# Working title of the downscaling paper at IIASA

Sebastian Zwickl-Bernhard^a,\*, Daniel Huppmann^b, Antonia Golab^a, Hans Auer^a

<sup>a</sup> Energy Economics Group (EEG), Technische Universität Wien, Gusshausstrasse
25-29/E370-3, 1040 Wien, Austria
<sup>b</sup> Energy, Climate and Environment (ECE) Program, International Institute for Applied
Systems Analysis (IIASA), Laxenburg, Austria

Abstract			
Keywords:			

Email address: zwickl@eeg.tuwien.ac.at (Sebastian Zwickl-Bernhard)

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author

#### 1. Introduction

Climate change and its already apparent negative effects are likely to be the greatest challenge of humanity - both today and in the next decades [1]. What is encouraging in this regard, however, is that we have recently built a deep understanding of existing natural [2] and human-influence solutions to mitigate climate change and global warming. At the same time, studies show that two-thirds of impacts with regard to the increase of global temperature (atmospheric and ocean) can be attributed to anthropogenic activities [3]. Thus, to speak of natural variability is far from justified. It is for that reason that there is already the broad consens to make it our prioritized concern to reduce anthropogenic emissions and get them down to zero.

In the field of a sustainable energy system, the scientific community has produced a large number of strategies, recommendations and studies aimed at contributing to the achievement of the clean energy transition and thus a sustainable provision of energy services [4]. Of course, there are differences between the individual sectors of the energy system, which has led to the development of tailor-made strategies and recommendations to supply the different kinds of energy services. Leibowicz et al. [5] present optimal decarbonization pathways for the supply of energy services for urban residential buildings. Pan et al. [6] focus on the decarbonization of the transport sector in China in the light of the Paris Agreement goals. Habert et al. [7] provide an comprehensive analysis of the environmental impacts and decarbonization strategies in concrete industries. In addition, we recommend with regard to challenges in the decarbonization of the energy sector the recently published work by Papadis and Tsataronis [8]. Despite all the details associated with the sector-specific decarbonization strategies, the principles of a net-zero society base on three key points: (i) a massive deployment/generation of renewable energy technologies (e.g., Bakhtavar et al. [9] focusing on net-zero districts), (ii) a significant reduction of the energy demand (e.g., Oshiro et al. [10] conducting an analysis on the impact of energy service demand reduction on the decarbonization), and (iii) an increase in efficiency in the context of the provision of energy services and the associated optimal utilization of energy carriers and sources. The latter point includes, among others, two detailed aspects, namely, on the one hand, that potentials of renewable resources are exploited locally and on the other hand that energy carriers with various fields of application are utilized with the highest possible efficiency. We would like to refer to just a few selected references without claiming to be exhaustive and focus here on hydrogen as one example of an energy carrier with high potentials in sustainable energy systems and a significant bandwidth of efficiency in terms of its generation and use. Van Ressen [11] systematically investigates the possibilities and challenges of hydrogen and discusses extensively its role in the energy transition. Van Ruijven et al. [12] highlight that the introduction of hydrogen in global energy systems only leads to lower emissions with high end-use efficiency and low-carbon production. Therefore, it is necessary to think also about where we use the limited amounts of renewable energy carriers (such as renewable-based hydrogen or biomass, etc.) in the most efficient (optimized) way.

In many cases when it comes to the question of optimal solutions, academic uses numerical models. In general, these models strike a balance between complexity and aggregation. Integrated assessment models (IAMs) are large-numerical models covering complex interrelations between climate, society, economics, policy and technology. Dowlatabadi [13] provided 1995 a fundamental review on IAMs focusing on their role in the context of climate change. Krey et al. [14] discuss and systematically compare 15 different IAMs. Wilkerson et al. [15] are heading in a similar direction focusing in their comparison on the impact of carbon price. Van Vuuren et al. [16] focus in their analysis on IAMs in the context of carbon budgets and energy transition pathways. Huppmann et al. [17] provide an open framework for integrated and cross-cutting analysis of energy, climate, the environment, and sustainable development. Schwanitz [18] evaluates IAMs of global climate change and discusses, among others, the

appropriate level of regional (spatial) aggregation of countries in the modeling analysis. Generalizing this aspect reveals an aspect already known but essential in the context of large-numerical models. It becomes necessary for modelers to set priorities regarding the level of detail, which inevitably creates trade-offs in the analysis regarding the granularity of the temporal, spatial, and other dimensions. Gambhir et al. [19] also highlight this aspect of aggregation bias in their critical review of IAMs. They propose, among others, that IAMs should be increasingly be supplemented with other models and analytical approaches. Not least for this reason, (large) energy models also play a significant role in the analysis of energy systems in the context of climate change. Compared to IAMs, they again emphasize the level of detail in terms of techno-economic characteristics (see the review of modeling tools of energy systems in [20]). However, the lack of granularity remains as a result that these (global) energy models consider only a highly aggregated spatial resolution. To name just two selected approaches, Capros et al. [21] (PRIMES) and Löffler et al. [22] (GENeSYS-MOD) provide energy system models focusing on the European energy system with a spatial resolution on the country. Thus, further approaches are needed to link development/results/insights generated at the country level with those at the local level in this and many other cases. In this context, Backe et al. [23] provided a novel approach in the context of merging local activities/behaviour in sustainable local communities into a large energy system model (bottom-up linkage). They integrated local flexibility options into the global energy system model EMPIRE, which provides in principle only country level resolution.

Against this background, the core objective of this work is to downscale global energy system model results from the country to a high spatial granularity. We focus on the heating sector 2050 and consider as one of the main novelties in this work the infrastructure needs and requirements of sustainable heat generation sources in the downscaling. In particular, we investigate the modeling results of GENeSYS-MOD in the context of four different deep decarbonization scenarios developed in the H2020 openENTRANCE. We use downscaling as a method

to estimate centralized heat networks on a high spatial granularity in 2050 and use heat density as criteria comparing the downscaled centralized heat networks with existing ones today.

The method applied is a novel downscaling technque, which includes two separate subsequent downscaling methods. As the first, we introduce an iterative downscaling techniques which is used to dissaggregate heat generation from the country to different sub-regions. Thereby, we use population density and the infrastructure requirements of heat technology sources as additional criterias. As the second, we introduce an sequential downscaling algorithm. Thereby, we use graph-theory benchmarking techniques to improve centralized heat networks on the local level. We use an Austrian case study to demonstrate our approach and focus on the low-temperature heat supply and corresponding centralized heat networks.

This paper is organized as follows:

#### Declaration of interests

None.

### **Declaration of Competing Interest**

The authors report no declarations of interest.

## Acknowledgments

#### References

[1] T. R. Karl, K. E. Trenberth, Modern global climate change, Science 302 (5651) (2003) 1719-1723. doi:https://doi.org/10.1126/science. 1090228.

- [2] B. W. Griscom, J. Adams, P. W. Ellis, R. A. Houghton, G. Lomax, D. A. Miteva, W. H. Schlesinger, D. Shoch, J. V. Siikamäki, P. Smith, et al., Natural climate solutions, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 114 (44) (2017) 11645–11650. doi:https://doi.org/10.1073/ pnas.1710465114.
- [3] G. Hansen, D. Stone, Assessing the observed impact of anthropogenic climate change, Nature Climate Change 6 (5) (2016) 532–537.
- [4] J. Rockström, O. Gaffney, J. Rogelj, M. Meinshausen, N. Nakicenovic, H. J. Schellnhuber, A roadmap for rapid decarbonization, Science 355 (6331) (2017) 1269–1271. doi:https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aah3443.
- [5] B. D. Leibowicz, C. M. Lanham, M. T. Brozynski, J. R. Vázquez-Canteli, N. C. Castejón, Z. Nagy, Optimal decarbonization pathways for urban residential building energy services, Applied Energy 230 (2018) 1311–1325. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2018.09.046.
- [6] X. Pan, H. Wang, L. Wang, W. Chen, Decarbonization of china's transportation sector: in light of national mitigation toward the paris agreement goals, Energy 155 (2018) 853-864. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2018.04.144.
- [7] G. Habert, S. Miller, V. John, J. Provis, A. Favier, A. Horvath, K. Scrivener, Environmental impacts and decarbonization strategies in the cement and concrete industries, Nature Reviews Earth & Environment 1 (11) (2020) 559–573. doi:https://doi.org/10.1038/ s43017-020-0093-3.
- [8] E. Papadis, G. Tsatsaronis, Challenges in the decarbonization of the energy sector, Energy 205 (2020) 118025. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2020.118025.
- [9] E. Bakhtavar, T. Prabatha, H. Karunathilake, R. Sadiq, K. Hewage, Assessment of renewable energy-based strategies for net-zero energy communi-

- ties: A planning model using multi-objective goal programming, Journal of Cleaner Production 272 (2020) 122886. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.122886.
- [10] K. Oshiro, S. Fujimori, Y. Ochi, T. Ehara, Enabling energy system transition toward decarbonization in japan through energy service demand reduction, Energy 227 (2021) 120464. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2021.120464.
- [11] S. van Renssen, The hydrogen solution?, Nature Climate Change 10 (9) (2020) 799–801. doi:https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-0891-0.
- [12] B. Van Ruijven, D. P. Van Vuuren, B. De Vries, The potential role of hydrogen in energy systems with and without climate policy, International Journal of Hydrogen Energy 322, number=.
- [13] H. Dowlatabadi, Integrated assessment models of climate change: An incomplete overview, Energy Policy 23 (4-5) (1995) 289–296. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/0301-4215(95)90155-Z.
- [14] V. Krey, F. Guo, P. Kolp, W. Zhou, R. Schaeffer, A. Awasthy, C. Bertram, H.-S. de Boer, P. Fragkos, S. Fujimori, et al., Looking under the hood: A comparison of techno-economic assumptions across national and global integrated assessment models, Energy 172 (2019) 1254–1267. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2018.12.131.
- [15] J. T. Wilkerson, B. D. Leibowicz, D. D. Turner, J. P. Weyant, Comparison of integrated assessment models: carbon price impacts on US energy, Energy Policy 76 (2015) 18–31. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol. 2014.10.011.
- [16] D. P. Van Vuuren, H. Van Soest, K. Riahi, L. Clarke, V. Krey, E. Kriegler, J. Rogelj, M. Schaeffer, M. Tavoni, Carbon budgets and energy transition pathways, Environmental Research Letters 11 (7) (2016) 075002. doi: https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/11/7/075002.

- [17] D. Huppmann, M. Gidden, O. Fricko, P. Kolp, C. Orthofer, M. Pimmer, N. Kushin, A. Vinca, A. Mastrucci, K. Riahi, et al., The MESSAGEix Integrated Assessment Model and the ix modeling platform (ixmp): An open framework for integrated and cross-cutting analysis of energy, climate, the environment, and sustainable development, Environmental Modelling & Software 112 (2019) 143–156. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j. envsoft.2018.11.012.
- [18] V. J. Schwanitz, Evaluating integrated assessment models of global climate change, Environmental Modelling & Software 50 (2013) 120–131. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2013.09.005.
- [19] A. Gambhir, I. Butnar, P.-H. Li, P. Smith, N. Strachan, A review of criticisms of integrated assessment models and proposed approaches to address these, through the lens of BECCS, Energies 12 (9) (2019) 1747. doi:https://doi.org/10.3390/en12091747.
- [20] H.-K. Ringkjøb, P. M. Haugan, I. M. Solbrekke, A review of modelling tools for energy and electricity systems with large shares of variable renewables, Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews 96 (2018) 440–459. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2018.08.002.
- [21] P. Capros, N. Tasios, A. De Vita, L. Mantzos, L. Paroussos, Model-based analysis of decarbonising the EU economy in the time horizon to 2050, Energy Strategy Reviews 1 (2) (2012) 76-84. doi:https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.esr.2012.06.003.
- [22] K. Löffler, K. Hainsch, T. Burandt, P.-Y. Oei, C. Kemfert, C. Von Hirschhausen, Designing a model for the global energy system—GENeSYS-MOD: an application of the open-source energy modeling system (OSeMOSYS), Energies 10 (10) (2017) 1468. doi:https://doi.org/10.3390/en10101468.
- [23] S. Backe, M. Korpås, A. Tomasgard, Heat and electric vehicle flexibility

in the European power system: A case study of Norwegian energy communities, International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems 125 (2021) 106479. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijepes.2020.106479.