

# Life cycle impact assessment for a district heating project with seasonal storage

A case study analysis for a project based in Bracht, Hessen, Germany

Elke Michlmayr

## 1 Abstract

A Life Cycle Impact Assessment (LCIA) is performed for a solar district heating community project in Bracht, Rauschenberg, Germany.

## 2 Introduction

Heating is an important topic for energy consumption since it amounts to roughly half of the consumed energy in the EU. Currently, 60% of that energy is generated from fossil fuels [1]. District heating is a setup where one heating generator plant serves many households connected via pipes. District heating works in two ways: Either to utilise surplus heat from sources such as waste incineration plants for heating purposes in residential areas and service centers [2], or to use a dedicated source of energy, e.g. biomass or solar thermal collectors. There are 6000 existing district heating systems across the EU [1]. Process heating uses a similar setup but is targeted at industrial purposes, which usually require higher heat temperature. Studies like [3] have shown that using a centralized heating component together with heat transport pipes to reach participating consumers has lower environmental impact compared to standalone heating component for each consumers.

Solar thermal collectors (STCs) are devices that absorb solar radiation and convert it into heat. There are different types of solar thermal collectors, including flat plate solar collectors, unglazed water collectors, and evacuated tube solar collectors. They are combined with heat pumps to bridge the gap between solar field produced water temperature and district heating delivery system required temperature [4]. According to [5], there are more than 300 large scale district heating systems globally that are powered with STCs, and more than 1200 STC systems that provide industrial process heat.

STCs are a mature technology. In 2023, the total operational solar thermal capacity reached 560 GWth, which covers roughly 800 km<sup>2</sup> of collector area [5]. STC-provided capacity varies seasonally depending on available sunlight. Sometimes STCs are used only for parts of the year, e.g. to enable turning off a biomass-powered plant in the summer since it would run at extremely low capacity. STCs can be combined with a short term heat storage acting as buffer or a seasonal heat storage tank (e.g. underground hot water basin) to store extra heat from the hot season for the cold season, which incurs heat losses. If space restrictions require such a setup (or if land is cheaper), the geographical location of an STC can be remote from consumers and plants via pipelines (e.g., 4 km in Priština [1]). However, there is a trade-off since the remote location required laying the necessary pipes underground.

In scientific literature, LCA case studies exist for the district heating system in Milan [6] and Marseille [7]. LCA, in particular the ReCiPe method, has been used to assess the environmental impact of different STC powered district heating configurations by [8]. The outcome was that larger systems that serve many households have a lower environmental impact per energy unit served.

In [9], the authors provide an LCA study of a STC plant connected to the Geneva district heat network and find that there is no LCA data available for the coupling of large scale solar thermal installations and district heating networks, and provides suggested numbers that could be used to complement district heat production routes in the KBOB database.

For the community project in Bracht, while the economic viability of the project in comparison to energetic renovation was analysed by [10], the environmental impact has not yet been studied in detail. This is the subject of the given study.

### 3 Methodology and research questions

The foreground data is collected from various online sources and combined with background data from the Ecoinvent v3 database [11] and from the UVEK LCI database version DQRv2:2025 database [12]. Environmental impacts are assessed using the mid-point level Environmental Footprint (EF) method [13], and the Ecological Scarcity 2021 v1.04 method [14] at the single score level with UVEK LCI weighting set. The LCIA is performed using the SimaPro 9.6.0.1 software [15].

The research questions are formulated as follows:

- (1) What is the relevance of the additional electricity required in the setup (amounting to 6% of overall energy consumed) and the supplemental biomass boiler (amounting to 26% of overall energy consumed) with respect to the overall environmental impact? The hypothesis is that the additional electricity and biomass required will amount to a sizable part of the overall environmental impact.

- (2) How does the STC based system with seasonal heat storage compare to other heating technologies in terms of environmental impact? The comparison will include district heating from other sources that would be available in small communities (such as a heat pump or wood chips), and consumer side heating installations such as oil or gas boilers. The hypothesis is that the STC based system will have a lower environmental impact compared to other district heating setups and to fossil energy based consumer installations.
- (3) What is the environmental impact contribution of the seasonal heat storage unit in the production, construction, and use stages in the life cycle? A sensitivity analysis will be performance to assess the benefits of the STC based system with a seasonal heat storage component included under several assumed loss coefficients for the storage component and the transport pipes system. The hypothesis is that the seasonal storage component will lower the environmental impact.

## 4 Goal and scope

The goal and scope definition of an LCA provides a description of the product system and its system boundaries, and a functional unit.

The district heating project that is the topic of this analysis is led by a cooperative comprising future household consumers and the local council. The project setup consists of a solar thermal collector field, a seasonal storage unit also called Pit Thermal Energy Storage (PTES), a heat pump which is using power from the grid, a buffer storage unit, a backup biomass combustion unit that if required can be used as an alternative source of heat (for the cases where there is no availability of heat from neither the solar collector nor the storage), and a distribution network for the customer households (see Figure 1). A receiver unit is installed in each participating household. There are at least 180 consumer households expected, which is roughly 60% of all households in the community.




Figure 1: System overview for the Bracht community district heating network. (Source: University of Kassel)

The functional unit is defined to be 1 MegaJoule (MJ) of thermal energy provided to the consumer directly at the consumer site during the heating period. Using MJ instead of kilowatt-hours of thermal energy ( $\text{kWh}_{\text{th}}$ ) ensures consistency with the UVEK processes for other forms of district heating in SimaPro that the comparison will be performed against.

The lifetime of the installation is assumed to be 50 years. The system diagram shown in Figure 2 describes the product system and its boundaries.




Figure 2: System diagram for the Bracht community district heating network, with functional unit as stated.

System deconstruction was modeled for the solar thermal collector field and the seasonal storage unit. Disposal (via municipal waste incineration) of the plastic material used for seasonal storage unit sealing and insulation was included in the modelling.

## 5 Life Cycle Inventory

There is a lot of information available on the project website [16], which has been used as the source for detailed life cycle inventory information for solar thermal collector field, seasonal storage unit, and heat preparation (heat pump, buffer storage, installation facility, and

consumer installations) can be found in the supporting information appendix in Section 9.1. The heat transport network was modeled based on existing UVEK LCI data. The modelling default electricity source was chosen to be the European Network of Transmission System Operators for Electricity (ENTSO-E) production mix [12], aiming to make the model representative for a plant located in the European region.

The remainder of this section describes the assumptions for component lifetimes, electricity requirements and loss coefficients.

## 5.1 Component lifetimes

The planned lifetime for the Bracht plant is 50 years. The assumed individual component lifetimes and the resulting relevant multipliers are shown in Table 1. The assumed individual component lifetimes are in line with the assumptions used in [17].

Table 1

Component	Years	Multiplier	Source
Solar thermal collector	30	1.67	[18]
Seasonal storage unit	30	1.67	[17]
Heat pump	20	2.5	[19]
Heat buffer storage	20	2.5	[18]
Heat installation facility	50	1	[20]
Heat exchange station at consumer	20	2.5	[17]
Heat transport network	50	1	[17]

## 5.2 Electrical power requirements and loss coefficient assumptions

Several estimations of annual collector output can be found in the relevant performance data from [21] for the solar thermal collectors used in this project. They are based on geographical location and on the desired output temperature. The geographically closest matching entry is 5.283 kWh per collector per year for the Würzburg location and 75 degrees output. For the given 855 collectors, this leads to an estimate of 4.517 MWh per year.

The Bracht documentation [22] states that in total, 2.700 MWh per year are expected to reach consumer households. This means that the assumed loss coefficients for the storage unit and in the pipes together is estimated to amount to a significant factor of 40% loss.

The electrical power is generated to 67% from the solar thermal collectors and stored (2.258 MWh), to 26% from biomass (904 MWh), and to 6% from the grid (209 MWh). This is the percentage distribution included in Figure 1.

There is no detailed information how the expected loss was estimated. However, based on the published numbers and an assumed 20% loss coefficient in the pipes, the resulting expected loss in the seasonal storage unit can be calculated at 50%. These assumptions were used in the modelling. Further discussion of loss coefficients and a related sensitivity analysis can be found in Section 7.3.

## 6 Results

For answering the first research question about the relative environmental impact of the additional electricity and the supplemental biomass boiler, the influence of the different components of the solar thermal district heating system on environmental impact was assessed using the Ecological Scarcity 2021 v1.04 method at the single score level with UVEK LCI weighting set.




Figure 3: Relative environmental impact of Bracht community district heating network system components using the Ecological Scarcity 2021 v1.04 method at the single score level, using the UVEK LCI weighting set.

The results are shown in Figure 3. While the solar thermal collectors contribute two thirds of the energy production (see Figure 1), their relative environmental impact amounts to less than 15%. The biomass and electricity (ENTSO-E production mix as discussed in Section 5) required in the setup for one third of the energy production contribute two thirds of the environmental impact. This is the combined environmental impact based on the UVEK LCI weighting for the relative importance of the damage categories.

For further detail on the damage categories involved, Figure 4 provides the results for the most relevant damage categories *Climate change*, *Particulate matter*, *Eutrophication*, *marine*, *Land use*, *Resource use*, *minerals and metals* and *Resource use, fossils*, as individual results in each category without the weighing provided by UVEK. It reveals that the biomass required

in the setup is the dominant influence in the damage categories land use, particulate matter (PM), and marine eutrophication. Electricity dominates the impact for fossil resource use and climate change. The resource use is most heavily influenced by heat preparation and the solar thermal collectors. The seasonal storage unit impacts climate change and fossil resource use.




Figure 4: Relative environmental impact of Bracht community district heating network system components using the Environmental Footprint Method

To summarize, the electricity and biomass required to power and supplement the system play the dominant roles with respect to the overall environmental impact.

The electricity use is not avoidable since it is required by the heat pump. Its impact can be lowered by using green energy, which will be investigated in Section 7.2. The opportunities and effects of using less biomass by lowering heat loss coefficients are assessed in Section 7.3.

To address the second research question, a comparison of the environmental impact of the heat generated from the STC based district heating system with seasonal heat storage to other heating technologies is performed. Figure 5 shows the results for comparing the environmental impacts of solar thermal based district network heat to other forms of district heating (DH) available in small communities with energy sources such as wood chips (biomass) or geothermal heat pump, and to the usually available consumer side heating installations (CI) such as a oil or gas boiler. This was assessed using the Ecological Scarcity 2021 v1.04 method at the single score level with UVEK LCI weighting set. The results are shown in environmental impact points (Pt) per kilowatt-hour (kWh) of heat.

The result is that the heat produced by the Bracht plant with 170 Pt per kWh of heat shows the second lowest environmental impact compared to the other heating technologies. The




Figure 5: Comparison of environmental impact of Bracht community district heating network to other energy sources for district heating (wood chips, heat pump), and to other types consumer installations (gas, oil). This analysis is based on the Ecological Scarcity 2021 v1.04 method at the single score level, with UVEK LCI weighting set.

largest contributor is the “Global warming” category, dominantly caused by the electricity required (ENTSO-E production mix as discussed in Section 5) and to a lesser extent by the seasonal storage unit and the solar thermal collectors (cf. Figure 4).

The lowest environmental impact with 165 Pt per kWh of heat is returned for the district heating system based on wood chips as the energy source, even with the impact on main air pollutants and particulate matter (PM) having a significant impact on the overall results for this setup. The district heating system based on a geothermal heat pump as the energy source has the third lowest impact with 225 Pt per kWh of heat, to the largest extent from impact on radioactive waste to deposit. Oil and gas based consumer installations fare worse with 430 Pt and 281 Pt per kWh of heat, dominantly from impact on climate change.

As before, Figure 6 provides the individual results for the most relevant damage categories. These are compared against each other, where the highest result in each damage category is shown as longest bar with 100% relative impact. The analysis confirms the numbers from Figure 5, again demonstrating that oil and gas boilers have extremely large impacts in the damage category climate change, which is equivalent to global warming in the Ecological Scarcity method, with 100% and 70%, respectively. It also reveals that oil and gas boilers have the highest fossil resource use with 100% and 80%. The district heating network with wood chips as the energy source has the relative worst impact in three categories: marine eutrophication, land use, and particulate matter (PM). While the latter has a sizable impact that was visible already in Figure 5, the former two exhibit no significant effects in the single score results. The district heating systems with solar thermal based and geothermal energy source return the highest amounts of metal and minerals resource use with 100% and 83%.






Figure 6: Damage assessment using the Environmental Footprint Method, visualized as relative environmental impacts in comparison.

## 7 Interpretation and discussion

This chapter discusses the results introduced in Section 6. They revealed that the district heating system based on solar thermal energy and seasonal storage compares favorably to other means of heating. However, in the given modelling, with limitations as documented in Section 7.1, it exhibits higher environmental impact compared to the district heating system based on wood chips as the energy sources. The electricity and the supplemental biomass required were found to be the two top single contributors to the overall results. To understand the saving potential from using lower-emitting (see Section 7.2) or less energy resources (see third research question and Section 7.3), sensitivity analyses for source of electricity and loss coefficients for the heat loss in the seasonal storage unit and the transport pipes will be performed.

### 7.1 Modeling limitations

The detailed data of the SimaPro process named *district heat, at consumer, solar thermal, 1MW/MJ/RER U* that was defined for this analysis can be found in Figure 8.

The UVEK data for the other energy sources for district heating (wood chips, heat pump) used an 11 % assumption which means that the solar thermal data with the 20% assumption as described in Section 5.2 is disadvantaged in the comparison in Figure 5. The effect of these assumptions on the results will be investigated in Section 7.3.

Data availability was generally satisfactory with one notable exception for the modelling of the heat pumps used in the system (see Section 9.1.3 for specifications). There are two heat pumps with 630 kW max electrical input power each used in the system, but in the UVEK data, the largest sized heat pump available has a maximum of 50 kW power. The best possible assumption in this situation was that the two large heat pump have the same impact as 25 units of the 50 kW heat pump, but this is likely leading an overestimation of the resource use for minerals and metals. This is acceptable since with 6.1 %, the heat preparation system which includes the heat pump showed only minor impact on the overall results (see Figure 3).

Worth mentioning is that the UVEK data for the transport system district heat has a lifetime assumption of 30 years whereas the Bracht setup assumes 50 years. This is acceptable since with 6.6 %, the heat transport system showed only minor impact on the overall results (see Figure 3).

### 7.2 Sensitivity analysis: Source of electricity

This is an additionally performed analysis for the first research question

- Winter electricity
- Future production mix (to plan ahead)

*TBD: Add results for a couple of different electricity sources*

### 7.3 Sensitivity analysis: Loss coefficients

Heat is harder to transport than electrical power since even good insulation cannot avoid losses of radiating heat. There are two main areas where heat losses occur in the setup: in the pipes, and in the seasonal storage unit. Therefore, the loss coefficients assumed for the pipes and for the storage unit are highly relevant to the modelling.

#### 7.3.1 Pipe heat loss

As summarized in [23], the relevant parameters affecting heat loss in the pipes are the length of the network which depends on the transmission distance relative to demand, the system age, and the operating temperature. The cited loss coefficient numbers for pipe loss range between 5% and 35%. The Bracht setup has a long transmission distance of 8.800 meters because of the rural setup, and a planned operating temperature of 85 degrees Celsius. Both of these factors affect performance negatively. Therefore, even if the system is brand new and therefore modern, assuming a 20% heat loss for the given modeling is a realistic number. However, the open source modelling tool Energy Transition Model [24] suggests 15% as a sensible default for modelling heat loss in the pipes of modern district heating networks based on real world numbers, and the UVEK assumptions for district heating are also lower with 11%. Using the UVEK assumption for the Bracht setup would result in efficiency savings of approximately 300 MWh per year, leading to a reduction from 170 Pt per kWh of heat to 155 Pt per kWh of heat (9% reduction) which is lower environmental impact compared to the district heating with wood chips as the energy source. The main impact factors changed are the *Climate change* and the *Main air pollutants and Particulate Matter (PM)* category.

#### 7.3.2 Seasonal storage unit heat loss

In [25], the authors report a 26% loss of heat production in the storage unit amounted to of heat production. The Energy Transition Model [24] suggests 30% as a sensible default for modelling heat loss in the storage unit. Another study [26] provides a comprehensive review and finds that 30% to 50% heat loss are common for Pit Thermal Energy Storage and that the majority of losses are caused by floating cover.

Given these reference numbers from literature, the 50% loss assumption for Bracht is on the conservative side. We assume that it can be lowered to 30% based on two different scenarios (1) without any changes in the setup but an understanding that the original assumptions were not accurate, and (2) by using twice the cover for the top of seasonal storage unit and therefore better insulation (with the sides and the bottom unchanged).

For both scenarios the result would be a higher amount energy supplied from the seasonal storage unit (3.160 MWh), and consequently an increase in electrical energy requirement for the heat pump (293 MWh). We perform a rough estimate of the heightened energy requirements based on using the same factor between energy from the seasonal storage unit and energy from electricity as in the original assumptions (see Section 5.2): 209 MWh divided by 2.258 MWh, which returns a 9 % electricity requirement factor. With an assumed 20% heat loss in the pipes as in the default assumptions, a remaining amount of 2.764 MWh of energy is available for consumers. Therefore, no supplemental energy from biomass would be required.

For scenario (1 - no changes), a 15 % reduction from 170 Pt per kWh of heat to 146 Pt per kWh of heat can be achieved. For scenario (2 - double cover), a 9 % reduction to 155<sup>1</sup> Pt per kWh of heat can be achieved.

## 8 Conclusion

A case study life cycle assessment was performed for the solar district heating community project in Bracht, Rauschenberg, Germany.

The results compare favorably to other heating technologies in terms of environmental impact, but the solar thermal based district heating is not the best available options without further improvements. To further improve, the recommendations are to use green energy for running the heat pump, and to lower or event completely remove the amount of biomass burnt by improving the heat loss coefficients for storage unit and transmission pipes with better insulation.

## 9 Supporting information

This section documents the supporting information related to the life cycle inventory in Section 9.1, the exact data used for process modelling in SimaPro in Section 9.2, and the project organization in Section 9.3.

### 9.1 Life Cycle Inventory

There are several components described in the following sections: solar thermal collector, seasonal storage unit, and heat preparation.

---

<sup>1</sup>This is coincidentally the same result as in Section 7.3.1.

### 9.1.1 Solar thermal collector (STC)

The relevant data for the solar thermal collector can be found in Table 2.

Table 2

Dimension	Value	Source
Size	11'638 $m^2$ (855 x 13.6 $m^2$ )	[27]
Type	Flat-plate collectors Vitosol 100-F XF13 Viessmann	[27] [28] [21]
Land use	23.500 $m^2$	[27]
Mounting infrastructure material	15 t steel	[16]
Collector weight	50 kg / $m^2$	Own assumption
Production country	China	Own assumption
Transport per container ship	8000 km	Own assumption
Transport per lorry	1000 km	Own assumption

### 9.1.2 Seasonal storage unit (SSU)

The relevant data for the seasonal storage unit can be found in Table 3. A picture of the floating cover can be found in Figure 7.




Figure 7: Floating cover profile. Source: Bracht community.

Table 3

Dimension	Value	Source
Volume	26'600 $m^3$	Figure 1
Resource: water	26'600 $m^3$ filled from local source	[29]
Cover layer 1, 10	Polyethylen (HDPE) sealing membranes 1.5 mm, 1.5 kg / $m^2$	[29], estimated weight
Cover layer 2, 9	Fleece (0.1 kg / $m^2$ ) laminated plastic grid (HDPE, 0.5 kg / $m^2$ )	[29], estimated weight
Cover layer 3	Foam glass, 8.33 kg / $m^2$	[29]
Cover layer 4	Polyurethane (bauder foam): 3.125 kg / $m^2$	[29]
Cover layer 5, 7, 8	Airing gap made of plastic grid, 0.5 kg / $m^2$ each	[29], estimated weight
Cover layer 6	Polystyrene (XPS), 3 kg / $m^2$	[29]
Floating cover dimensions	70 m x 70 m = 4900 $m^2$	[30]
Floating cover weight	$2 * (1.5 + 0.1 + 0.5) + 8.33 + 3.125 + 1.5 + 3 = 20.155$ kg / $m^2$	Calculation
Ground liner	Polyethylen (HDPE), 2.5mm, 2.5 kg / $m^2$	[29], estimated weight
Ground liner dimensions	Bottom 20 m x 20 m, vertical height 15 m, surface area on each of the four sides 5250 $m^2$	[30]
Ground liner weight	2.5 kg / $m^2$	Assumption
Production country	China	Assumption
Transport per container ship	8000 km	Assumption
Transport per lorry	1000 km	Assumption
Required construction process	Excavator 26.600 $m^3$	Figure 1

### 9.1.3 Heat preparation (HP)

The relevant data for the heat preparation unit can be found in Table 4.

Table 4

Dimension	Value	Source
Heat pump	2x Carrier Aquaforce 61XWH-ZE (630 kW max electrical input power)	[27] [31]
Electricity requirements	209 MWh per year	Own calculation, see Section 5.2

Dimension	Value	Source
Buffer storage	ca. 200 m <sup>3</sup> = 200'000 l	Figure 1
Biomass boiler	Mawera boiler with 700 kW thermal power	[27]
Controller	Vitocontrol 200-M	[27] [32]
Heat installation facility	50 m <sup>2</sup>	Own assumption

## 9.2 SimaPro Data

Table 5 and Table 6 show the parameters and calculated parameters that were defined as helpers for modelling the solar thermal based district heating process in Simapro. The data for the process itself is shown in Figure 8.

Table 5

Name	Value	Comment
Plant-size-m2	23500	The total size of the plant in sqm
STC-size-m2	11638	The total size of the STC panels in sqm
STC-weight-per-m2	50	The weight of the STC per sqm
STC-prod-MWh-per-a	2700	Production from the STC per year in MWh
Lifetime	50	The lifetime of the plant in years
MWhtoMJ	3600	Conversion from MWh to MJ
Mult30To50	1.67	Multiplier for components with 30 years lifetime
Mult20To50	2.5	Multiplier for components with 20 years lifetime
SSU-volume-m3	26600	The volume of the SSU
SSU-top-m2	4900	The size of the SSU at the top (floating cover) in sqm
SSU-side-m2	5250	The size of the SSU at each of the four sides in sqm
SSU-bottom-m2	5400	The size of the SSU at the ground in sqm
Steel-kg	15000	The weight of the required steel for the STC foundation
Freight-ship-dist-km	8000	The transport distance per freight ship in km
Lorry-dist-km	1000	The transport distance per lorry in km

Table 6

Name	Value	Comment
STC-prod-MJ-lifetime	STC-prod-MWh-per-a * Lifetime * MWhtoMJ	The total production from the STC over the plant lifetime in MJ

Name	Value	Comment
STC-weight-t-total	$(\text{STC-size-m2} * \text{STC-weight-per-m2} * \text{Mult30To50} + \text{Steel-kg}) / 1000$	The total transport weight of the STC over the plant lifetime in tons
SSU-ground-m2	$\text{SSU-bottom-m2} + 4 * \text{SSU-side-m2}$	The total size of the SSU that is touching the ground on the bottom and sides in sqm

1	Products			
2	district heat, at consumer, solar thermal, 1MW/MJ/RER U		1 MJ	
3				
4	Resources			
5	Water, cooling, unspecified natural origin, DE	$\text{SSU\_volume\_m3} / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	m3	SSU
6	Land use II-III	$\text{Plant\_size\_m2} * \text{Lifetime} / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	m2a	Total plant
7				
8	Materials/fuels			
9	steel, electric, unalloyed, at plant/CH U	$\text{Steel\_kg} / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	kg	STC
10	flat plate collector for PVT, aluminium copper absorber, at plant/CH/I U	$(\text{STC\_size\_m2} * \text{Mult30To50}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	m2	STC
11	transport, transoceanic freight ship/tkm/OCE U	$(\text{STC\_weight\_t\_total} * \text{Freight\_ship\_dist\_km}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	tkm	STC
12	transport, freight, lorry 40-50 metric ton, EURO 5/RER U	$(\text{STC\_weight\_t\_total} * \text{Lorry\_dist\_km}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	tkm	STC
13	Polyethylene, HDPE, granulate, at plant/RER U	$(\text{SSU\_top\_m2} * 1.5 * 2 * \text{Mult30To50}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	kg	SSU layer 1, 10: Sealing membrane
14	Polyethylene, HDPE, granulate, at plant/RER U	$(\text{SSU\_top\_m2} * 0.5 * 2 * \text{Mult30To50}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	kg	SSU layer 2, 9: Plastic grid
15	Fleece, polyethylene, at plant/RER U	$(\text{SSU\_top\_m2} * 0.1 * 2 * \text{Mult30To50}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	kg	SSU layer 2, 9: Fleece
16	Foam glass, at plant/RER U	$(\text{SSU\_top\_m2} * 8.33 * \text{Mult30To50}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	kg	SSU layer 3: Glapor
17	Polyurethane, rigid foam, at plant/RER U	$(\text{SSU\_top\_m2} * 3.125 * \text{Mult30To50}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	kg	SSU layer 4: Bauder Foam
18	Polyethylene, HDPE, granulate, at plant/RER U	$(\text{SSU\_top\_m2} * 0.5 * 3 * \text{Mult30To50}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	kg	SSU layer 5, 7, 8: Plastic grid
19	Polystyrene, extruded (XPS), at plant/RER U	$(\text{SSU\_top\_m2} * 3 * \text{Mult30To50}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	kg	SSU layer 6: XPS
20	Polyethylene, HDPE, granulate, at plant/RER U	$(\text{SSU\_ground\_m2} * 2.5 * \text{Mult30To50}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	kg	SSU ground liner
21	transport, transoceanic freight ship/tkm/OCE U	$((((\text{SSU\_top\_m2} * 20.155) + (\text{SSU\_ground\_m2} * 2.5)) * \text{Mult30To50}) / 1000 * \text{Freight\_ship\_dist\_km}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	tkm	SSU transport
22	transport, freight, lorry 40-50 metric ton, EURO 5/RER U	$((((\text{SSU\_top\_m2} * 20.155) + (\text{SSU\_ground\_m2} * 2.5)) * \text{Mult30To50}) / 1000 * \text{Lorry\_dist\_km}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	tkm	SSU transport
23	excavation, hydraulic digger, average/m3/CH U	$26600 / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	m3	SSU excavation
24	heat pump, brine-water, 50kW/RER/I U	$(25 * \text{Mult20To50}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	p	HP heat pump
25	Heat storage 2000L, at plant/CH/I U	$(100 * \text{Mult20To50}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	p	HP heat pump
26	Building, hall/CH/I U	$50 / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	m2	HP building
27	Heat exchanger of Mini CHP plant/CH/I U	$(180 * \text{Mult20To50}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	p	Distribution infrastructure
28	transport, district heat, large area network, for warm water/MJ/CH/I U	$(\text{STC\_prod\_MWh\_per\_a} * \text{Lifetime}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	MWh	Lifetime 30 years
29				
30	Electricity/heat			
31	electricity, production mix ENTSO/kWh/ENTSO U	$(209 * \text{Lifetime}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	MWh	
32	heat, mixed chips from forest, at furnace 1000kW/MJ/CH U	$(904 * \text{Lifetime}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	MWh	
33				
34	Waste to treatment			
35	deconstruction, average/CH U	$(\text{STC\_weight\_t\_total} * 1000 + (((\text{SSU\_top\_m2} * 20.155) + (\text{SSU\_bottom\_m2} * 2.5)) * \text{Mult30To50}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	kg	
36	disposal, polyethylene, 0.4% water, to municipal incineration/kg/CH U	$((\text{SSU\_top\_m2} * 5.5 + \text{SSU\_ground\_m2} * 2.5) * \text{Mult30To50}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	kg	
37	disposal, polyurethane, 0.2% water, to municipal incineration/kg/CH U	$((\text{SSU\_top\_m2} * 3.125) * \text{Mult30To50}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	kg	
38	disposal, polystyrene, 0.2% water, to municipal incineration/kg/CH U	$((\text{SSU\_top\_m2} * 3) * \text{Mult30To50}) / \text{STC\_prod\_MJ\_lifetime}$	kg	
--				

Figure 8: SimaPro data excerpt.

For the comparison, the following SimaPro processes were employed (all of them part of the UVEK dataset):

- *district heat, at consumer, borehole heat pump, 50kW/MJ/CH U*



- district heat, at consumer, wood chips in industrial furnace, 1MW/MJ/CH U
- heat, light fuel oil, at boiler 10kW, average/CH U
- heat, natural gas, at boiler condensating modulating, 15kW/CH U

## 9.3 Project organization

In this section, the time plan and the meeting notes are documented.

### 9.3.1 Time planning

Figure 9 documents the time plan that was followed for this project. The live version can be found [here](#). Access is given upon request.




Figure 9: Gantt chart used for time planning.

### 9.3.2 Meeting notes

The notes for the meetings can be found [here](#). Access is given upon request.

## References

- [1] Euroheat & Power, “28/03/2023: The rise of solar district heating.” <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ngNgVxTT2y4>, 2023.
- [2] Swiss Federal Office of Energy, “District heat.” <https://www.bfe.admin.ch/bfe/en/home/supply/energy-efficiency/district-heat.html>, 2020.
- [3] C. Jeandaux, J.-B. Videau, and A. Prieur-Vernat, “Life cycle assessment of district heating systems in europe: Case study and recommendations,” *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 20, p. 11256, 2021.
- [4] Wikipedia, “Solar thermal collector.” [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Solar\\_thermal\\_collector](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Solar_thermal_collector), 2025.
- [5] W. Weiss and M. Spörk-Dür, “Solar heat world wide,” International Energy Agency, White paper DOI: 10.18777/ieashc-shww-2024-0001, 2024. Available: <https://www.iea-shc.org/Data/Sites/1/publications/Solar-Heat-Worldwide-2024.pdf>
- [6] J. Famiglietti *et al.*, “Environmental life cycle assessment scenarios for a district heating network. An italian case study,” *Energy Reports*, vol. 7, pp. 368–379, 2021.
- [7] M. Vauchez, J. Famiglietti, K. Autelitano, M. Colombert, R. Scoccia, and M. Motta, “Life cycle assessment of district heating infrastructures: A comparison of pipe typologies in france,” *Energies*, vol. 16, no. 9, p. 3912, 2023.
- [8] M. H. Abokersh, M. Vallès, L. F. Cabeza, and D. Boer, “A framework for the optimal integration of solar assisted district heating in different urban sized communities: A robust machine learning approach incorporating global sensitivity analysis,” *Applied Energy*, vol. 267, p. 114903, 2020.
- [9] J. Solano, M. Frossard, S. Lasvaux, and A. Duret, “Life cycle assessment of the new solar thermal power plant SolarCAD II connected to a district heating network in geneva, switzerland,” in *Journal of physics: Conference series*, IOP Publishing, 2023, p. 152005.
- [10] J. Kelch, O. Kusyy, J. Zipplies, J. Orozaliev, and K. Vajen, “Comparison of solar district heating and renovation of buildings as measures for decarbonization of heat supply in rural areas,” *Solar Energy Advances*, vol. 4, p. 100060, 2024.
- [11] G. Wernet, C. Bauer, B. Steubing, J. Reinhard, E. Moreno-Ruiz, and B. Weidema, “The ecoinvent database version 3 (part i): Overview and methodology,” *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, vol. 21, pp. 1218–1230, 2016.
- [12] Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN), “UVEK LCI database DQRv2:2025.” 2025.
- [13] European Commission, “Commission Recommendation (EU) 2021/2279 of 15 December 2021 on the use of the Environmental Footprint methods to measure and communicate the life cycle environmental performance of products and organisations.” <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32021H2279>, 2021.

- [14] Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN), “Swiss eco-factors 2021 according to the ecological scarcity method: Methodological fundamentals and their application in switzerland.” 2021. Available: <https://www.bafu.admin.ch/bafu/en/home/topics/economy-consumption/economy-and-consumption-publications/publications-economy-and-consumption/eco-factors-switzerland.html>
- [15] PRé Sustainability, *SimaPro 9.6 database manual: Methods library*. 2024. Available: <https://simapro.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/DatabaseManualMethods.pdf>
- [16] City of Rauschenberg, “Solarwärme Bracht eG, Stadtteile Bracht und Bracht-Siedlung.” <https://www.solarwaerme-bracht.de/>, 2025.
- [17] J. Kelch, O. Kusyy, J. Orozaliev, and K. Vajen, “Abschlussbericht weiterentwicklung und optimierung des konzepts einer solaren nahwärmeversorgung für ländliche gebiete am beispiel von bracht-dorf,” Universität Kassel, Technical report EF960 0039/2021 20008503, 2022.
- [18] R. Große, C. Binder, S. Wöll, R. Geyer, and S. Robbi, “Long term (2050) projections of techno-economic performance of large-scale heating and cooling in the EU,” Publications Office of the European Union, 2017.
- [19] S. Wolf, “Integration von Wärmepumpen in industrielle Produktionssysteme: Potenziale und Instrumente zur Potenzialerschließung,” 2017.
- [20] V. VDI, “VDI 2067 Blatt 1” Wirtschaftlichkeit gebäudetechnischer Anlagen-Grundlagen und Kostenberechnung.” Düsseldorf, 2012.
- [21] TÜV Rheinland, “Annex to solar keymark certificate.” <https://www.dincertco.de/logos/011-7S3003%20F.pdf>, 2021.
- [22] City of Rauschenberg, “Solarwärme Bracht eG, FAQ und häufig gestellte Fragen.” <https://www.solarwaerme-bracht.de/faq/>, 2025.
- [23] S. Werner, “International review of district heating and cooling,” *Energy*, vol. 137, pp. 617–631, 2017.
- [24] Quintel, “Energy Transition Model (ETM).” [https://energytransitionmodel.com/scenario/supply/heat\\_ht/transport-and-distribution-losses](https://energytransitionmodel.com/scenario/supply/heat_ht/transport-and-distribution-losses), 2025.
- [25] P. Penttinen, J. Vimpari, and S. Junnila, “Optimal seasonal heat storage in a district heating system with waste incineration,” *Energies*, vol. 14, no. 12, p. 3522, 2021.
- [26] Y. Xiang, Z. Xie, S. Furbo, D. Wang, M. Gao, and J. Fan, “A comprehensive review on pit thermal energy storage: Technical elements, numerical approaches and recent applications,” *Journal of Energy Storage*, vol. 55, p. 105716, 2022.
- [27] Viessmann Climate Solutions, “Energiewende: Solarthermie und Erdspeicher decken rund 70 Prozent des Wärmebedarfs im hessischen Bracht.” <https://www.viessmann-climatesolutions.com/de/newsroom/unternehmen/erstes-klimaneutrales-mit-solarwaerme-versorgtes-dorf.html>, 2024.
- [28] Viessmann Climate Solutions, “Großflächen-Solarthermie für die Nah- und Fernwärme.” <https://energiekonsens.de/media/pages/media/6a0997554c-1640096559/2-viessmann-nah-und-fernwaerme-mit-solarthermie.pdf>, 2021.
- [29] City of Rauschenberg, “Solarwärme Bracht eG, Genossenschaftsunterlagen: Floating Cover.” <https://www.solarwaerme-bracht.de/unterlagen-der-genossenschaft/>, 2025.

- [30] Top Agrar, “Hessisches Dorf baut riesiges Wasserbecken für eigene Solarthermieranlage.” <https://www.topagrar.com/energie/news/hessisches-dorf-baut-riesiges-wasserbecken-fur-eigene-solarthermieranlage-20010847.html%0A>, 2025.
- [31] Carrier Klimatisierungs- und Heizsysteme - Deutschland, “AquaForce - Hochtemperatur Wasser/Wasser-Wärmepumpe mit Kältemittel HFO R-1234ze.” <https://www.carrier.com/commercial/de/de/produkte/heizung/wasser-wasser-waermepumpen/61xwhze/>, 2025.
- [32] Viessmann Climate Solutions, “Regelungsprogramm für Mittel- und Großkessel.” <https://www.viessmann.de/de/loesungen/gewerbe-und-industrie/regelung-mittelkessel-grosskessel.html>, 2025.