Decarbonisation & industrial dynamics of energy intensive sectors

Effective innovation support under the forthcoming EU ETS "Innovation Fund" and examples of breakthrough technologies



Institute for European Studies Vrije Universiteit Brussel



15 March 2016, Brussels Tomas Wyns - Senior Researcher

Outline

- Decarbonising the European economy (context)
- Industrial decarbonisation & challenges
- Parameters influencing radical process innovation
- Barriers for radical low-carbon process innovation
- Policy options to enhance process innovation
- Examples of industrial breakthrough technologies (steel, aluminium, chemicals, cement)
- Conclusions

Decarbonising the European economy



- European Commission low-carbon roadmap (2010)
- Followed by transport and energy roadmaps
- No EU industrial decarbonisation roadmap (or vision)
- Most (energy intensive) industrial sectors developed sectoral roadmaps

Industrial decarbonisation



Specific challenges for energy intensive sectors in the EU

- Still **recovering from crisis** (weak balance sheets, low credit ratings, possible consolidation, ...)
- Higher energy costs compared to e.g. US and Middle East
- Growth in EU remains low compared to e.g. emerging markets
- and therefore investments in new large process plants in EU have been low for at least a decade (mature economy)
- Long investment cycles <-> predictability of policies and costs
- Low R&D intensity in most energy intensive sectors, restricted ability of companies to make needed investments in R&D



Industrial sector

Parameters influencing radical process innovation in industrial sectors - literature

- Product innovation: innovative products drive process innovation
 (Reichstein, Salter 2006)
- Cost savings factor: cost reduction is factor in driving process
 innovation (Reichstein, Salter 2006) but comes over time with lower marginal returns
- **Productivity increase** key enabler & driver of important recent industrial process innovations at firm (CEO & board) level (Luiten, Blok 2001)
- Cross company/sectoral collaboration/network (e.g. open innovation) shows important correlation with (radical) process innovation (Reichstein, Salter 2006) (Luiten, Blok 2001) (CEPI 2-team project, 2012)
- Stricter legislation/targets or expectation thereof drive process innovation (e.g. ULCOS)

Barriers for (radical) process innovation in industrial sectors

- High Capital risk and problems with balance sheet financing in some companies
- General (negative) investment climate in Europe (e.g. mature market (low growth), international consolidation, costs in EU, policy risk, …)
- Low room and acceptance of failure at company and policy level
- Low R&D intensity of energy intensive companies
- Transparency and governance related to **EU state aid rules** (NER 300)
- Incumbents (Schumpeter Mark II) dominate policy/stakeholder debate

Policy options to enhance process innovation (i)

- Link low-carbon demonstration support with increase in productivity in the process design (if and where possible) and project selection criteria (e.g. post 2020 NER 300). Within the firm, the higher management should be made aware of possible productivity improvements in these new processes (where possible). —> Enhances competitiveness
- Enable the linkages between process and product (& business model) innovation at the design stage and in the project selection criteria (e.g. post 2020 NER 300). —> Low-carbon transformation across value chain
- Encourage cross company and cross sectoral collaboration in the R&D phase of process innovation and at the demonstration phase (e.g. to lower investment risk). —> Can accelerate innovation
- Identify and mitigate economic and legal barriers with regard to intellectual property rights and competition (e.g. related to cross company collaboration).

Policy options to enhance process innovation (ii)

- Have upfront clarity on what type or extent of national (additional) support would constitute unacceptable State Aid. —> Reduces financial/regulatory risk
- Developing a practical guide for companies' project developers and governments, using the experiences (and examples) from the two NER 300 calls could facilitate the process for post 2020 (co-)financing of industrial low-carbon demonstration plants. —> Accelerates learning curve
- Improved project risk sharing: Link the financial reward ETS innovation fund not only with successful *final* project implementation but also with key *intermediate* (engineering) milestones.
- Develop a financing toolbox (e.g. EIB's risk sharing facility, equity participation, EIF, ...) that facilitates de-risking/financing of projects. —> Leveraging factor
- **Tolerate failure** (mitigate through early warning system) and implement lessons learned from failure

Steel sector "low carbon steel for mature economy"



Successful testing of **HIsarna** (ULCOS) pilot blast furnace in limuiden (Netherlands).

- 20% less CO2 ref. current best practice
- up to -80% possible if linked to CCS
- Increased productivity
- Smaller design —> modularity, can deal better with cyclicality of steel economics
- Endurance test this summer, followed by start of Demonstration size design (NER 400, ...)





important for EU to pioneer + keep these new technologies

Aluminium: Game changing breakthrough(s)









"New inert anode process can virtually eliminate direct CO2 emissions and reduce energy consumption/ costs by 50%"



EC JRC (2015): multiple options such as inert anodes, dynamic AC induced magnetic fields, CCS. FP7, Horizon 2020, NER 400 crucial to bring these to the market

Petrochemicals —> Bio-based chemicals



- €3.7 billion investments in bio-based innovation from 2014-2020; €975 million of EU funds (Horizon 2020) and €2.7 billion of private investments
- Replace at least 30% of oil-based chemicals and materials with bio-based and biodegradable ones by 2030.
- Deliver bio-based products that are comparable and/or superior to fossil-based products in terms of price, performance, availability and environmental benefits.
- on average reduce CO2 emissions by at least 50% compared to their fossil alternatives.

Ammonium production emission reductions: "out of the box thinking" Direct "Nitrogen" fixation





N-Fix by Azotic technologies (UK)

- Direct fixation of Nitrogen (using bacteria)
- Reduce use of ammonium based fertiliser by 50%
- Same crop yield
- Major environmental co-benefits
- Tested now

Cement: multiple options for deep emission reductions



Biomason: Using bacteria to grow concrete bricks from basic raw materials virtually no CO2 emissions



Geo-polymer cement: Plasmarok using urban mining for raw materials

CO2-free STEP Cement Hot electrolysis of limestone forms lime & graphite with limestone CaCO3 CaO+O2+C CaO

Solar Thermal electrochemical production of cement

Conclusions

- Additional industrial decarbonisation vision, policy and financing framework needed
- 10-15 years left to develop and commercialise key low-carbon breakthroughs
- There are important barriers and triggers towards radical process innovation
- We can develop the policy and financing tools to address these
- If radical process innovations happen first "outside" EU, structural competitive loss of Europe is certain.

References

- Luiten, E. E. M. (2001). Beyond energy efficiency: Actors, networks and government intervention in the development of industrial process technologies.
- Reichstein, T., & Salter, A. (2006). Investigating the sources of process innovation among UK manufacturing firms. Industrial and Corporate Change, 15(4), 653-682.
- European Commission (2011), A Roadmap for moving to a competitive low carbon economy in 2050. Staff Working Document
- Biosbased industries PPP http://www.bbi-europe.eu
- CEPI (2013), 2-team project. http://twoteam.unfoldthefuture.eu
- European Commission JRC (2014), 2014 Industrial R&D investment Scoreboard.
- ARPA-E METALS programme: <u>http://arpa-e.energy.gov/?q=arpa-e-site-page/view-programs</u>
- JRC, European Commission (2015), Energy Efficiency and GHG Emissions: Prospective Scenarios for the Aluminium Industry, https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en/publication/eur-scientific-and-technical-research-reports/energy-efficiency-and-ghg-emissions-prospective-scenarios-aluminium-industry
- US DOE: top value added chemicals from biomass http://www.biofuelsdigest.com/bdigest/2015/04/30/
 http://www.biofuelsdigest.com/bdigest/2015/04/30/
 http://www.biofuelsdigest.com/bdigest/2015/04/30/
 http://www.biofuelsdigest.com/bdigest/2015/04/30/

- HIsarna steel making: <u>http://www.tatasteeleurope.com/en/innovation/case-studies/hisarna-pilot-plant</u> Van der Stel, J., Louwerse, G., Sert, D., Hirsch, A., Eklund, N., & Pettersson, M. (2013). Top gas recycling blast furnace developments for 'green' and sustainable ironmaking. Ironmaking & Steelmaking, 40(7), 483-489.
- Azotic N-Fix: http://www.azotictechnologies.com/index.php/technology/n-fix/ Dayton, L. (2014). Agribiotechnology: Blue-sky rice. Nature, 514(7524), S52-S54.
- Biomason (http://biomason.com) Dosier, G. K. (2014). U.S. Patent No. 8,728,365. Washington, DC: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.
- Van Passel, S., Dubois, M., Eykmans, J., de Gheldere, S., Ang, F., Peter Tom Jones, & Van Acker, K. (2013). The economics of enhanced landfill mining: private and societal performance drivers. Journal of Cleaner Production, 55, 92–102. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.03.024
- Licht, S., Wu, H., Hettige, C., Wang, B., Asercion, J., Lau, J., & Stuart, J. (2012). STEP cement: solar thermal electrochemical production of CaO without CO 2 emission. Chemical Communications, 48(48), 6019-6021.