

# Analysis of Hydrogen Export Potential

Mark Chung, Ed Frank, Amgad Elgowainy  
and Krishna Reddi

National Renewable Energy Laboratory  
Argonne National Laboratory

DOE Contract # or WBS # 5.1.0.6

June 8<sup>th</sup>, 2022

DOE Hydrogen Program  
2022 Annual Merit Review and Peer Evaluation Meeting

Project ID: SA177

# **Project Goal:** Assess Hydrogen Export Opportunity and Potential to Leverage Existing Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Infrastructure

**Vision**      *Understand hydrogen export potential, competitiveness of transport paths, access to cheap, clean electricity and how, if at all, existing LNG facilities could be leveraged*

## **What**

- Quantify export market potential and competitiveness of multiple transport paths
- Quantify hydrogen technical potential and access to cheap, clean electricity near LNG facilities
- Understand and quantify what cost or time savings may be achieved from leveraging existing LNG infrastructure, if any

## **How**

- Assess existing literature, public announcements, previously conducted DOE research and other publicly available technical reports
- Leverage NREL past resource assessment work, NREL's U.S. Utility Rate Database (USURDB) and EPA's eGRID data
- Interview industry experts in cryogenic technologies and derive approximate cost estimates

## **Why**

- To understand if such opportunities exist and if so, how to leverage infrastructure to economically scale exports

# Overview: Analysis of Hydrogen Export Potential

Timeline	Partners
<p>Start: May 2021 End: April 2022</p> <p>90% complete*</p> <p>*As of April 25<sup>th</sup>, 2022</p>	<p><b><i>National Labs</i></b></p> <p>NREL - Mark Chung, PI</p> <p>Argonne National Lab – Ed Frank</p> <p>Argonne National Lab – Amgad Elgowainy</p> <p>Argonne National Lab – Krishna Reddi</p>
Budget	
<p>Total project budget: \$175k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• DOE Share: \$175k</li><li>• DOE funds spent*: \$130.4k</li></ul> <p>*as of ~03/01/2022</p>	


# Approach (1/1): Analysis of Hydrogen Export Potential

<u>Task Description</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Lab</u>	<u>Challenges / Barriers</u>
Quantify potential export market size	Complete	NREL	High uncertainty without deeper analysis
Quantify and compare cost competitiveness of hydrogen export paths	Complete	NREL	None
Quantify hydrogen production technical potential within 200-mile radius of existing LNG export terminals	Complete	NREL	None
Identify access to clean, cheap electricity within a 200-mile radius of LNG export terminals	In Progress	NREL	Difficult to know with certainty the emissions from grid electricity
Understand and quantify what cost or time savings may be achieved from leveraging existing LNG infrastructure, if any	Complete	ANL	Existing literature is sparse. Rely primarily of expert interviews.


# Accomplishments and Progress (1/10): Quantifying German Import Potential

**Base case and High case:** Max potential green hydrogen imports by 2030 could be **2.41 MMT**, assuming base case demand growth and only 5 GW of electrolyzer capacity installed. Should significant demand materialize, required imports could reach **5.4 MMT**. Low case suggests 1.08 MMT of required imports.

Projected Hydrogen Demand by Sector



German Supply vs. Demand



Source: [Opportunities for Hydrogen Energy Technologies Considering the National Energy & Climate Plans](#), German National Hydrogen Strategy

\*These are among Germany's highest emitting sectors whose facilities are aging and will require reinvestment this decade.

MMT = million tons

# Accomplishments and Progress (2/10): Quantifying International Import Potential


International export market potential could reach 40+ MMT by 2050

- EU to import 19 MMT by 2035 to support energy and feedstock transition. This quantity is far beyond limits of what existing infrastructure can handle. – Hydrogen Import Coalition
- EU to import 30 MMT by 2050, half of potential demand. – World Energy Council Report
- Korea to import 2 MMT by 2030 – Korea’s Ministry of Trade, Industry and Energy
- Japan will require 5-10 MMT imported hydrogen by 2050 – Ministry of Energy Trade and Industry
  - Developing LH2 capabilities with Australia. Trying to demonstrate LH2 supply chain in the 2020’s for commercial deployment in 2030’s. Also looking to research MCH and ammonia as alternative pathways.
  - Large LNG importers are likely to be large hydrogen importers. Japan imported 85 MM tons of LNG in 2016.

# Accomplishments and Progress (3/10): Transport Cost Comparison

DOE cost estimates of LH2 transport in range of third-party estimates. All studies concur LH2 for export is the most expensive transport pathway, but cost estimates vary widely.

Levelized Cost of Hydrogen Exports from Morocco (~3,000 km) to Netherlands



## Terms Defined:

- LOHC = Liquid organic hydrogen carrier (dibenzyl toluene), except DOE which used MCH
- MCH = Methylcyclohexane
- NH3 = Ammonia
- MeOH = Methanol
- GH2 = Gaseous hydrogen via pipeline
- LH2 = Liquid hydrogen via ocean tanker

Sources: NREL Research, (Ahluwalia, 2021), (Elgowainy, 2021), International Energy Agency, Hydrogen Import Coalition, CE Delft, Guidehouse

\* DOE estimates are based on research done as of May 2021.



\*\* Green hydrogen from Morocco via new build 48" pipeline

\*\*\* Green hydrogen from Seville, Spain to Hamburg, Germany via new 48" pipeline

Assumes production cost of 2 USD/kg for comparison purposes

# Accomplishments and Progress (4/10): U.S. Technical Potential

Hydrogen production technical potential amounts to ~885 mpta, but how can existing LNG infrastructure benefit large-scale hydrogen exports?



Note: Technical production potential differs from economic potential as it does not include economic or market constraints.  
Source: (Connelly, 2020)



# *Accomplishments and Progress (5/10):* Can existing LNG Export Terminals be Leveraged?

## **BACKGROUND**

- US decarbonization plans call for developing hydrogen export capacity
- The US is the world's largest LNG exporter
- Historically, the US deployed the largest H2 liquefaction plants (individually and total fleet capacity).

## **BARRIER**

- Hydrogen liquefaction is expensive and energy intensive

## **PROJECT OBJECTIVE**

- Determine whether US NG liquefaction plants and terminals can be leveraged to reduce hydrogen liquefaction cost

## **PROJECT APPROACH**


- Literature search for prior analysis
- High level assessment calculations

# Accomplishments and Progress (6/10): Can existing LNG Export Terminals be Leveraged?

## TECHNICAL BACKGROUND

- H<sub>2</sub> liquefaction comprises two steps
  - Pre-cooling to below the inversion temp.
  - Cryo-cooling to liquefaction
- Existing H<sub>2</sub> liquefiers use LN<sub>2</sub> for pre-cooling
  - Achieve pre-cooled temp. of ~80-90K
- LNG refrigeration almost reaches H<sub>2</sub> inversion temperature

**LNG facilities can only contribute to the pre-cooling portion of the hydrogen liquefaction process**




# Accomplishments and Progress (7/10): Can existing LNG Export Terminals be Leveraged?

## H2 LIQUEFIER COST

- CAPEX and O&M are almost entirely from compressors used for liquefaction
- Used compressor power as a surrogate to estimate shares of liquefaction cost arising from pre-cooling vs. cryo-cooling

Breakdown of H2 Liquefaction Cost



**Only ~14% of the liquefaction cost is a *candidate* for cost savings from leveraging an LNG facility**

# *Accomplishments and Progress (8/10):* Can existing LNG Export Terminals be Leveraged?

## WHAT PORTION OF THE 14% MIGHT ACTUALLY BE AVOIDED?

- From discussions with LNG engineers and analysts:
  - Offtake agreements cover LNG facility lifetime
  - LNG plants primarily operate at capacity
  - Small variability in operations, except for planned/unplanned maintenance events or sudden shift in market dynamics (i.e., COVID resulting in a sudden sharp, but brief reduction in exports)
  - Most LNG export capacity is relatively new: Many years of capital annuity remain
- Therefore:
  - ∴ Small or no marginal opportunity
  - ∴ Economic value of cooling exergy should be close to as-built
  - ∴ Heat integration opportunities unlikely

...What do these mean?

# *Accomplishments and Progress (9/10):* Can existing LNG Export Terminals be Leveraged?

## **SAVINGS OPPORTUNITIES NOT APPARENT**

- Small or no marginal opportunity:
  - If there were idle periods or excess capacity, the operator might see a business value arising from offering capacity at a discount
  - LNG plants operate at capacity and low variability; hence, no marginal opportunity
- Economic value of cooling exergy should be close to as-built:
  - Facilities are relatively new and small depreciation has occurred
  - Thus, if LNG equipment were repurposed for H<sub>2</sub> liquefaction, the original LNG cost calculations would need to be satisfied for a new business case to be made
  - The hydrogen liquefaction would see small saving in equipment CAPEX contributions to the H<sub>2</sub> liquefaction cost compared to simply acquiring new equipment. OPEX may be higher for lack of optimization.
- Heat integration opportunities unlikely:
  - H<sub>2</sub> liquefaction needs the coldest temperatures, but LNG plants will already be utilizing such high-exergy streams in its existing heat integration

**Significant cost savings unlikely**

# Accomplishments and Progress (10/10): Can existing LNG Export Terminals be Leveraged?

## FINAL THOUGHTS

- Perhaps opportunity for savings in *time to market*?
  - Use idle import terminals and abandoned LNG export projects to reduce permitting time?
- Savings from site development?
  - Note that LNG storage is not suitable for LH2 nor are LNG transfer lines, with both lack vacuum jacketing
  - New storage, transfer, ship loading, and probably electrical utilities all seem likely

LNG industry investments might be best engaged and most rapidly applied by shipping LNG as the H<sub>2</sub> carrier and making blue hydrogen at the destination

- For countries dependent upon LNG imports, NG liquefaction is a sunk cost
  - Partial pre-cooling against LNG at the import regasifier is a savings
- LNG ocean transport less costly than LH2 transport?
- Available storage sites will be required for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration at destination

# Collaboration and Coordination

- **U.S. DOE National Laboratories**

- NREL: Project Lead
- ANL: Assessing whether there are advantages to hydrogen liquefaction that could be provided by existing LNG export terminals

- **Expert interviews**

- In-depth interviews with process engineers skilled in designing, building, and deploying commercial cryogenic technologies

# Proposed Future Work

- **Planned tasks for FY22**

- None at this point. Awaiting further guidance from HFTO.

- **Proposed future tasks**

- Deeper dive into global import potential with country-by-country supply/demand analysis and hydrogen breakeven economics to competing fuels.
- Quantify on a country-by-country basis the levelized cost of hydrogen from renewable resources.
- Quantify economics of larger-scale exports (including terminals, transport, hydrogen conversion/gasification) to better understand costs at scale.



# Remaining Challenges and Barriers

- Difficulty in pinpointing emissions to electricity from the grid makes identifying low-cost, clean grid electricity highly uncertain.
- Due to uncertainty and ambiguity on clean, low-cost grid electricity, this portion of the analysis has been put on hold until further guidance from HFTO on direction of this work.

# Summary

- The size of the hydrogen export market could reach **40+ MMT by 2050**
- The **most expensive mode** of transport overseas is in liquefied form with costs across liquefied and carrier form **ranging widely**.
- The technical potential for U.S. hydrogen production within 200 miles of existing LNG export terminals is significant at ~885 MMT, however access to clean, low-cost electricity as well as economic and market constraints will impact availability of low-cost production.
- Significant cost savings from utilizing LNG heat integration systems for liquefied hydrogen **seems highly unlikely**.
- However, **time savings could be realized** from utilizing idled terminals or failed projects if time from permit application and approvals can be saved.

# Thank You

---

[www.nrel.gov](http://www.nrel.gov)

NREL/PR-5400-82564


This work was authored in part by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, operated by Alliance for Sustainable Energy, LLC, for the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) under Contract No. DE-AC36-08GO28308. Funding provided by U.S. Department of Energy Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Technologies Office. The views expressed in the article do not necessarily represent the views of the DOE or the U.S. Government. The U.S. Government retains and the publisher, by accepting the article for publication, acknowledges that the U.S. Government retains a nonexclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, worldwide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this work, or allow others to do so, for U.S. Government purposes.



# Technical Backup and Additional Information

---

# US Natural Gas Infrastructure (Backup): Major Shale Plays and Natural Gas Infrastructure




# Hydrogen Transportation Cost by Pipeline (Backup): Select Locations to Select LNG Terminals

## HYDROGEN TRANSPORTATION COST BY PIPELINE TO TERMINALS


- **Scale** in exports would be needed to drive down costs of building new hydrogen-dedicated pipeline

Pathway	Approximate Mileage
Midland, TX to Freeport, TX	450
Midland, TX to Corpus Christi, TX	400
Shreveport, LA to Lake Charles, LA	160




# Accomplishments and Progress (Backup): Liquefaction Cost

## MODIFIED HDSAM LIQUEFIER COST EXPONENT



$$SLC = \text{Cost/Capacity} = C^e/C,$$

C=Capacity, e=scaling exponent



Cardella, U., Decker, L. and Klein, H., 2017. Roadmap to economically viable hydrogen liquefaction. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 42(19), pp.13329-13338.





**FIGURE COPIED WITHOUT PERMISSION**

Specific liquefaction costs from Cardella 2017c and from HDSAM. The ordinate is the SLC divided by the reference 5 tpd SLC. Note that Cardella 2017c uses an unspecified value for SLC<sub>5</sub> while the HDSAM SLC values were divided by the HDSAM<sub>5 tpd</sub> SLC. Thus, the two datasets do not share a common normalization and only the scaling behavior can be compared.





# Accomplishments and Progress (Backup): Liquefaction Cost

## INTERPOLATION OF ST001 DATA

Distance  
Scaling



Demand Scaling  
to derive 1200 tpd



Route	1-way, nm	350 tpd	500 tpd	780 tpd	1200 tpd
Anchorage-> Tokyo	3643	\$1.40	\$1.20	\$1.10	\$1.00
Texas-> Hamburg	5264	\$1.60	\$1.40	\$1.30	\$1.10
Providence-> Hamburg	3441	\$1.30	\$1.20	\$1.00	\$1.00



# Accomplishments and Progress (Backup): Liquefaction Cost

## UPDATED PIPELINE TRANSMISSION COSTS

- Krishna Reddi

		Pipeline Cost Transmission Cost [\$/kg]							
		Market Demand [tpd]							
Great Plains	Transmission Distance [km]	350 tpd		500 tpd		780 tpd		1200 tpd	
	50	\$	0.013	\$	0.012	\$	0.010	\$	0.007
	100	\$	0.034	\$	0.029	\$	0.022	\$	0.017
● New England	Transmission Distance [km]	50 tpd		500 tpd		780 tpd		1200 tpd	
	50	\$	0.29	\$	0.27	\$	0.22	\$	0.17
	100	\$	0.71	\$	0.62	\$	0.49	\$	0.38
Pacific Northwest	Transmission Distance [km]	350 tpd		500 tpd		780 tpd		1200 tpd	
	50	\$	0.026	\$	0.023	\$	0.018	\$	0.014
	100	\$	0.063	\$	0.054	\$	0.041	\$	0.031
California	Transmission Distance [km]	350 tpd		500 tpd		780 tpd		1200 tpd	
	50	\$	0.13	\$	0.12	\$	0.096	\$	0.076
	100	\$	0.33	\$	0.29	\$	0.23	\$	0.18
● Southwest	Transmission Distance [km]	350 tpd		500 tpd		780 tpd		1200 tpd	
	50	\$	0.13	\$	0.12	\$	0.096	\$	0.076
	100	\$	0.33	\$	0.29	\$	0.23	\$	0.18

- Cost difference drivers:

- Terrain, which affects labor costs
- Right of way costs

No pipeline data for Alaska