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IEAGHG Activities on CCS in the Oil Refining Sector

- Initiated the study to evaluate the Techno-Economics of Retrofitting CO₂ Capture in an Oil Refining Sector.

- Project Partners
  - GASSNOVA (CLIMIT Programme)
  - CONCAWE
  - Shell

- Cost of the Project
  - Total: ~£850,000
  - IEAGHG: ~£180,000 (Cash & In-Kind)
Outline of the Presentations

- **Purpose of the Presentation**
  - To present the outline of the work plans for the oil refining study

- **Oil Refining Sector Overview**
  - What are the important considerations
  - CO$_2$ Point Sources from Oil Refineries

- **Capture Technology Overview**
  - Post-Combustion
  - Pre-Combustion
  - Oxyfuel Combustion

- **Scope of the Work**

- **Recommendations**

- To thank CONCAWE in providing data & information
World Oil Refining Sector

- In 2012, the global consumption of petroleum products reached nearly ~90 million bbl/d.

- Top 10 Countries
  - USA 17.38 mbbl/d
  - China 11.54 mbbl/d
  - Russia 5.75 mbbl/d
  - Japan 4.25 mbbl/d
  - India 4.21 mbbl/d
  - S. Korea 2.88 mbbl/d
  - Italy 2.20 mbbl/d
  - S. Arabia 2.12 mbbl/d
  - Germany 2.09 mbbl/d
  - Canada 2.06 mbbl/d
Overview of Refining Crude Oil

- The only common processing unit among all the integrated refinery is the atmospheric distillation.
Feedstock Variation

Data from Valero 2010
Product Quality Requirements

Data from CONCAWE 2011
Simple, low upgrading capability refineries run sweet crude
Medium Conversion: Catalytic Cracking

Moderate upgrading capability refineries tend to run more sour crudes while achieving increased higher value product yields and volume gain.
Complex refineries can run heavier and more sour crudes while achieving the highest light product yields and volume gain.
Deployment of CCS in Oil Refining Sector...

- *Oil Refinery has high level of process integration*
- *Fuel/energy required by the complex refinery is met by using the used of by-product gases or low quality liquid fuel, and balanced by using natural gas or other external fuel.*
- *No oil refineries are alike...*
  - Very site specific conditions

*Benchmarking is necessary...*
Difference between Simple vs Complex Refineries
(Refinery with 150K bbl/d Capacity)

Hydroskimming refinery, 0.6 Mt/a CO₂

Conversion refinery, 1.4 Mt/a CO₂

Data from CONCAWE 2011
An Example of CO\textsubscript{2} Emissions Profile of a Complex Oil Refinery
(Shell Pernis Refinery ~400K bbl/d – data from van Straelan, 2010)

Emissions comes from different stacks and have varying CO\textsubscript{2} concentration
Challenges to Oil Refinery to Reduce CO\textsubscript{2} Emissions (1)

• **CO\textsubscript{2} emissions varies from site to site.**
  • Comes from different stacks
  • Depends on process complexity

• **Regulations based only on site’s direct CO\textsubscript{2} emission tends to discriminate complex refineries.**
  • Low CO\textsubscript{2} Emissions from simple refinery are not necessarily “good” and high CO\textsubscript{2} Emissions are not always “bad”.
  • They are simply performing different jobs
  • Differences in emissions are due to complexity, not CO\textsubscript{2} efficiency
Complex Refineries is Required to Meet Demand of the Products

Data from CONCAWE 2011
Demand of Products lead to Evolution of Refineries’ Landscape

Original Refinery
- Gasoline: 24%
- Diesel & Home heating oil: 39%
- Heavy fuel oil: 43%

1975

1982–1988 New Units
- LPG: 3%
- Gasoline: 32%
- Catalytic Cracker
- MHC
- Vis-breaker

1990–1994 New Units
- LPG: 3%
- Env. cl. Gasoline: 14%
- Isomerisation: 18%
- Gasoline: 31%
- Env. cl. Diesel MK-1: 15%
- Molten Oil: 18%
- Heavy fuel oil: 18%

2002–2006 New Units
- Propylene: 2%
- Env. cl. Gasoline: 31%
- Env. cl. Diesel MK-1: 15%
- Sulphur free Diesel: 32%
- Heavy fuel oil: 18%
Simple and Complex Refineries are complementary to each other.

This illustrates that simple refinery could sell bottom products (HFO) to other complex refineries to further processing to lighter products.
CO₂ Emissions accounting is important.

- CO₂ emitted per tonne of crude or refined product is an indicator of “what refinery does” rather than “how efficiently it is done”.
- Need to evaluate cost of CO₂ capture deployment for oil refineries on a comparable basis.
- The use of newly established “CWT” method based a common refinery activity parameter could allow comparable techno-economic analysis for CO₂ capture deployment in an integrated oil refinery.
Reasons for Refinery Hydrogen Intensification

- Heavy Sour Crude
- Low S. Ultra Clean Fuel
- BoB Upgrading (Min. FO/Max. RM)
- Dieselisation
- Opportunity Crudes
- Oil-Gas Price Gap
- Future PQ Change

H₂ Demand

2000 - 2012
Identifying the Future Growth of CO₂ Emissions of the Oil Refineries

“Chemical” CO₂ emissions from hydrogen production in EU refineries

Data from CONCAWE 2011
Scope of the Study

- **Work will include the following:**
  - To establish the boundary of the battery limit and the techno-economic information of the reference Oil Refinery (both Simple and Complex Refinery Configuration).
    - This cover 3 different capacities (100K, 250K and 500K bbl/d)
  - To look onto options for Retrofitting CO₂ Capture in an integrated refinery (both Simple and Complex Refinery Configuration)
    - Post-Combustion CO₂ Capture Option (Capture Rate between 30 to 70%)
    - Pre-Combustion CO₂ Capture Option based on Hydrogen Enriched Fueled Refinery (Allow centralised CO₂ capture)
    - Oxy-Fired FCC Technology (Capture Rate below 30%)
  - Should cover between 20-22 Cases (Much more complex than the Integrated Steel Study)
CO2 Capture Technologies
Options to be considered

• Pre-, Post- & Oxyfuel Combustion Options for Fired Heaters and Boilers
  • Considerations for natural draft stack
  • Considerations for multi-stack and common stack configurations
  • And many others…

• Oxygen Blown FCC Regenerator

• Use of H2 enriched refinery fuel
## Cost of CO$_2$ Capture
(Data from various literature)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Estimation year</th>
<th>Process Unit/Technology</th>
<th>Cost (€/t CO$_2$ avoided)</th>
<th>Cost ($/t CO$_2$ avoided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RCI [26]</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Post-Combustion (Heaters)/Amines</td>
<td>110-130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCP2 [14]</td>
<td>Mid2008</td>
<td>Post-Combustion (Boiler)/Amines</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERM [27]</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Post-Combustion (Heater, Boiler)/Amines</td>
<td>114-192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell [19]</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Post-Combustion/Amines</td>
<td>90-120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Compiled from CONCAWE 2011
Cost of CO2 Capture (Data from Mello et. al. 2009)

Table 3: Comparative CO₂ avoidance cost for Post- and Oxyfuel combustion CO₂ capture reported by CCP Project (Mello et. al., 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Unit</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Cost ($/t CO₂ avoided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refinery Boiler (Retrofit)</td>
<td>MEA</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxyfuel</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinery Boiler (New Build – Single Unit)</td>
<td>MEA</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxyfuel</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCC</td>
<td>MEA</td>
<td>85-112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxyfuel</td>
<td>52-55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cost of CO₂ Capture (Data from van Straelen, 2010)
Concluding Remarks

• Reported cost (i.e. CO₂ avoidance cost for oil refineries) in various literature are not comparable. It is likely comparing an apple and orange. This is due site to site variation of process complexity and capacity.

• No literature is available that analyses the CO₂ avoidance cost to the Refinery Margin (an important index to viability of refineries)

• There are significant uncertainties with CCS cost estimates, since the technology has not been built to similar scale previously.

• For refiners deep CO₂ reduction (greater than 90%) may be physically impossible or impractical due to multiple source types and capture efficiency limits

• Piggybacking on a larger CO₂ transport network will be crucial
Progress - Current Status of this Work

• **Proposal submitted to CLIMIT / GASSNOVA for co-funding application** - *This has been approved.*

• **Agreement with SINTEF to provide project management and interface to CLIMIT application.**
  - Subcontractor chosen for the project – Contract Negotiation in-Progress

• **Agreement with CONCAWE – Agreed in principle**
  - Provide technical expertise
  - Provide small cash contribution to this study

• **Invite other potential partners for co-funding.**
  - Shell has agreed to provide both cash and in-kind contribution.
  - Discussion on-going with other stakeholders

• **Development and discussion of Scope – to be finalised potential partners**
BACK UP SLIDES – CWT METHODOLOGY
The refining sector in the EU ETS

- Refining qualifies as an “exposed” energy-intensive sector
- Total CO₂ emissions from EU refining are approx 140 Mt/a
  - about 8% of total CO₂ emissions from all EU ETS sectors
  - about 3% of EU total CO₂ emissions
How does the CWT methodology work?

- A list of generic process units is defined, applicable to all refineries
- Each process unit is allocated a CWT factor indicating its propensity to emit CO₂ at standard conditions of energy efficiency and fuel emission factor
  - E.g. Crude Distillation Unit = 1, Naphtha Reformer = 4.95, ....
  - Each factor accounts for emissions arising from net energy needs of each unit, including direct fuel, steam and electricity
  - Factors also include standard process emissions where relevant, e.g. Fluidised Catalytic Cracker (FCC), Hydrogen Production unit, Coker, Methanol from Syngas
- The throughput of each process unit is multiplied by its CWT factor and the results are totalled up
- An “off-sites” allowance is added for emissions not linked to specific process units e.g. blending, tankage, product despatching
- The resulting total CWT is the total activity or ‘product’ of the refinery
  - Common denominator for benchmarking refineries for ETS phase III
- The CWT methodology is Solomon property
  - CONCAWE has a license to use and promote it for EU refineries
CWT: a single throughput parameter as a basis for comparing refinery CO$_2$ efficiencies

CWT is not a benchmark in itself – it enables a benchmarking methodology to be developed.

On the line:
CO$_2$ emissions at standard CO$_2$ efficiency

Above the line:
⇒ higher CO$_2$ per CWT
⇒ lower CO$_2$ efficiency

Below the line:
⇒ lower CO$_2$ per CWT
⇒ higher CO$_2$ efficiency

X represents actual emissions for a refinery. All points are not on the line because of differences in CO$_2$ efficiency (i.e. energy efficiency and fuel carbon content).
98 mainstream refineries were identified for the CWT benchmark
- Additional 15 “atypical” sites were not included in CWT benchmark
  - Producers of specialities, not normal range of fuels products
  - Fallback approaches apply to these sites (fuel and/or heat benchmark)
- CONCAWE collected data from members for all mainstream refineries
  - Data is kept strictly confidential
  - Annual unit throughputs
  - Verified emissions, fuels and emission factors
  - Electricity production, imports and exports
  - Heat imports and exports
- \( CO_2 \) performance indicator (PI) was determined for each refinery, defined as:
  \[
  PI = \frac{\text{actual } CO_2 \text{ emissions}\,*}{[\text{CWT}]}
  \]
  (*) discounting emissions from exports/imports of heat or electricity
- Benchmarking curve submitted to the EC (after independent verification):
  - Plot of average PIs over 2007-2008 of all 98 refineries
  - Refining Products Benchmark is average PI of 10% best refineries
    \( = 0.0295 \text{ t CO}_2 \text{ per CWT} \)
- Mean EU refining \( CO_2 \) performance is 0.037 t CO\(_2\) per CWT
Phase III free allowances are calculated for each refinery as follows:

- Determine the refinery’s **Baseline CWT**
  
  - median of annual total CWT over 2005-2008 or 2009-2010
- Determine Electricity Correction Factor (**ECF**) over chosen baseline period
  
  \[
  \text{ECF} = \frac{\text{Direct emissions, excluding electricity \& including net heat imports}}{\text{Total emissions}}
  \]
  
  - typically about 0.88 (i.e. 88% of emissions are NOT electricity-related)
- Determine refinery’s Free Allowances
  
  \[0.0295 \times \text{Baseline CWT} \times \text{ECF}\]

**Example: Refinery Y**

- Crude throughput = approx 7 Mt/a
- Baseline CWT = 33 million
- ECF = 0.90
- Free ETS allowances
  
  \[0.0295 \times 33 \text{ million} \times 0.9\]
  
  - 0.88 million t/a
- Baseline verified emissions
  
  = 1.30 million t/a
- Free ETS allowances/baseline emissions
  
  = 67%