

6TH IEF IGU MINISTERIAL GAS FORUM

Session 1: The role of gas technologies in low carbon energy systems

IEF-IGU Gas Ministerial



Key messages: The role of new gas technologies in resilient low carbon energy systems

Key messages

Session objectives

In the near term, gas offers significant climate benefits from coal fuel switching

- Some OECD markets have demonstrate significant climate benefits for coal to gas switching
- To prompt fuel switching in Asia, localized pollution controls and/or carbon price signals are critical

In the medium term, gas is complementary with increasing renewables deployment to manage intermittency

• Gas is fast to ramp up and is not time-limited like battery storage

In the long run, multiple levers are available to decarbonize gas though the value chain

- Biomethane and hydrogen technologies can decarbonize gas supply
- Methane leak prevention is critical in gas midstream
- CCUS and efficiency measures are available to reduce emissions from end use of gas

Identify how governments and industry can accelerate fuel switching to gas

Discuss the role that gas can play in supporting renewables deployment

Discuss what will be required to accelerate the development and deployment of new, low carbon gas technologies such as biomethane, hydrogen, and CCUS

Identify what measures should be taken to reduce methane leaks and to improve efficiency of gas consumption





Near term: Coal to gas switching

Medium term: Complementary with renewables

Long term: Decarbonization of gas

Questions for discussion



Natural gas emits half the CO_2 and a fraction of other pollutants vs. coal



Note: Coal emissions based on supercritical boiler technology; Gas based on CCGT Data: NETL, BCG analysis

In power generation, gas is advantaged on land and capital intensity

Capital intensity (\$/MWh)¹ 50 Solar PV -**Utility Scale** 40 Wind - Onshore 30 Coal 20 Gas CCGT 10 0 20 40 60 0 80 Land intensity (Acres/MW produced)

Coal to gas switching responsible for greatest share of CO₂ reduction in US

US share of gas in power generation mix

US Energy sector emissions 2007-13



Annual share of US power generation (%)

22 21

2008 2009



Substantial coal to gas switching opportunity in the Asian power sector...





... But requires >\$40 carbon pricing given current gas prices



Note: Short run marginal cost for CCGT (54% efficiency) and coal plant (39% efficiency); transport cost 1 \$/mmbtu, 9\$/tonne Source: BCG Analysis



In the UK, a carbon price >\$20/t drove significant coal to gas switching

UK power generation capacity Gas-fired generation increased by 40% in 2016, replacing coal UK power generation capacity (GW) UK power production (TWh) shut downs 0.4 150 Announcement of carbon price floor in 2011, set at £18/T from 2016 0.3 12 1 18 100 9 19 0.2 43 Complete coal 38 33 36 phase out 50 8 9 expected 36 0.1 9 around 2025 46 42 31 11 9 0.0 0 2010 2012 2013 2014 2015 2011 2016 2017 2010 2020 2025 2015 Other Gas Renewable Gas Oil Nuclear Oil Nuclear All renewables Coal Coal

UK power production by source

Source: IEA, Ofgem, BCG analysis



Regulation of localized pollution the most effective lever for improving gas competitiveness in Asia Example of China



Note: Based on average base case LCOE for China in 2016 per Bloomberg; Local pollution externality costs per University of Texas LCOE study Source: Bloomberg, University of Texas, BCG analysis





Near term: Coal to gas switching

Medium term: Complementary with renewables

Long term: Decarbonization of gas

Questions for discussion



Renewables require additional backup beyond 40-45% of generation mix

Developed grids can absorb 40-45% of renewables without additional backup

Intermittent renewables can be absorbed through several levers

- Available reserve capacity
- Flexing non-RE sources (e.g., gas, coal)
- Demand management
- Trade with other grids

Examples

- Hawaii: 40-45% renewables, ~0MW of storage
- California: 41% renewables, repurposed ~4GW of hydro for pumped storage (~5% of total capacity)
- **Denmark:** 50-55% renewables (~45% wind), no storage capacity of note, strongly connected to Norway and Sweden

Beyond 40-45%, backup is required— Example of generation mix modeling





Significant role for gas peaking capacity going forward

A high renewables penetration scenario ...

... Will shift gas capacity from baseload to peaking



Power Generation Mix (%)

Source: Bloomberg NEF, IEA; Bloomberg New energy finance





Near term: Coal to gas switching

Medium term: Complementary with renewables

Long term: Decarbonization of gas

Questions for discussion



Five ways to reduce emissions from the gas system



Biomethane

- Cost competitive with policy enablers in some contexts
- Limited supply & feedstock challenges



Supply

- Technology still immature with multiple potential
 - pathways & competing tech.
- Grid integration will be challenging

Transmission/ distribution



Leak reduction

- Critical driver of emissions for natural gas
- Proven technology available, but there are key barriers to adoption

End use



Efficiency

- New tech. with significant benefits (CHP, heat exchangers)
- Challenge is how to deploy and integration up tech. solutions



Carbon capture

- Demonstrated in some contexts, but not yet achieved scale
- Requires high carbon price or public support



In Europe, hydrogen and biomethane are nearing cost competitiveness due in part to policy

Renewable gas technology cost estimates - Europe

Cost of hydrogen production (£p/kWh)



Policy drivers of renewable gas cost competitiveness

Market price & supply support:

- Carbon price minimum future price of \$40/t planned
- Renewable gas portfolio standards in place

Capital investment:

- Building capital conversion support
- CCS infrastructure development direct or subsidized

New regulations and standards:

- Feed-in / injection rules
- Safety standards established for hydrogen use
- Feedstock standards for biomethane

Source: Imperial College London, BCG analysis





In the US, biomethane supply limited and uncompetitive vs. Henry Hub - Example of California

California biomethane supply costs and availability



Capturing all available biogas in California will be cost prohibitive

1.Henry Hub Source: EIA, UC Davis



Power-to-gas provides highly flexible, seasonal long-term storage

Storage technologies by discharge time and device size



1. Compressed air energy storage 2. Superconducting magnetic energy storage Source: IEA, IRENA, EASE, AECOM, HSBC, BCG



Proven solutions are available to address key sources of methane emissions

Majority of methane leakage driven by upstream production & gathering



US - CH₄ emission per bcm

Existing solutions can largely eliminate upstream fugitive methane

Example - range of emissions factors for technology or methods



Low emissions tech.

Source: EDF study in the journal Science; CCAC O&G Methane Partnership

BCCG



New technologies and approaches are emerging to reduce methane emissions

Detection and measurement

- Devices and systems with infra-red cameras or optical path laser spectroscopy technology
- Satellite technology for measurements of fugitive emissions
- Drones equipped with technology to scan areas
 / equipment
- Continuous detection systems for shale sites

Maintenance / repairs

- Systems for Directed Inspection & Maintenance (DI&M)
- Big-data software to optimize repair campaigns
- IoT and blockchain technology applications
- Sealing robots
- Platform with real-time view of emissions (e.g. for distribution networks)
- Innovative business models (ESCO)

New equipment

- Innovation in established
 technologies
 - Electro-centrifugal pumping technology
 - Compressed-air pumps
 - "low/intermittentbleed" pneumatic controllers
 - Vapor recovery systems
 - Electric circulation pumps for dehydrators
 - Compressors/VRUs to capture casing head gas
- AI and simulation applications to test applications of new technology

Venting / flaring operations

- New small scale LNG applications
- Mobile gas to liquids
- Solutions for efficient well venting for liquids unloading (e.g. foaming agent)
- Solutions to stabilize hydrocarbon liquid storage tanks
- Software to support efficient operation with equipment





Industrial efficiency measures can reduce emissions - example of CHP and heat exchangers

Combined heat and power (CHP)

Heat exchangers

- Top cycle CHP uses waste heat from electricity generation directly for heating
- Bottom cycle CHP uses excess heat from industrial processes to produce electricity
- Can achieve up to 50% energy savings vs conventional gas boilers, with <5yr payback period in the US

- Regenerative burner systems add heat exchangers to gas exhaust systems
- At >800°C can achieve 30% savings compared to traditional gas heat system, and up to 60% energy savings vs oil fired system

Key challenge is how to accelerate adoption





CCS for power gen is a relatively expensive technology

CAPEX of a 250MW power plant with various capture systems (first-of-a-kind)



Including CCS in a power plant increases LCOE by 20%



1. Natural gas plant is based on combined cycle technology. Post-combustion and oxy-fuel base plants are supercritical pulverized coal. Precombustion base plant is an IGCC unit. Does not include cost of pipelines, storage etc. 2. Based on expected costs in 2020; EIA 2015 Source: Schlumberger 2012, Global CCS Institute, EIA Energy Outlook 2015





CO2 capture is the main cost component for CCS in power systems

While storage is the major technical constraint

CCS value chain

	Capture	Transportation	Storage
Technology	Capture technology with significant progress • Large-scale CCS power projects moving into operation and construction	Technology for CO2 pipelines well established Existence of small scale shipment of CO2 • Limited to niche sectors (i.e. food industry)	Established storage in deep underground rock formations • Depleted O&G field (DOGF) • Deep saline aquifers (SA) • Enhanced Oil Recovery (EOR) Limited availability worldwide • Suitable sites 25-50 Mt CO2
Economics	 70-90% of the overall cost of a large-scale CCS project Capture (capex) and compression process (opex) Current cost: ~60 \$/tCO2 	Costs roughly proportional to distance for pipeline transport • Onshore ~5 \$/tCO2 • Offshore ~9 \$/tCO2 Shipment more expensive • 12-18 \$/tCO2 ¹	 Large variation in storage costs SA: 5-25 \$/tCO2² DOGF: 5-15 \$/tCO2² Risk of investing in exploration of unsuitable SA

CCS not yet at mature stage: cost reduction and technology development are needed

1. 12 \$/tCO2 for ~180 km shipments of 20 Mt CO2 p.a., 18 \$/tCO2 for ~1500 km shipments and including liquefation costs 2. Onshore vs. offshore Source: US DOE, Global CCS Institute, European Technology Platform for Zero Emission Fossil Fuel Power Plants





Near term: Coal to gas switching

Medium term: Complementary with renewables

Long term: Decarbonization of gas

Questions for discussion



Questions for discussion

1 Accelerating coal to gas switching

- What policies are most effective for accelerating coal to gas fuel switching?
- How can additional investment in Asian coal power generation capacity be avoided?
- What measures should industry be taking to accelerate fuel switching?
- **2** Role of gas in supporting renewables deployment
 - What is required to accelerate investment in gas peaking capacity?
 - Will gas peaking be complementary or competitive with battery storage?
- **3** Requirements to accelerate biomethane, hydrogen, and CCUS
 - What technologies have the greatest potential for reducing emissions from gas supply and consumption?
 - What scale of investment is required to develop these technologies?
 - How can the industry achieve "quick wins" to demonstrate the viability of these technologies?

4 Measures to reduce methane emissions and improve gas end use efficiency

- What is the role of policy vs. industry action in reducing methane emissions and improving efficiency?
- Are new technologies required, or is it purely a challenge of scaling up existing technology?
- What are success stories that industry and government can highlight?

