

# Multi-Carrier Model Data

## Detailed Version

LAST UPDATED | August 1, 2018

### Numerical Data

Table 1: Load and VRE generation profiles, gas demand

Param.	Value	Unit	Notes
$\gamma_t^S$	$[0, 1]^T$	p.u.	<b>Computed</b> from [1], normalised yearly profile.
$\gamma_t^{W_{off}}$	$[0, 1]^T$	p.u.	<b>Computed</b> from [2], normalised yearly profile.
$\gamma_t^{W_{on}}$	$[0, 1]^T$	p.u.	<b>Computed</b> from [2], normalised yearly profile.
$\gamma_t^L$	$[0, 1]^T$	p.u.	<b>Computed</b> from [3], normalised yearly profile.
$\pi_t^{NG}$	Time Series	MWh	<b>Computed</b> from [4].

Table 2: Power and energy capacity parameters

Param.	Value	Unit	Notes
$\kappa_t^L$	Time Series	MW	<b>Derived</b> from 2016 peak load; 1% yearly increase.
$\kappa_0^S$	3000.0	MW	Retrieved from [1].
$\kappa_{max}^S$	25000.0	MW	<b>Assumed.</b>
$\kappa_0^{W_{off}}$	900.0	MW	Retrieved from [2].
$\kappa_{max}^{W_{off}}$	25000.0	MW	<b>Assumed.</b>
$\kappa_0^{W_{on}}$	1750.0	MW	Retrieved from [2].
$\kappa_{max}^{W_{on}}$	25000.0	MW	<b>Assumed.</b>
$\kappa_{max}^{PtG}$	16500.0	MW	<b>Assumed</b> , estimation of peak electricity demand.
$\kappa_{max}^{H_2tP}$	16500.0	MW	<b>Assumed</b> , estimation of peak electricity demand.
$\kappa_{max}^{H_2tCH_4}$	16500.0	MW	<b>Assumed</b> , estimation of peak electricity demand.
$\kappa_{t,0}^{NG}$	Time Series	MW	Retrieved from [5].
$\kappa_{max}^{NG}$	16500.0	MW	<b>Assumed</b> , estimation of peak electricity demand.

$\kappa_{max}^{PtPH}$	1300.0	MW	Retrieved from [5].
$\kappa_{max}^{PHtP}$	1300.0	MW	Retrieved from [5].
$\kappa_{max}^{disp}$	1700.0	MW	<b>Derived</b> from [5].
$\Xi_{max}^{H_2}$	396.0	GWh <sub>th</sub>	<b>Assumed</b> , 24 hours of peak electricity demand.
$\Xi_{max}^{CH_4}$	12.0	TWh <sub>th</sub>	<b>Assumed</b> , 30 days of peak electricity demand.
$\Xi_{max}^{PH}$	5.3	GWh	Retrieved from [5].
$\kappa_{net}^{NG}$	90.0	GWh <sub>th</sub>	<b>Assumed</b> , linepack flexibility of Fluxys H & L grids.
$\kappa_{t,0}^{NK}$	Time Series	MW	<b>CHECK</b> Retrieved from [5].
$\kappa_{max}^{trs}$	6500.0	MW	Retrieved from [6].
$\Psi_{max}^{CO_2}$	7.0	Mt	<b>Extrapolated</b> from [7] and [8], very sensitive parameter.

Table 3: Efficiencies

Param.	Value	Unit	Notes
$\eta^{NGtP}$	[45.0, 65.0]	%	Retrieved from [9], technology dependent (OCGT $\rightarrow$ CCGT), 2020.
$\eta^{H_2tP}$	{42.0, 70.0}	%	Retrieved from [10], hydrogen gas turbine technology, 2008-9.
$\eta^{H_2tP}$	[45.0, 60.0]	%	Retrieved from [11], fuel cell technology, 2012.
$\eta^{disp}$	45.0	%	<b>Computed</b> from [9], aggregate value for various techs, 2010.
$\eta^{PtG}$	70.0	%	Retrieved from [12], alkaline electrolysis technology.
$\eta^{H_2tCH_4}$	78.0	%	Retrieved from [12], fixed-bed reactor catalytic methanation.
$\eta^{PtPH}$	90.0	%	<b>Approximated</b> from [13], to match round-trip efficiency of 80%.
$\eta^{PHtP}$	90.0	%	<b>Approximated</b> from [13], to match round-trip efficiency of 80%.

Table 4: Storage and emission parameters

Param.	Value	Unit	Notes
$\sigma^{H_2}$	0.0	%	<b>Assumed</b> , non-zero value forces construction of technology.
$\sigma^{CH_4}$	0.0	%	<b>Assumed</b> , non-zero value forces construction of technology.
$\sigma^{PH}$	0.0	%	<b>Assumed</b> , fully usable PH capacity.
$\sigma^{NG}$	0.0	%	<b>Assumed</b> , as capacity is linepack operational flexibility.

$\mu^{disp}$	20.0	%	<b>Assumed</b> , must-run condition.
$\mu^{NK}$	TBD	%	<b>Assumed</b> .
$\mu^{trs}$	15.0	%	<b>Assumed</b> , half the current value for Belgium.
$\nu^{NG,CO_2}$	0.18	t/MWh	Retrieved from [14].
$\nu^{CH_4,CO_2}$	0.018	t/MWh	<b>Assumed</b> , 10% of NG emissions.
$\nu^{disp,CO_2}$	0.35	t/MWh	<b>Approx.</b> from [14], aggregates technologies (biomass, waste).
$\nu^{trs,CO_2}$	0.20	t/MWh	<b>Approximated</b> from [8], considering all interconnected countries' CO2 intensity.

Table 5: Technology capital and operational costs

Param.	Value	Unit	Notes
$\zeta^{ENS}$	3000	€/MWh	Retrieved from [15].
$\zeta^{C,S}$	100	€/MWh	Retrieved from [15].
$\zeta^{C,W_{on}}$	100	€/MWh	Retrieved from [15].
$\zeta^{C,W_{off}}$	100	€/MWh	Retrieved from [15].
$\zeta^S$	$8 \times 10^5$	€/MW	Retrieved from [16], 2040 forecast.
$\zeta^{W_{on}}$	$10^6$	€/MW	Retrieved from [16], 2040 forecast.
$\zeta^{W_{off}}$	$2.2 \times 10^6$	€/MW	Retrieved from [16], 2040 forecast.
$\zeta^{PtG}$	$[8, 30] \times 10^5$	€/MW <sub>el</sub>	Retrieved from [17], depending on AE, PEM or SE technology.
$\zeta^{H_2tCH_4}$	$[7, 15] \times 10^5$	€/MW	Retrieved from [18], depending on year (2030 $\rightarrow$ now).
$\zeta^{H_2tCH_4}$	$[1.3, 4] \times 10^5$	€/MW	Retrieved from [17], OUTOTEC GmbH data.
$\zeta^{CH_4}$	<b>50.0</b>	€/MWh	<b>Assumed</b> , based on discussions with Fluxys.
$\zeta_s^{H_2}$	$[0.8, 7.2] \times 10^3$	€/MWh	Retrieved from [19], 0.8 € to \$ rate assumed.
$\zeta^{NG}$	$[550, 850] \times 10^3$	€/MW	Retrieved from [16], depends on technology (OCGT $\rightarrow$ CCGT).
$\zeta^{H_2}$	$10^6$	€/MW	Retrieved from [10], hydrogen turbine technology.
$\zeta^{H_2}$	$[6.4, 16] \times 10^5$	€/MW	Retrieved from [20], PEM and SO fuel cell technologies ( $\rightarrow$ 2050).
$\theta^{CO_2}$	[33.0, 126.0]	€/tCO2	Retrieved from [16].
$\theta_{fuel}^{disp}$	6.0	€/MWh	Retrieved from [21], median in given range.
$\theta_v^{disp}$	[3.0, 4.0]	€/MWh	Retrieved from [16].

$\theta_f^{disp}$	$4 \times 10^4$	€/MW	Retrieved from [16], new biomass technology, 2040 forecast.
$\theta_{fuel}^{NG}$	[29.0, 35.0]	€/MWh	Retrieved from [16], depending on coal/gas merit order.
$\theta_v^{NG}$	[2.0, 11.0]	€/MWh	Retrieved from [16], depending on technology (CCGT $\rightarrow$ OCGT).
$\theta_f^{NG}$	$[17, 21] \times 10^3$	€/MW	Retrieved from [16], depending on technology (OCGT $\rightarrow$ CCGT).
$\theta_v^{H_2}$	[2.0, 11.0]	€/MWh	<b>Extrapolated</b> from [16], from NG-fired plant costs for $H_2$ turbine.
$\theta_f^{H_2}$	8.0	€/MWh <sub>el</sub>	Retrieved from [10], hydrogen gas turbine technology, 2008-9.
$\theta_f^{H_2}$	$[3.2, 8] \times 10^4$	€/MWh <sub>el</sub>	Retrieved from [19], fuel cell technologies (2050 $\rightarrow$ now).
$\theta_{s,f}^{H_2}$	[40, 360]	€/MWh	Retrieved from [19], 5% of CAPEX per year.
$\theta_f^{CH_4}$	2.5	€/MWh	<b>Assumed</b> , 5% of CAPEX per year.
$\theta_f^{W_{off}}$	$7.7 \times 10^4$	€/MW	Retrieved from [16], 2040 forecast.
$\theta_f^{W_{on}}$	$2.9 \times 10^4$	€/MW	Retrieved from [16], 2040 forecast.
$\theta_f^S$	$2 \times 10^4$	€/MW	Retrieved from [16], 2040 forecast.
$\theta_v^{W_{off}}$	0.0	€/MWh	<b>Assumed</b> .
$\theta_v^{W_{on}}$	0.0	€/MWh	<b>Assumed</b> .
$\theta_v^S$	0.0	€/MWh	<b>Assumed</b> .
$\theta_f^{PtG}$	$[1.6, 6.0] \times 10^4$	€/MWh <sub>el</sub>	<b>Extrapolated</b> from [18], 2% of CAPEX for alkaline electrolyser.
$\theta_f^{H_2tCH_4}$	$[3.5, 7.5] \times 10^4$	€/MW	<b>Extrapolated</b> from [18], 5% of CAPEX for catalytic methanation.
$\theta_f^{PH}$	$4.5 \times 10^4$	€/MW	Retrieved from [16], 2040 forecast.
$\theta_v^{PH}$	8.0	€/MWh	Retrieved from [16].
$\theta^{el}$	Time Series	€/MWh	Retrieved from [22].

## References

- [1] Elia. Solar PV Generation Data. <http://www.elia.be/en/grid-data/power-generation/Solar-power-generation-data/Graph>.
- [2] Elia. Wind Power Generation Data. <http://www.elia.be/en/grid-data/power-generation/wind-power>.
- [3] Elia. Load and Load Forecasts. <http://www.elia.be/en/grid-data/Load-and-Load-Forecasts/total-load>.
- [4] Fluxys. Transmission & ZTP Trading Services - Flow Data - Ex-post Domestic Exit Point Information, 2017. <https://gasdata.fluxys.com/transmission-ztp-trading-services/flow-data/>.
- [5] Elia. Electricity Scenarios for Belgium Towards 2050 - Belgian Demand and Generation Assumptions (Renewable Generation), 2017. p. 39–42.
- [6] Elia. Electricity Scenarios for Belgium Towards 2050 - Assumptions on Interconnections, 2017. p. 55–57.
- [7] IEA. Energy Policies of IEA Countries - Belgium, 2016 Review (Climate Change - Energy-related CO2 emissions), 2016. p. 29–32.

- [8] Electricity Map. Carbon intensity. <https://www.electricitymap.org>.
- [9] IEA. Energy supply technologies data. <https://iea-etsap.org/index.php/energy-technology-data/energy-supply-technologies-data>.
- [10] NREL. Lifecycle Cost Analysis of Hydrogen Versus Other Technologies for Electrical Energy Storage, 2009. p. 18.
- [11] Thomas A. Adams et al. Energy Conversion With Solid Oxide Fuel Systems: A Review of Concepts and Outlooks for the Short- and Long-Term. Table 3, p3092.
- [12] Manuel Goetz et al. Renewable Power-to-Gas : A technological and economic review, 2015. Fig. 11, p1383.
- [13] EASE European Association for Storage of Energy. Energy Storage Technologies. <http://ease-storage.eu/energy-storage/technologies/>.
- [14] US EPA. Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2014.
- [15] Elia. Electricity Scenarios for Belgium Towards 2050 - Economic Assumptions, 2017. p. 71.
- [16] Elia. Electricity Scenarios for Belgium Towards 2050 - Economic Assumptions, 2017. p. 58–62.
- [17] Manuel Goetz et al. Renewable Power-to-Gas : A technological and economic review, 2015. Sec 2.2.4, p1373-4 and sec 5.3.1.1, p1383.
- [18] Enea Consulting. The Potential of Power-to-Gas, 2016. p. 34-45.
- [19] IEA. Technology roadmap: Hydrogen and fuel cells, 2015. Table 15, p. 56.
- [20] IEA. Technology roadmap: Hydrogen and fuel cells, 2015. Fuel Cells Table, p. 60.
- [21] IRENA. Biomass for Power Generation - Current Costs of Biomass Power : Feedstock Prices, 2012. p. 27-31.
- [22] EPEX Spot. European electricity index. <https://www.epexspot.com/en/market-data/elix>.