA cost</td>
<td>22620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA requirements</td>
<td>22619.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA cost (£·kg⁻¹)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TCI</strong></td>
<td>£26,936,777</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TCI costs results of the PD-MEA2 design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Cost</th>
<th>COST (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchased equipment</td>
<td>3444025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment installation</td>
<td>1618692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation and control</td>
<td>1239849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piping</td>
<td>2341937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>378843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and building services</td>
<td>619925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard improvements</td>
<td>344403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service facilities</td>
<td>2410818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Direct Cost</strong></td>
<td>12398490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Cost</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1136529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction expenses</td>
<td>1412050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal costs</td>
<td>137761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor’s fee</td>
<td>757686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>1515371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Indirect Cost</strong></td>
<td>4959396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FCI</strong></td>
<td><strong>17357886</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Working investment     | 3673253   |
| MEA cost               | 22620     |

| MEA requirements       | 22619.6 kg |
| MEA cost (£·kg⁻¹)      | 1          |

| **TCI**                | **£21,053,758** |
Table D.3 TCI costs results of the PD-CHP1 design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCI</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TCI</strong></td>
<td><strong>£58,806,922</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased equipment</td>
<td>9919763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment installation</td>
<td>4662289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation and control</td>
<td>3571115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piping</td>
<td>6745439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>1091174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and building services</td>
<td>1785557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard improvements</td>
<td>991976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service facilities</td>
<td>6943834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Direct Cost</strong></td>
<td>35711146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>3273522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction expenses</td>
<td>4067103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal costs</td>
<td>396791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor's fee</td>
<td>2182348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>4364696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Indirect Cost</strong></td>
<td>14284458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FCI</strong></td>
<td>49995604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working investment</strong></td>
<td>8811317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA cost</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA requirements</td>
<td>0 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA cost (£·kg⁻¹)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table D.4 TCI costs results of the PD-CHP1-OXY design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCI</th>
<th>COST (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased equipment</td>
<td>8194361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment installation</td>
<td>3851350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation and control</td>
<td>2949970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piping</td>
<td>5572166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>901380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and building services</td>
<td>1474985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard improvements</td>
<td>819436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service facilities</td>
<td>5736053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Direct Cost</strong></td>
<td>29499701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2704139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction expenses</td>
<td>3359688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal costs</td>
<td>327775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor’s fee</td>
<td>1802760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>3605519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Indirect Cost</strong></td>
<td>11799881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FCI</strong></td>
<td>41299582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working investment</td>
<td>7310670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA cost</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA requirements</td>
<td>0 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA cost (£·kg(^{-1}))</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TCI** £48,610,252
## Table D.5 TCI costs results of the PD-CHP2 design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCI Items</th>
<th>Cost (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased equipment</td>
<td>10296349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment installation</td>
<td>4839284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation and control</td>
<td>3706684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piping</td>
<td>7001517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>1132598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and building services</td>
<td>1853343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard improvements</td>
<td>1029635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service facilities</td>
<td>7207444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Direct Cost</strong></td>
<td>37066856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>3397795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction expenses</td>
<td>4221503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal costs</td>
<td>411854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor’s fee</td>
<td>2265197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>4530394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Indirect Cost</strong></td>
<td>14826742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FCI</strong></td>
<td>51893598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working investment</td>
<td>9156443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA cost</td>
<td>22620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA requirements</td>
<td>22619.6 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA cost (£·kg⁻¹)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TCI</strong></td>
<td>£61,072,661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PD-CHP2-OXY

Table D.6 TCI costs results of the PD-CHP2-OXY design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCI</th>
<th>COST (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased equipment</td>
<td>8828527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment installation</td>
<td>4149408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrumentation and control</td>
<td>3178270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piping</td>
<td>6003398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>971138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and building services</td>
<td>1589135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard improvements</td>
<td>882853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service facilities</td>
<td>6179969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Direct Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>31782697</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2913414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction expenses</td>
<td>3619696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal costs</td>
<td>353141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor’s fee</td>
<td>1942276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>3884552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Indirect Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>12713079</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FCI</strong></td>
<td><strong>44495776</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Working investment 7849425
MEA cost 22620

| MEA requirements | 22619.6 kg |
| MEA cost (£·kg⁻¹) | 1 |

| **TCI** | **£52,367,820** |
**PD-CHP1-POST**

Table D.7 TCI costs results of the PD-CHP1-POST design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCI</th>
<th>COST (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased equipment</td>
<td>8975263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment installation</td>
<td>4218374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation and control</td>
<td>3231095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piping</td>
<td>6103179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>987279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and building services</td>
<td>1615547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard improvements</td>
<td>897526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service facilities</td>
<td>6282684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Direct Cost</strong></td>
<td>32310946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2961837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction expenses</td>
<td>3679858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal costs</td>
<td>359011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor’s fee</td>
<td>1974558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>3949116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Indirect Cost</strong></td>
<td>12924378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FCI</strong></td>
<td>45235324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working investment</strong></td>
<td>7989651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEA cost</strong></td>
<td>49661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEA requirements</strong></td>
<td>49660.4 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEA cost (£·kg⁻¹)</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TCI</strong></td>
<td><strong>£53,274,635</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D.2 Total Capital Investment (TCI) of the evaluated ionic liquid and MEA-based CO\textsubscript{2} capture processes

\[\text{[C}_2\text{MIm]}\text{[Tf}_2\text{N]}\]

\textbf{Table D.8} TCI costs results of the \([\text{C}_2\text{MIm]}\text{[Tf}_2\text{N]}\) CO\textsubscript{2} capture design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIC</th>
<th>COST (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased equipment</td>
<td>1519000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment installation</td>
<td>713930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation and control</td>
<td>546840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piping</td>
<td>1032920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>167090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and building services</td>
<td>273420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard improvements</td>
<td>151900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service facilities</td>
<td>1063300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Direct Cost</strong></td>
<td>5468400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>501270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction expenses</td>
<td>622790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal costs</td>
<td>60760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor’s fee</td>
<td>334180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>668360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Indirect Cost</strong></td>
<td>2187360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCI</td>
<td>7655760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Working investment** 1481674  **IL cost** 740970

| IL requirements | 56997.6 kg |
| IL Cost (£-kg\textsuperscript{-1}) | 13 |

**TIC** £9,878,403
### Table D.9 TCI costs results of the \([\text{C}_6\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]\) \(\text{CO}_2\) capture design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIC</th>
<th>COST (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased equipment</td>
<td>1550800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment installation</td>
<td>728876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation and control</td>
<td>558288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piping</td>
<td>1054544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>170588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and building services</td>
<td>279144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard improvements</td>
<td>155080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service facilities</td>
<td>1050560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Direct Cost</strong></td>
<td>5582880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>511764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction expenses</td>
<td>635828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal costs</td>
<td>62032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor's fee</td>
<td>341176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>682352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Indirect Cost</strong></td>
<td>2233152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FCI</strong></td>
<td><strong>7816032</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working investment</td>
<td>1502682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL cost</td>
<td>685684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IL requirements</strong></td>
<td><strong>52744.9</strong> kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IL Cost (£·kg(^{-1}))</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIC** £10,004,398
**Table D.10** CO₂ capture design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIC</th>
<th>COST (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased equipment</td>
<td>1570500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment installation</td>
<td>738135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation and control</td>
<td>565380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piping</td>
<td>1067940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>172755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and building services</td>
<td>282690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard improvements</td>
<td>157050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service facilities</td>
<td>1099350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Direct Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>5653800</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>518265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction expenses</td>
<td>643905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal costs</td>
<td>62820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor's fee</td>
<td>345510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>691020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Indirect Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>2261520</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FCI</strong></td>
<td><strong>7915320</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working investment</td>
<td>1498131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL cost</td>
<td>574366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL requirements</td>
<td>44182 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL Cost (£/kg)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIC</strong></td>
<td><strong>£9,987,817</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MEA

### Table D.11 TCI costs results of the MEA CO₂ capture design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCI</th>
<th>COST (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased equipment</td>
<td>519900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment installation</td>
<td>244353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation and control</td>
<td>187164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piping</td>
<td>353532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>57189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and building services</td>
<td>93582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard improvements</td>
<td>51990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service facilities</td>
<td>363930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Direct Cost</strong></td>
<td>1871640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>171567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction expenses</td>
<td>213159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal costs</td>
<td>20796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor's fee</td>
<td>114378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>228756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Indirect Cost</strong></td>
<td>748656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FCI</strong></td>
<td>2620296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working investment</strong></td>
<td>466453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEA cost</strong></td>
<td>22620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEA requirements</strong></td>
<td>22619.6 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEA cost (£·kg⁻¹)</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TCI</strong></td>
<td>£3,109,369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D.3 Annual Operating and Maintenance (O&M) costs of the evaluated CCU process designs

**PD-MEA1**

**Table D.12** Annual O&M costs results of the PD-MEA1 design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O&amp;M</th>
<th>COST (£·year⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed charge</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local taxes</td>
<td>457100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>228550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fixed charge</strong></td>
<td>685650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct prod. cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling</td>
<td>6587475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>2704151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity (value from Aspen)</td>
<td>1979040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA make up</td>
<td>4256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂ and Steam Reformer</td>
<td>685644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalysts &amp; PSA packing</td>
<td>319488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>1599851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating labour</td>
<td>399600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>59940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating supplies</td>
<td>239978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory charges</td>
<td>59940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total direct prod. Cost</strong></td>
<td>14639363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plant overhead</strong></td>
<td>1235635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production cost</strong></td>
<td>16560648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative cost</td>
<td>59940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution and marketing</td>
<td>349276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D cost</td>
<td>349904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General expenses</strong></td>
<td>759120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANNUAL O&M** £17,319,768
## Table D.13 Annual O&M costs results of the PD-MEA2 design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O&amp;M</th>
<th>COST (£·year(^{-1}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed charge</td>
<td>Local taxes 347158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insurance 173579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Fixed charge</strong> 520737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct prod. cost</td>
<td>Cooling 3870663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heating 1144945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electricity (value from Aspen) 721680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEA make up 4256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H(_2) 3130678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catalysts &amp; PSA packing 12374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance 1215052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating labour 399600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision 59940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating supplies 182258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laboratory charges 59940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total direct prod. Cost</strong> 10912762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant overhead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General expenses</td>
<td>Administrative cost 59940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution and marketing 259573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R&amp;D cost 258388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total General expenses</strong> 577900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANNUAL O&M** £13,016,154
## PD-CHP1

**Table D.14** Annual O&M costs results of the PD-CHP1 design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O&amp;M</th>
<th>COST (£·year⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed charge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local taxes</td>
<td>999912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>499956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fixed charge</strong></td>
<td>1499868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct prod. cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling</td>
<td>7802093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>2073400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>1592160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA make up</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂</td>
<td>9210040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalysts &amp; PSA packing</td>
<td>1040992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>3499692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating labour</td>
<td>399600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>59940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating supplies</td>
<td>524954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory charges</td>
<td>59940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total direct prod. Cost</strong></td>
<td>26262811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant overhead</td>
<td>2375539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production cost</td>
<td>30138218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative cost</td>
<td>59940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution and marketing</td>
<td>631795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D cost</td>
<td>628944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General expenses</strong></td>
<td>1320679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANNUAL O&M** \( \£31,458,897 \)
## PD-CHP1-OXY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O&amp;M</th>
<th>Fixed charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Fixed charge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct prod. cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEA make up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H₂ and O₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catalysts &amp; PSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laboratory charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total direct prod. Cost</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant overhead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Production cost</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution and marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R&amp;D cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total General expenses</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANNUAL O&M £25,708,236**
### PD-CHP2

**Table D.16** Annual O&M costs results of the PD-CHP2 design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O&amp;M</th>
<th>COST (£·year⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed charge</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local taxes</td>
<td>1037872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>518936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fixed charge</strong></td>
<td>1556808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct prod. cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling</td>
<td>9935834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>2902271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>1534500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA make up</td>
<td>4256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂</td>
<td>8286720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalysts &amp; PSA</td>
<td>1083628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>3632552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating labour</td>
<td>399600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>59940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating supplies</td>
<td>544883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory charges</td>
<td>59940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total direct prod. Cost</strong></td>
<td>28444124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant overhead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2455255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production cost</strong></td>
<td>32456187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative cost</td>
<td>59940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution and marketing</td>
<td>680537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D cost</td>
<td>677357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General expenses</strong></td>
<td>1417834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANNUAL O&M** £33,874,021
## PD-CHP2-OXY

Table D.17 Annual O&M costs results of the PD-CHP2-OXY design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O&amp;M</th>
<th>COST (£·year⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed charge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local taxes</td>
<td>889916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>444958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fixed charge</strong></td>
<td>1334873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct prod. cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling</td>
<td>7263747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>1779549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA make up</td>
<td>4256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂ and O₂</td>
<td>11034874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalysts &amp; PSA</td>
<td>382456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>3114704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating labour</td>
<td>399600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>59940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating supplies</td>
<td>467206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory charges</td>
<td>59940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total direct prod. Cost</strong></td>
<td>24566273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant overhead</td>
<td>2144547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production cost</strong></td>
<td>28045693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative cost</td>
<td>59940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution and marketing</td>
<td>588465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D cost</td>
<td>585030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General expenses</strong></td>
<td>1233435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANNUAL O&M** £29,279,128
### PD-CHP1-POST

**Table D.18** Annual O&M costs results of the PD-CHP1-POST design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O&amp;M</th>
<th></th>
<th>COST (£·year$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed charge</td>
<td>Local taxes</td>
<td>904706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>452353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Fixed charge</strong></td>
<td>1357060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct prod. cost</td>
<td>Cooling</td>
<td>9684692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>2610665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEA make up</td>
<td>11266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H$_2$</td>
<td>8286720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catalysts &amp; PSA/O$_2$ plant packing</td>
<td>327396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>3166473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating labour</td>
<td>399600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>59940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating supplies</td>
<td>474971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laboratory charges</td>
<td>59940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total direct prod. Cost</strong></td>
<td>25081663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td>2175608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Production cost</strong></td>
<td>28614330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General expenses</td>
<td>Administrative cost</td>
<td>59940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution and marketing</td>
<td>600656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R&amp;D cost</td>
<td>596970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total General expenses</strong></td>
<td>1257565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANNUAL O&M** £29,871,895
Appendix D.4 Annual Operating and Maintenance (O&M) costs of the evaluated ionic liquid and MEA-based CO₂ capture processes

\([\text{C}_2\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O&amp;M</th>
<th>COST (£·year⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed charge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local taxes</td>
<td>153115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>76558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fixed charge</strong></td>
<td>229673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct prod. cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling</td>
<td>53340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>292156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL make-up</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>535903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating labour</td>
<td>266400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>39960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating supplies</td>
<td>80385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory charges</td>
<td>39960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total direct prod. Cost</strong></td>
<td>1308105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant overhead</td>
<td>505358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production cost</strong></td>
<td>2043136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative cost</td>
<td>39960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution and marketing</td>
<td>43869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D cost</td>
<td>42179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General expenses</strong></td>
<td>126008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANNUAL O&amp;M</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2,169,144</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D.20 Annual O&M costs results of the [C$_{8}$MIm][Tf$_{2}$N] CO$_{2}$ capture design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O&amp;M</th>
<th>COST (£·year$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed charge</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local taxes</td>
<td>156321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>78160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fixed charge</strong></td>
<td>234481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct prod. cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling</td>
<td>58577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>313243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL &amp; Water make-up</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>547122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating labour</td>
<td>266400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>39960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating supplies</td>
<td>82068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory charges</td>
<td>39960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total direct prod. Cost</strong></td>
<td>1347330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plant overhead</strong></td>
<td>512089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production cost</strong></td>
<td>2093901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative cost</td>
<td>39960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution and marketing</td>
<td>44713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D cost</td>
<td>43089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General expenses</strong></td>
<td>127762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANNUAL O&M** £2,221,662
Table D.21 Annual O&M costs results of the [P₆₆₆₁₄][Tf₂N] CO₂ capture design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O&amp;M</th>
<th>COST (£·year⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed charge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local taxes</td>
<td>158306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>79153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fixed charge</strong></td>
<td>237460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct prod. cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling</td>
<td>57796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>331229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL &amp; Water make-up</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>554072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating labour</td>
<td>266400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>39960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating supplies</td>
<td>83111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory charges</td>
<td>39960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total direct prod. Cost</strong></td>
<td>1372528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant overhead</td>
<td>516259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production cost</strong></td>
<td>2126247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative cost</td>
<td>39960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution and marketing</td>
<td>44737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D cost</td>
<td>45023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General expenses</strong></td>
<td>129720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANNUAL O&M** £2,255,967
### O&M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost (£·year⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed charge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local taxes</td>
<td>52406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>26203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fixed charge</strong></td>
<td>78609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct prod. cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling</td>
<td>65450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>624332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>73154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA &amp; Water make-up</td>
<td>4272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>183421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating labour</td>
<td>266400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>39960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating supplies</td>
<td>27513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory charges</td>
<td>39960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total direct prod. Cost</strong></td>
<td>1324462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant overhead</td>
<td>293868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production cost</strong></td>
<td>1696939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative cost</td>
<td>39960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution and marketing</td>
<td>36167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D cost</td>
<td>36353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General expenses</strong></td>
<td>112480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANNUAL O&M**  £1,809,419
Appendix D.5 Sensitivity analysis results of the evaluated CCU process designs

Note that in all process concepts, the operating hours were varied by ±9.5%.

### PD-MEA1

**Table D.23** Sensitivity analysis results of the PD-MEA1 concept as a result of parameters’ variations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production costs (£·GJ⁻¹)</th>
<th>-30%</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>+30%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital investment</td>
<td>91.04</td>
<td>95.46</td>
<td>99.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>92.57</td>
<td>95.46</td>
<td>98.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant life</td>
<td>97.76</td>
<td>95.46</td>
<td>94.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating hours</td>
<td>105.48</td>
<td>95.46</td>
<td>87.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity price</td>
<td>92.70</td>
<td>95.46</td>
<td>98.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂ price</td>
<td>94.50</td>
<td>95.46</td>
<td>96.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ conversion</td>
<td>96.41</td>
<td>95.46</td>
<td>89.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PD-MEA2

**Table D.24** Sensitivity analysis results of the PD-MEA2 concept as a result of parameters’ variations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production costs (£·GJ⁻¹)</th>
<th>-30%</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>+30%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital investment</td>
<td>234.62</td>
<td>246.43</td>
<td>258.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>238.70</td>
<td>246.43</td>
<td>254.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant life</td>
<td>252.55</td>
<td>246.43</td>
<td>243.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating hours</td>
<td>272.29</td>
<td>246.43</td>
<td>225.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity price</td>
<td>242.98</td>
<td>246.43</td>
<td>249.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂ price</td>
<td>231.48</td>
<td>246.43</td>
<td>261.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ conversion</td>
<td>338.20</td>
<td>246.43</td>
<td>201.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PD-CHP1**

Table D.25 Sensitivity analysis results of the PD-CHP1 concept as a result of parameters’ variations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production costs (£·GJ⁻¹)</th>
<th>-30%</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>+30%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital investment</td>
<td>263.75</td>
<td>278.81</td>
<td>293.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>268.95</td>
<td>278.81</td>
<td>289.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant life</td>
<td>286.62</td>
<td>278.81</td>
<td>275.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating hours</td>
<td>308.08</td>
<td>278.81</td>
<td>254.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity price</td>
<td>275.34</td>
<td>278.81</td>
<td>282.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂ price</td>
<td>258.73</td>
<td>278.81</td>
<td>298.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ conversion</td>
<td>359.30</td>
<td>278.81</td>
<td>215.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PD-CHP1-OXY**

Table D.26 Sensitivity analysis results of the PD-CHP1-OXY concept as a result of parameters’ variations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production costs (£·GJ⁻¹)</th>
<th>-30%</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>+30%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital investment</td>
<td>168.59</td>
<td>178.32</td>
<td>188.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>171.95</td>
<td>178.32</td>
<td>185.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant life</td>
<td>183.36</td>
<td>178.32</td>
<td>176.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating hours</td>
<td>197.03</td>
<td>178.32</td>
<td>162.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂ price</td>
<td>162.08</td>
<td>178.32</td>
<td>193.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ conversion</td>
<td>275.79</td>
<td>178.32</td>
<td>152.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PD-CHP2**

Table D.27 Sensitivity analysis results of the PD-CHP2 concept as a result of parameters’ variations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production costs (£·GJ⁻¹)</th>
<th>-30%</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>+30%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital investment</td>
<td>283.07</td>
<td>298.73</td>
<td>314.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>288.48</td>
<td>298.73</td>
<td>309.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant life</td>
<td>306.86</td>
<td>298.73</td>
<td>295.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating hours</td>
<td>330.09</td>
<td>298.73</td>
<td>272.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity price</td>
<td>295.38</td>
<td>298.73</td>
<td>302.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂ price</td>
<td>280.64</td>
<td>298.73</td>
<td>316.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ conversion</td>
<td>399.34</td>
<td>298.73</td>
<td>236.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PD-CHP2-OXY

**Table D.28** Sensitivity analysis results of the PD-CHP2-OXY concept as a result of parameters’ variations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production costs (£·GJ⁻¹)</th>
<th>-30%</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>+30%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital investment</td>
<td>187.14</td>
<td>197.42</td>
<td>207.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>190.69</td>
<td>197.42</td>
<td>204.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant life</td>
<td>202.76</td>
<td>197.42</td>
<td>195.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating hours</td>
<td>218.14</td>
<td>197.42</td>
<td>180.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂ price</td>
<td>182.09</td>
<td>197.42</td>
<td>212.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ conversion</td>
<td>260.19</td>
<td>197.42</td>
<td>168.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PD-CHP1-POST

**Table D.29** Sensitivity analysis results of the PD-CHP1-POST concept as a result of parameters’ variations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production costs (£·GJ⁻¹)</th>
<th>-30%</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>+30%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital investment</td>
<td>205.83</td>
<td>217.11</td>
<td>228.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>209.72</td>
<td>217.11</td>
<td>225.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant life</td>
<td>222.96</td>
<td>217.11</td>
<td>214.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating hours</td>
<td>239.90</td>
<td>217.11</td>
<td>198.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂ price</td>
<td>202.17</td>
<td>217.11</td>
<td>232.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ conversion</td>
<td>280.21</td>
<td>217.11</td>
<td>171.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D.6 Sensitivity analysis results of the evaluated ionic liquid and MEA-based CO$_2$ capture processes

[C$_{2}$MIm][Tf$_{2}$N]

Table D.30 Sensitivity analysis results of the [C$_{2}$MIm][Tf$_{2}$N] CO$_2$ capture design as a result of parameters’ variations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production costs (£·GJ$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>-30%</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>+30%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IL cost</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity price</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant life</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating hours</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital investment</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>6.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[C$_{6}$MIm][Tf$_{2}$N]

Table D.31 Sensitivity analysis results of the [C$_{6}$MIm][Tf$_{2}$N] CO$_2$ capture design as a result of parameters’ variations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production costs (£·GJ$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>-30%</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>+30%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IL cost</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>6.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity price</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant life</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>6.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating hours</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital investment</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table D.32 Sensitivity analysis results of the [P_{6614}][Tf_2N] CO₂ capture design as a result of parameters’ variations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production costs (£/GJ)</th>
<th>-30%</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>+30%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IL cost</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity price</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>7.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant life</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating hours</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital investment</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>8.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E. Aspen Plus parameters of ionic liquid models

Pure-component parameters implemented in AspenPlus for the ionic liquids

Table E.1 Model parameters and corresponding physical properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Property model</th>
<th>Physical property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPIG</td>
<td>Aspen Ideal gas heat capacity Polynomial</td>
<td>Ideal gas heat capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNLDIP</td>
<td>DIPPR equation</td>
<td>Liquid molar volume (liquid density)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULAND</td>
<td>Andrade equation</td>
<td>Liquid viscosity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equations:
- **Aspen Ideal Gas Heat Capacity Polynomial**
  \[ c_p^{\text{ig}} = C_1 + C_2 T + C_3 T^2 + \ldots + C_n T^{n-1} \]
- **DIPPR equation**
  \[ \rho_L = \frac{C_1}{C_2^{1+(T/C_3)^{C_4}}} \]
- **Andrade equation**
  \[ ln(\mu_t) = A + \frac{B}{T} + C \ ln(T) \]
**CPIG parameter (ideal gas heat capacity)**

**Table E.2** Ideal gas heat capacity polynomial coefficients for [C$_2$MIm][Tf$_2$N]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>[C$_2$MIm][Tf$_2$N]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>CPIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideal gas heat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>J/kmol-K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>351324.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>491.204363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.059570441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.48E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table E.3** Ideal gas heat capacity polynomial coefficients for [C$_3$MIm][Tf$_2$N]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>[C$_3$MIm][Tf$_2$N]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>CPIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideal gas heat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>J/kmol-K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>529611.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-104.194741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.61685781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.0009216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table E.4 Ideal gas heat capacity polynomial coefficients for \([\text{P}_{66614}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>([\text{P}_{66614}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}])</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>CPIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>Ideal gas heat capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature units</td>
<td>°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property units</td>
<td>J/kmol-K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1227085.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2300.82035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3.59688255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-273.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>726.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DNLDIP parameter (liquid molar volume)

### Table E.5 DIPPR equation coefficients for \([\text{C}_2\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>([\text{C}_2\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}])</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>DNLDIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>Liquid molar volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature units</td>
<td>°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property units</td>
<td>kmol/cum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.353418419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.275785506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1100.38374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.477783803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-273.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>726.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table E.6 DIPPR equation coefficients for [C₆MIm][Tf₂N]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>DNLDIP</th>
<th>Physical property</th>
<th>Liquid molar volume</th>
<th>Temperature units</th>
<th>Property units</th>
<th>Physical property</th>
<th>Liquid molar volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>DNLDIP</td>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>Liquid molar volume</td>
<td>Temperature units</td>
<td>Property units</td>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>Liquid molar volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Components</td>
<td>[C₆MIm][Tf₂N]</td>
<td>Components</td>
<td>[P₆₆₆₁₄][Tf₂N]</td>
<td>Components</td>
<td>[P₆₆₆₁₄][Tf₂N]</td>
<td>Components</td>
<td>[P₆₆₆₁₄][Tf₂N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>DNLDIP</td>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>Liquid molar volume</td>
<td>Temperature units</td>
<td>Property units</td>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>Liquid molar volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>DNLDIP</td>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>Liquid molar volume</td>
<td>Temperature units</td>
<td>Property units</td>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>Liquid molar volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature units</td>
<td>DNLDIP</td>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>Liquid molar volume</td>
<td>Temperature units</td>
<td>Property units</td>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>Liquid molar volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property units</td>
<td>DNLDIP</td>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>Liquid molar volume</td>
<td>Temperature units</td>
<td>Property units</td>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>Liquid molar volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.141575074</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.196354965</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1283.70363</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.44450507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table E.7 DIPPR equation coefficients for [P₆₆₆₁₄][Tf₂N]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>DNLDIP</th>
<th>Physical property</th>
<th>Liquid molar volume</th>
<th>Temperature units</th>
<th>Property units</th>
<th>Physical property</th>
<th>Liquid molar volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>DNLDIP</td>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>Liquid molar volume</td>
<td>Temperature units</td>
<td>Property units</td>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>Liquid molar volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature units</td>
<td>DNLDIP</td>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>Liquid molar volume</td>
<td>Temperature units</td>
<td>Property units</td>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>Liquid molar volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property units</td>
<td>DNLDIP</td>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>Liquid molar volume</td>
<td>Temperature units</td>
<td>Property units</td>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>Liquid molar volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.014059989</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.091041506</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1908.04139</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MULAND parameter (liquid viscosity)

Table E.8 Andrade equation coefficients for \([\text{C}_2\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>([\text{C}_2\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}])</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>MULAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>viscosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature units</td>
<td>°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property units</td>
<td>cP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-166.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10367.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E.9 Andrade equation coefficients for \([\text{C}_6\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>([\text{C}_6\text{MIm}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}])</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>MULAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>viscosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature units</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property units</td>
<td>cP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-139.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9863.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E.10 Andrade equation coefficients for \([\text{P}_{66614}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}]\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>([\text{P}_{66614}][\text{Tf}_2\text{N}])</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>MULAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical property</td>
<td>Liquid viscosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature units</td>
<td>°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property units</td>
<td>cP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-166.04383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12027.5942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.0845053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-273.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>226.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E.11 Coefficients of the SGPRF1 molecular component s-profile parameter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>[C$_2$MIm][Tf$_2$N]</th>
<th>[C$_6$MIm][Tf$_2$N]</th>
<th>[P$_{66614}$][Tf$_2$N]</th>
<th>CO$_2$</th>
<th>CH$_4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0293</td>
<td>0.0663</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.5117</td>
<td>0.5745</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5850</td>
<td>1.5230</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.7077</td>
<td>2.5953</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.8183</td>
<td>3.8998</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E.12 Coefficients of the SGPRF2 molecular component s-profile parameter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>[C₂MIm][Tf₂N]</th>
<th>[C₆MIm][Tf₂N]</th>
<th>[P₆₆₆₁₄][Tf₂N]</th>
<th>CO₂</th>
<th>CH₄</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.1627</td>
<td>5.4098</td>
<td>0.4020</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2802</td>
<td>6.4383</td>
<td>3.4570</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.9108</td>
<td>8.7745</td>
<td>8.8712</td>
<td>0.1050</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8980</td>
<td>13.0858</td>
<td>12.0615</td>
<td>2.8640</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.5543</td>
<td>14.4793</td>
<td>13.2078</td>
<td>6.6930</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.8038</td>
<td>14.1375</td>
<td>15.9835</td>
<td>6.3210</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.0195</td>
<td>15.9373</td>
<td>19.3168</td>
<td>3.5510</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.0132</td>
<td>19.5700</td>
<td>27.5197</td>
<td>2.4270</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.8320</td>
<td>23.6263</td>
<td>50.1048</td>
<td>2.5120</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.2243</td>
<td>25.5933</td>
<td>81.1903</td>
<td>1.2930</td>
<td>2.7082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.1955</td>
<td>26.1660</td>
<td>102.4308</td>
<td>1.0620</td>
<td>5.4569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.4023</td>
<td>26.5018</td>
<td>101.7848</td>
<td>2.3450</td>
<td>8.9848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>SGPRF3</td>
<td>[C₂MIm][Tf₂N]</td>
<td>[C₆MIm][Tf₂N]</td>
<td>[P₆₆₆₁₄][Tf₂N]</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.3303</td>
<td>29.8080</td>
<td>89.5632</td>
<td>1.6370</td>
<td>5.8897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.8400</td>
<td>38.9005</td>
<td>85.1365</td>
<td>1.0130</td>
<td>6.0301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.5305</td>
<td>41.4693</td>
<td>81.3280</td>
<td>3.2090</td>
<td>7.2904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.3542</td>
<td>27.7665</td>
<td>61.9112</td>
<td>4.4650</td>
<td>15.8236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6435</td>
<td>11.4365</td>
<td>32.6507</td>
<td>2.8160</td>
<td>3.8237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.3810</td>
<td>4.0245</td>
<td>10.1092</td>
<td>6.2550</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6405</td>
<td>2.6405</td>
<td>2.6333</td>
<td>10.7980</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1775</td>
<td>4.1775</td>
<td>4.3037</td>
<td>6.1000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.6040</td>
<td>6.6040</td>
<td>7.0310</td>
<td>0.7000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.3445</td>
<td>9.3445</td>
<td>9.7947</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.4585</td>
<td>14.4585</td>
<td>15.0143</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.4210</td>
<td>18.4210</td>
<td>18.8207</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>[C&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;MIm][Tf&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;N]</td>
<td>[C&lt;sub&gt;6&lt;/sub&gt;MIm][Tf&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;N]</td>
<td>[P&lt;sub&gt;66614&lt;/sub&gt;][Tf&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;N]</td>
<td>CO&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>CH&lt;sub&gt;4&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.3105</td>
<td>15.3105</td>
<td>14.9800</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7535</td>
<td>7.7535</td>
<td>7.0797</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1670</td>
<td>2.1670</td>
<td>1.7777</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2845</td>
<td>0.2845</td>
<td>0.1770</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0295</td>
<td>0.0295</td>
<td>0.0177</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E.15 Coefficients of the SGPRF5 molecular component s-profile parameter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>SGPRF5</th>
<th>[C₂MIm][Tf₂N]</th>
<th>[C₆MIm][Tf₂N]</th>
<th>[P₆₆₆₄][Tf₂N]</th>
<th>CO₂</th>
<th>CH₄</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Carbon dioxide utilisation for production of transport fuels: process and economic analysis**

**Abstract**

Utilising CO₂ as a feedstock for chemicals and fuels could help mitigate climate change and reduce dependence on fossil fuels. For this reason, there is an increasing world-wide interest in carbon capture and utilisation (CCU). As part of a broader project to identify key technical advances required for sustainable CCU, this work considers different process designs, each at a high level of technology readiness and suitable for large-scale conversion of CO₂ into liquid hydrocarbon fuels, using biogas from sewage sludge as a source of CO₂. The main objective of the paper is to estimate fuel production yields and costs of different CCU process configurations in order to establish whether the production of hydrocarbon fuels from commercially proven technologies is economically viable. Four process concepts are examined, developed and modelled using the process simulation software Aspen Plus to determine raw materials, energy and utility requirements. Three design cases are based on typical biogas applications: (1) biogas upgrading using a monoethanolamine (MEA) unit to remove CO₂, (2) combustion of raw biogas in a combined heat and power (CHP) plant and (3) combustion of upgraded biogas in a CHP plant which represents a combination of the first two options. The fourth case examines a post-combustion CO₂ capture and utilisation system where the CO₂ removal unit is placed right after the CHP plant to remove the excess air with the aim of improving the energy efficiency of the plant. All four concepts include conversion of CO₂ to CO via a reverse water-gas-shift reaction process and subsequent conversion to diesel and gasoline via Fischer–Tropsch synthesis. The studied CCU options are compared in terms of liquid fuel yields, energy requirements, energy efficiencies, capital investment and production costs. The overall plant energy efficiency and production costs range from 12–17% and £15.8–29.6 per litre of liquid fuels, respectively. A sensitivity analysis is also carried out to examine the effect of different economic
and technical parameters on the production costs of liquid fuels. The results indicate that the production of liquid hydrocarbon fuels using the existing CCU technology is not economically feasible mainly because of the low CO$_2$ separation and conversion efficiencies as well as the high energy requirements. Therefore, future research in this area should aim at developing novel CCU technologies which should primarily focus on optimising the CO$_2$ conversion rate and minimising the energy consumption of the plant.
Carbon Capture and Utilisation: Application of Life Cycle Thinking to Process Design

Abstract

Global emissions of CO$_2$ from fossil fuels are increasing steadily and are currently 60% above the 1990 levels, despite the need to reduce them by at least 50% to limit the rise of the global average temperature to 2°C by 2050 (IPCC, 2013). A range of options that could help towards this target are being considered, including carbon capture and utilisation (CCU) which converts waste CO$_2$ to valuable products such as fuels (Styring et al., 2011). However, conversion of CO$_2$ to fuels is very energy intensive because of its thermodynamic stability, as well as requiring the use of different chemicals, so that it is not clear if this option is environmentally more sustainable than conventional fossil or biofuels. As CCU technologies are currently being developed, this presents an ideal opportunity to evaluate and optimise their potential for mitigating climate change, the main driver for their development. This is best carried out at an early design stage, taking a life cycle approach to avoid shifting of environmental burdens from one life cycle stage to another (Azapagic et al., 2006). Therefore, this paper sets out to demonstrate how this can be achieved by considering a CCU system for the production of synthetic diesel from waste CO$_2$. 
Techno-Economic Feasibility of Selective CO₂ Capture Processes from Biogas Streams Using Ionic Liquids as Physical Absorbents


**Abstract**

Biogas from anaerobic digestion of sewage sludge is a renewable resource with high energy content, which is composed mainly of CH₄ (40–75 vol %) and CO₂ (15–60 vol %). Other components, such as water (H₂O, 5–10 vol %) and trace amounts of hydrogen sulfide and siloxanes, can also be present. A CH₄-rich stream can be produced by removing the CO₂ and other impurities so that the upgraded bio-methane can be injected into the natural gas grid or used as a vehicle fuel. The main objective of this paper is to assess the technical and economic performance of biogas upgrading processes using ionic liquids that physically absorb CO₂. The simulation methodology is based on the COSMO-SAC model as implemented in Aspen Plus. Three different ionic liquids, namely, 1-ethyl-3-methylimidazolium bis[(trifluoromethyl)sulfonyl]imide, 1-hexyl-3-methylimidazoliumbis[(trifluoromethyl)sulfonyl]imide, and trihexyl(tetradecyl)phosphonium bis[(trifluoromethyl)sulfonyl]imide, are considered for CO₂ capture in a pressure-swing regenerative absorption process. The simulation software Aspen Plus and Aspen Process Economic Analyzer is used to account for mass and energy balances as well as equipment cost. In all cases, the biogas upgrading plant consists of a multistage compressor for biogas compression, a packed absorption column for CO₂ absorption, a flash evaporator for solvent regeneration, a centrifugal pump for solvent recirculation, a pre-absorber solvent cooler, and a gas turbine for electricity recovery. The evaluated processes are compared in terms of energy efficiency, capital investment, and bio-methane production costs. The overall plant efficiency ranges from 71 to 86%, and the bio-methane production cost ranges from $9.18–11.32 per GJ (LHV). A sensitivity analysis is also performed to determine how several technical and economic parameters affect the bio-methane production costs. The results of this study show that the simulation methodology developed can predict plant efficiencies and production costs of large scale CO₂ capture processes using ionic liquids without having to rely on gas solubility experimental data.