INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

Universität Hohenheim

Chair in Agricultural Engineering in the Tropics and Subtropics

Prof. Dr. J. Müller

Environmental assessment of energy and waste systems based on anaerobic digestion

Dissertation

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

"Doktor der Agrarwissenschaften"

(Dr.sc.agr. / Ph.D. in Agricultural Sciences)

to the

Faculty of Agricultural Sciences

presented by

Torsten Rehl

from Solingen, Germany

2012

This thesis was accepted as a doctoral dissertation in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree “Doktor der Agrarwissenschaften” by the Faculty of Agricultural Sciences at University of Hohenheim on 25.06.2012

Date of oral examination: 25.06.2012

Examination Committee

Deputy of the Dean	Prof. Dr. Grethe
Supervisor and Reviewer	Prof. Dr. Joachim Müller
Co-Reviewer	Prof. Dr. Iris Lewandowski
Additional examiner	Prof. Dr. Enno Bahrs

Schriftenreihe des Lehrstuhls für Agrartechnik in den Tropen und Subtropen der Universität Hohenheim

herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. Joachim Müller

Schriftenreihe des Lehrstuhls für Agrartechnik in den Tropen und Subtropen der Universität Hohenheim
herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. Joachim Müller

Band 06/2013

Torsten Rehl

Environmental assessment of energy and waste systems based on anaerobic digestion

D 100 (Diss. Universität Hohenheim)

Shaker Verlag
Aachen 2013

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at http://dnb.d-nb.de.

Zugl.: Hohenheim, Univ., Diss., 2012

Copyright Shaker Verlag 2013
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publishers.

Printed in Germany.

ISBN 978-3-8440-1940-7
ISSN 1867-4631

Shaker Verlag GmbH • P.O. BOX 101818 • D-52018 Aachen
Phone: 0049/2407/9596-0 • Telefax: 0049/2407/9596-9
Internet: www.shaker.de • e-mail: info@shaker.de

Preface and acknowledgement

The work presented in this thesis was carried out at the Institute of Agricultural Engineering, University of Hohenheim, during the years 2006 – 2012.

I am truly grateful for the encouragement and patient support provided by my supervisor Prof. Dr. Joachim Müller (University of Hohenheim). I want to thank him not only for constructive discussions, advices and for guiding me in the wide field of scientific work but especially for the constant confidence he have had in me during the last years. I have learned a great deal.

I want to thank as well Prof. Dr. Lewandowski and Prof. Dr. Bahrs for second and third supervision.

Moreover I would like to sincerely thank all the people who have supported me in different ways with this thesis. In particular I wish to thank:

Antonia Heinke for her untiring assistance with language corrections and preparation of the manuscripts,

the students Bastian Kircher, Georg Hiepp and Barbara Dannenmann for their hard work in collecting data from farms, biogas plants, administrations and secondary sources;

many thanks Eloise Byrne for providing me with constructive comments on the language;

Dr. Sabine Deimling and Jürgen Stichling from PE INTERNATIONAL for giving me the necessary flexibility to work on my thesis and to use the GaBi software and

my sisters Mareike and Wiebke as well as my parents for always being tremendous supporters and sources of happiness.

Stuttgart, 24.01.2012

Torsten Rehl

CONTENT

1 GENERAL INTRODUCTION 1
1.1 Biogas production and use 1
1.2 Environmental impacts of biogas systems 2
1.3 Methodology 7
1.3.1 Life Cycle Assessment 9
1.3.2 Attributional and Consequential LCI 14
1.3.3 CO_2 abatement costs 17
1.4 Objectives 18
1.5 References 19

2 LIFE CYCLE ASSESSMENT OF ENERGY GENERATION FROM BIOGAS - ATTRIBUTIONAL VS. CONSEQUENTIAL APPROACH." (REHL, T., LANSCHE, J., MÜLLER, J.) 29
2.1 Abstract 29
2.2 Introduction 29
2.3 Methodology 31
2.3.1 General assumptions 31
2.3.2 System description 32
2.3.3 Allocation procedure 35
2.3.4 Attributional approach 36
2.3.5 Consequential approach 39
2.4 Results and discussion 43
2.4.1 Primary energy demand 43
2.4.2 Impact assessment 44
2.5 Discussion 48
2.6 Conclusions 50
2.7 Acknowledgements 51
2.8 References 51

3 LIFE CYCLE ASSESSMENT OF BIOGAS DIGESTATE PROCESSING TECHNOLOGIES. (REHL, T., MÜLLER, J.) 55
3.1 Abstract 55
3.2 Introduction 56
3.3 Methodology 57
3.3.1 Scope 57
3.3.2 Data recovery, classification and assessment 57
3.3.3 Inventory definition 58
3.3.4 Emissions 63
3.4 Scenario definition 66
3.5 Results and discussion 70
3.5.1 Primary energy demand 70
3.5.2 Global warming potential 72

3.5.3 Acidification potential 73
3.5.4 Scenario analysis 74
3.6 Conclusions 79
3.7 References 81

4 CO_2 ABATEMENT COSTS OF GREENHOUSE GAS (GHG) MITIGATION BY DIFFERENT BIOGAS CONVERSION PATHWAYS. (REHL, T., MÜLLER, J.) 89
4.1 Abstract 89
4.2 Introduction 89
4.3 Methodology 91
4.3.1 Biogas systems definition 92
4.3.2 Functional equivalence and system boundary 99
4.3.3 Reference systems definition 99
4.3.4 Life Cycle Cost (LCC) 102
4.3.5 Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) 103
4.3.6 Sensitivity analysis 104
4.4 Results and discussion 104
4.4.1 Environmental impact 104
4.4.2 Economic impact 106
4.4.3 Abatement costs 107
4.4.4 Sensitivity analysis 110
4.5 Discussion 113
4.6 Conclusion 114
4.7 References 115

5 GENERAL DISCUSSION 121
5.1 Environmental impacts of biogas systems 121
5.2 Methodology 123
5.2.1 Goal definition 123
5.2.2 Scope derivation 124
5.2.3 Life cycle inventory 127
5.2.4 Life cycle impact assessment 131
5.3 References 134

6 CONCLUSIONS 141
6.1 Environmental impacts of biogas systems 141
6.2 Methodology 142
6.3 Outlook 143
6.4 References 144

7 SUMMARY 145

8 SUMMARY (GERMAN) 149

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

aLCA	Attributional Life Cycle Assessment
AP	Acidification Potential
BAU	Business As Usual
C	Carbon
CH_4	Methane
CHP	Combined Heat and Power Station
cLCA	Consequential Life Cycle Assessment
CML	Cetrum for Milieukunde Leiden
CNG	Compressed Natural Gas
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CO_2	Carbon Dioxide
DIN	German Industry Standard (Deutsche Industrie Norm)
Dw	Dry weight
e.g.	for example
EF	Ecological Footprint
El	Electric
ELCD	European Life Cycle Database
EMEP	European Monitoring and Evaluation Program
EoL	End of Life
EP	Eutrophication Potential
Eq	Equivalents
Fu	Functional unit
Fw	Fresh weight
GaBi	Software tool for calculating LCA ("Ganzheitliche Bilanzierung")
GEM	German Electricity Mix
GEMIS	Global Emission Model of Integrated Systems
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GWP	Global Warming Potential
Ha	Hectare
i.e.	id est

IEA	International Energy Agency
IGCC	Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle
ILCD	International Cycle Data System
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ISO	International Standard Organization
Kg	Kilogram
kWh	Kilowatt hour
L	Liter
LCA	Life Cycle Assessment
LCC	Life Cycle Cost
LCI	Life Cycle Inventory
LCIA	Life Cycle Impact Assessment
LU	Land Use
LUC	Land Use Change
M	Marginal
m^3	Cubic meter
MACC	Marginal Abatement Cost Curve
MJ	Mega Joule
MoE	Molasses-based Ethanol
MT	Mega Ton
MWh	Megawatt hour
N	Nitrogen
N_2O	Dinitrous Oxide
NH_3	Ammonia
NH_{4+}	Ammonium
NO	Nitric Oxide
NO_2	Nitrogen Dioxide
NO_{3-}	Nitrate
oDM	Organic Dry Matter
OFMSW	Organic Fraction of Municipal Solid Waste
P_2O_5	Phosphorus Pentoxide
PED	Primary Energy Demand
PO_4^{3-}	Phosphor
POCP	Photochemical Ozone Creation Potential

Ppb	Parts per billion
SO_2	Sulfur Dioxide
T	Tonne
Th	Thermal
UBA	German environmental ministry (Umweltbundesamt)
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program
UNFCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VDI	German association of engineers (Verein Deutscher Ingenieure)
Yr	Year

FIGURES

Fig. 1-1: Regional differentiation between livestock husbandry density and nitrogen area balance in Germany for the year 2008 according to (Gömann et al., 2004) 6

Fig. 1-2: Decision support instruments according to Hofstetter (Hofstetter, 1998). Columns show the affiliation of instruments to sustainability dimensions for impact analysis, while shadings indicate the affiliation of instruments to different object levels. 8

Fig. 1-3: Life cycle from raw material extraction to product manufacturing, its use and end of life with indicated in - and outputs and their linked background system. 10

Fig. 1-4: Framework of the Life Cycle Assessment method according to ISO 14040 (ISO, 2006) methodology. 10

Fig. 1-5: System boundaries within the life cycle of a product 11

Fig. 1-6: Aggregation of emissions in the CML 2006 method based on (Guinée et al., 2001). ... 13

Fig. 1-7: System boundary in attributional and consequential LCA approaches 15

Fig. 1-8: Theoretical CO_2 eq. abatement costs curve showing abatement costs in € per ton and total abatement potential in ton CO_2 eq. per technology/option 17

Fig. 2-1: System boundary, energy, material and emission flows for attributional life cycle assessment (aLCA) of a biogas system 37

Fig. 2-2: System boundary, energy, material and emission flows for consequential life cycle assessment (cLCA) of a biogas system 40

Fig. 2-3: Primary energy demand (PED) per functional unit (FU, 1MJ supplied electricity) of three attributional life cycle assessment scenarios (aLCAp physical allocation, aLCAe economic allocation, aLCAc core product allocation) and two consequential life cycle assessment scenarios (cLCAl local, cLCAg general) of an exemplary biogas system in Germany. In Fig. 3.A average German electricity mix (GEMa) and the marginal German electricity mix (GEMm) are indicated by dotted lines. 43

Fig. 2-4: Global warming potential (GWP) per functional unit (FU, 1MJ supplied electricity) of three attributional life cycle assessment scenarios (aLCAp physical allocation, aLCAe economic allocation, aLCAc core product allocation) and two consequential life cycle assessment scenarios (cLCAl local, cLCAg general) of an exemplary biogas system in Germany. Average German electricity mix (GEMa) and the marginal German electricity mix (GEMm) are indicated by dotted lines. 44

Fig. 2-5: Eutrophication (EP) per functional unit (FU, 1MJ supplied electricity) of three attributional life cycle assessment scenarios (aLCAp physical allocation, aLCAe economic allocation, aLCAc core product allocation) and two consequential life cycle assessment scenarios (cLCAl local, cLCAg general) of an exemplary biogas system in Germany. Average German electricity mix (GEMa) and the marginal German electricity mix (GEMm) are indicated by dotted lines. 45

Fig. 2-6: Acidification potential (AP) per functional unit (FU, 1MJ supplied electricity) of three attributional life cycle assessment scenarios (aLCAp physical allocation, aLCAe

economic allocation, aLCAc core allocation) and two consequential (cLCA) life cycle assessment scenarios (cLCAl local, cLCAg general) of an exemplary biogas system in Germany. Average German electricity mix (GEMa) and the marginal German electricity mix (GEMm) are indicated by dotted lines..... 46

Fig. 2-7: Photochemical ozone creation potential (POCP), per functional unit (FU, 1MJ supplied electricity) of three attributional life cycle assessment scenarios (aLCAp physical allocation, aLCAe economic allocation, aLCAc core allocation) and two consequential (cLCA) life cycle assessment scenarios (cLCAl local, cLCAg general) of an exemplary biogas system in Germany. Average German electricity mix (GEMa) and the marginal German electricity mix (GEMm) are indicated by dotted lines..... 47

Fig. 3-1: System boundary, mass flow and final products for the treatment options conventional digestate management (CM), composting (CO), belt drying (BD), drum drying (DD), solar drying (SD), thermal concentration (TC) and physical-chemical treatment (PT) 62

Fig. 3-2: Primary energy demand (PED) in MJ per functional unit (fu) as covered by different energy sources (a) and as resulting from different life cycle stages (b) for default parameter setting in different treatment options (s. Tab. 3-1). 70

Fig. 3-3: Global warming potential (GWP) in CO_2 equivalents per functional unit (fu) as resulting from different main emissions (a) and from different life cycle stages (b) for default parameter setting in different treatment options (s. Tab. 3-1). 72

Fig. 3-4: Acidification potential (AP) in SO_2 equivalents per functional unit (fu) as resulting from different main emissions (a) and from different life cycle stages (b) for default parameter setting in different treatment options (s. Tab. 3-1). 73

Fig. 3-5: Relative primary energy demand (PED), global warming potential (GWP) and acidification potential (AP) of different feedstock (F2, F3) compared to default setting (F1=0) (s. Tab. 3-3) for different treatment options (s. Tab. 3-1)..... 74

Fig. 3-6: Relative primary energy demand (PED), global warming potential (GWP) and acidification potential (AP) of different energy supply parameter variations (E2, E3, E4) compared to default setting (E1=0) (s. Tab. 3-4) for different treatment options (s. Tab. 3-1)..... 75

Fig. 3-7: Relative primary energy demand (PED), global warming potential (GWP) and acidification potential (AP) of different emission reduction parameter variations (R2, R3, R4, R5) compared to default setting (R1=0) (s. Tab. 3-5) for different treatment options (s. Tab. 3-1). 77

Fig. 3-8: Relative primary energy demand (PED), global warming potential (GWP) and acidification potential (AP) of different logistic parameter variations (L2, L3, L4, L5) compared to default setting (L1=0) for different treatment options (s. Tab. 3-1). 78

Fig. 4-1: Routine for the determination and calculation of abatement costs 92

Fig. 4-2: Functional outputs of the new biogas systems and their substituted reference production systems. 99

Fig. 4-3: Analysis of the environmental impacts of different biogas systems in terms of CO_2 equivalents per year compared to average and marginal reference systems; E1 (power

plant), E2 (power plant + optimized biogas system), EH1 (CHP), EH2 (Biogas pipeline supplying distant CHP), H (Heating plant supplying a district heating network), G1 (limited gas injection for heat application), G2 (unlimited gas injection for heat application), and F (unlimited gas injection for fuel application). Savings due to substituted energy provision technologies are resulting in negative values (credits). Numbers indicate the net-CO_2 equivalents, i.e. the balance of burdens and credits... 104

Fig. 4-4: Analysis of the economics of different biogas systems compared to average and marginal reference systems; E1 (power plant), E2 (power plant + optimized biogas system), EH1 (CHP), EH2 (Biogas pipeline supplying distant CHP), H (Heating plant supplying a district heating network), G1 (limited gas injection for heat application), G2 (unlimited gas injection for heat application), and F (unlimited gas injection for fuel application). Savings due to substituted technologies or earning from waste disposal result in negative values (credits). Numbers indicate the net abatement costs, i.e. the balance of costs and credits. 106

Fig. 4-5: Average (green) and marginal (yellow) abatement costs per tonne of CO_2 equivalence (y-axis) and CO_2 abatement potential in tonnes CO_2 eq per year (x-axis) for different biogas systems: E1 (power plant), E2 (power plant + optimized biogas system), EH1/HE1 (CHP), EH2/HE2 (Biogas pipeline supplying distant CHP), H (Heating plant supplying a district heating network), G1 (limited gas injection for heat application), G2 (unlimited gas injection for heat application), and F (unlimited gas injection for fuel application). Positive values result in costs, negative values in savings per tonne of CO_2 equivalence avoided. 108

Fig. 4-6: CO_2 eq abatement cost sensitivities of system E1 (power plant): Change of (a) the marginal reference technology costs, (b) substituted costs for marginal by-products, (c) investment costs, (d) feedstock costs, (e) distance of digestate transportation, (f) energy requirements of the plant itself and (g) methane losses. 110

Fig. 4-7: CO_2 eq abatement cost sensitivity of different biogas systems in relation to changes in marginal reference technology costs; E1 (power plant), E2 (power plant + optimized biogas system), EH1 (CHP), EH2 (Biogas pipeline supplying distant CHP), H (Heating plant supplying a district heating network), G1 (limited gas injection for heat application), G2 (unlimited gas injection for heat application), and F (unlimited gas injection for fuel application). 112

TABLES

Tab. 1-1: Differences between attributional LCA and consequential LCA (Ekvall, 1999; Weidema, 2003; Ekvall, 2004a; Frischknecht, 2006; Hauschild et al., 2009) 15

Tab. 2-1: Main parameters of energy maize and silo maize production 33

Tab. 2-2: Power, feedstock and emission characteristics of the biogas combined heat and power plant (CHP) 34

Tab. 2-3: Allocation factors (in %) for main and by-products in a biogas system for physical, economic and core product allocation in the aLCA approach for different feedstock sources 38

Tab. 2-4: Marginal technologies used in scenario $cLCA_{local}$ and $cLCA_{general}$ to provide the system functions of the biogas system under consideration 42

Tab. 3-1: Set up and system boundary for the seven options of biogas digestate treatment and supply. 59

Tab. 3-2: Structure of scenario analysis, performed on seven options for four sensitivity scenarios (S1-4) with variation of feedstock F, energy supply E, emission reduction R and logistic L. 67

Tab. 3-3: Dry matter, macro nutrient content of feedstock F1 (default), F2, and F3 in % and g*kg-1 wet basis of the digestate, respectively. 68

Tab. 3-4: Energy source and distribution (%) of primary energy demand and environmental burdens between heat and power with different ways of product allocation 69

Tab. 3-5: Emission factors used in application parameter settings R4 and R5 based on default parameter setting R1. 69

Tab. 4-1: Composition and methane yield of various feedstock (Baserga, 2005; FNR, 2006; Hiepp, 2008; Schroetters, 2008) 93

Tab. 4-2: Characteristics of the biogas plant 94

Tab. 4-3: Technical characteristics of the biogas systems 97

Tab. 4-4: Average and marginal cost price and greenhouse gas emissions for the reference technologies (Fritsche & Schmidt, 2007; AGEB, 2008; Fritsche, 2008; Frondel et al., 2008; UBA, 2008; EEX, 2009; EU, 2009) 100