

## Chapter 3: Case 1 - Busan Port with Storage

### 3.1 Overview

Parameter	Value
Case ID	case_1
Storage at Busan	<b>Yes</b>
Travel Time (one-way)	1.0 hour
Bunker Volume per Call	5,000 m3
Optimal Shuttle Size	<b>2,500 m3</b>

### 3.2 Cycle Time Calculation

#### 3.2.1 Formula (Case 1)

For Case 1, the shuttle makes **multiple trips** from storage tank to vessel:

```
Trips_per_Call = ceil(Bunker_Volume / Shuttle_Size)
```

```
Cycle_Duration = Shore>Loading + Travel_Out + Travel_Return + Setup + Pumping
```

where:

```
Shore>Loading = Shuttle_Size / Shore_Pump_Rate = Shuttle_Size / 1500  
Travel_Out = 1.0 hour  
Travel_Return = 1.0 hour  
Setup = 2.0 hours (1.0 inbound + 1.0 outbound)  
Pumping = Shuttle_Size / Pump_Rate
```

#### 3.2.2 Example: 2,500 m3 Shuttle (Optimal)

##### Step 1: Trips per Call

```
Trips_per_Call = ceil(5000 / 2500) = 2 trips
```

##### Step 2: Cycle Duration

```
Shore>Loading = 2500 / 1500 = 1.6667 hours  
Travel_Out = 1.0 hour  
Travel_Return = 1.0 hour  
Setup = 2.0 hours  
Pumping = 2500 / 1000 = 2.5 hours
```

```
Cycle_Duration = 1.6667 + 1.0 + 1.0 + 2.0 + 2.5 = 8.1667 hours
```

CSV Verification: Cycle\_Duration\_hr = 8.1667 [PASS]

### 3.2.3 Example: 5,000 m3 Shuttle

#### Step 1: Trips per Call

Trips\_per\_Call = ceil(5000 / 5000) = 1 trip

#### Step 2: Cycle Duration

Shore>Loading = 5000 / 1500 = 3.3333 hours

Travel\_Out = 1.0 hour

Travel\_Return = 1.0 hour

Setup = 2.0 hours

Pumping = 5000 / 1000 = 5.0 hours

Cycle\_Duration = 3.3333 + 1.0 + 1.0 + 2.0 + 5.0 = 12.3333 hours

CSV Verification: Cycle\_Duration\_hr = 12.3333 [PASS]

---

## 3.3 Annual Capacity Calculation

### 3.3.1 Formula

Annual\_Cycles\_Max = Max\_Annual\_Hours / Cycle\_Duration  
= 8000 / Cycle\_Duration

Annual\_Supply\_m3 = Annual\_Cycles\_Max × Shuttle\_Size

### 3.3.2 Verification Table

Shuttle (m3)	Cycle (hr)	Annual Cycles	Annual Supply (m3)	CSV Match
2,500	8.1667	979.59	2,448,980	[PASS]
5,000	12.3333	648.65	3,243,243	[PASS]

---

## 3.4 Cost Verification

### 3.4.1 Shuttle CAPEX

Formula:

Shuttle\_CAPEX = 61,500,000 × (Size / 40,000)<sup>0.75</sup>

2,500 m3 Shuttle:

CAPEX = 61,500,000 × (2500 / 40000)<sup>0.75</sup>  
= 61,500,000 × (0.0625)<sup>0.75</sup>

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= 61,500,000 \times 0.1263 \\
 &= \$7,761,316
 \end{aligned}$$

#### 5,000 m3 Shuttle:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{CAPEX} &= 61,500,000 \times (5000 / 40000)^{0.75} \\
 &= 61,500,000 \times (0.125)^{0.75} \\
 &= 61,500,000 \times 0.2122 \\
 &= \$13,051,896
 \end{aligned}$$

#### 3.4.2 Annualized CAPEX

**Formula:**

$$\text{Annualized\_CAPEX} = \text{CAPEX} / \text{Annuity\_Factor} = \text{CAPEX} / 10.8355$$

Per Shuttle:   Shuttle (m3)   CAPEX   Annualized CAPEX/yr    -----
-----  2,500   \$7,761,316   \$716,345     5,000   \$13,051,896   \$1,204,496

#### 3.4.3 Bunkering Equipment CAPEX

**Formula:**

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Pump_Power_kW} &= (\text{Pump_Rate} \times \Delta_P \times 100) / (3600 \times \text{Efficiency}) \\
 &= (1000 \times 4 \times 100) / (3600 \times 0.7) \\
 &= 400000 / 2520 \\
 &= 158.73 \text{ kW}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Pump_CAPEX} &= \text{Power_kW} \times \$2000/\text{kW} \\
 &= 158.73 \times 2000 \\
 &= \$317,460
 \end{aligned}$$


---

### 3.5 Shuttle Size Comparison

#### 3.5.1 Comparison Table (1000 m3/h Pump)

Metric	2,500 m3	5,000 m3	Difference
<b>NPC Total</b>	<b>\$237.05M</b>	\$264.24M	+\$27.19M (+11.5%)
<b>LCOAmmonia</b>	<b>\$1.01/ton</b>	\$1.12/ton	+\$0.11/ton (+10.9%)
Cycle Duration	8.17 hr	12.33 hr	+4.16 hr
Trips per Call	2	1	-1
Annual Cycles	979.59	648.65	-330.94
Time Utilization	100%	100%	-

### 3.5.2 Cost Breakdown Comparison

Cost Component	2,500 m3	5,000 m3
Annualized Shuttle CAPEX	\$107.84M	\$138.41M
Annualized Bunkering CAPEX	\$7.69M	\$7.55M
Shuttle Fixed OPEX	\$58.42M	\$74.99M
Bunkering Fixed OPEX	\$4.17M	\$4.09M
Shuttle Variable OPEX	\$46.43M	\$26.70M
Bunkering Variable OPEX	\$12.51M	\$12.51M
<b>NPC Total</b>	<b>\$237.05M</b>	<b>\$264.24M</b>

### 3.5.3 Why 2,500 m3 is Optimal

1. **Lower CAPEX per unit:** \$7.76M vs \$13.05M per shuttle
2. **Higher cycle frequency:** 979 cycles/year vs 649 cycles/year
3. **Better scalability:** Easier to add incremental capacity
4. **Fleet flexibility:** Multiple smaller shuttles provide redundancy

The higher variable OPEX from more trips (\$46.43M vs \$26.70M) is offset by significantly lower annualized CAPEX (\$107.84M vs \$138.41M).

---

## 3.6 Full Scenario Results

Shuttle (m3)	NPC (M)	LCO(/ <del>Op</del> erale (hr)	Trips/Call	Utilization
500	380.67	1.62	4.83	10
1,000	274.80	1.17	5.67	5
1,500	290.11	1.23	6.50	4
2,000	281.70	1.20	7.33	3
<b>2,500</b>	<b>237.05</b>	<b>1.01</b>	<b>8.17</b>	<b>2</b>
3,000	282.25	1.20	9.00	2
3,500	333.87	1.42	9.83	2
4,000	384.48	1.63	10.67	2
4,500	441.67	1.87	11.50	2
5,000	264.24	1.12	12.33	1
7,500	445.34	1.89	16.50	1
10,000	660.58	2.80	20.67	1

---

## 3.7 Verification Summary

Item	Expected	CSV Result	Status
Optimal Shuttle	2,500 m3	2,500 m3 (min NPC)	[PASS]
Cycle Time (2500)	8.1667 hr	8.1667 hr	[PASS]
Cycle Time (5000)	12.3333 hr	12.3333 hr	[PASS]
Annuity Factor	10.8355	10.8355	[PASS]
NPC (2500)	~\$237M	\$237.05M	[PASS]
LCO (2500)	~\$1.01/ton	\$1.01/ton	[PASS]