Comparative Analysis of Infrastructures Hydrogen Fueling and Electric Charging of Vehicles

GRAZ, FEBRUARY 15, 2018

JOCHEN LINSSEN, MARTIN ROBINIUS, THOMAS GRUBE, MARKUS REUSS, PETER STENZEL, KONSTANTINOS SYRNANIDIS, DETLEF STOLTEN

Institute of Energy and Climate Research IEK-3: Electrochemical Process Engineering

EnInnov2018, Graz, Austria 2018 February 14th to 16th

Mitglied der Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft Institute of Electrochemical Process Engineering IEK-3



MOTIVATION









Meta-analysis of existing infrastructure scenario studies

In depth scenario analysis of infrastructure designs, Case Study for Germany

Consistent scenario framework with different vehicle penetration

Spatially and temporally resolved models for generation, conversion, transport and distribution

Analysis of investment, costs, efficiencies and emissions





STATUS QUO OF INFRASTRUCTURE

Hydrogen Fueling

- Approx. 2,500 FCEV in operation worldwide
- End of 2016, 213 public Hydrogen Fueling Station (HRS) in operation worldwide: Japan (44%), the USA (17%) and Germany (13%)
- Germany: HRS network reached 30 stations by mid June 2017. At present, 27 HRS are under construction or being planned in Germany, with a goal to build up to 400 HRS before 2023
- pipeline systems for the transportation and distribution of hydrogen concentrated for the chemical uses of hydrogen

Existing Hydrogen Pipelines (by 2017-05)				
The USA	2,608 km			
Europe	1,598 km			
of which in Germany	340 km			
Rest of world	337 km			
World total	4,542 km			

Sources: [9], [10], [14], [15]



Roadmap for hydrogen refueling stations in Germany

Sources: [12]



Mitglied der Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft

STATUS QUO OF INFRASTRUCTURE

Electric Charging

- By the end 2016, the total BEV and PHEV vehicle stock came to about 2 million worldwide and was largely concentrated in China (32 %) followed by the United States (28 %) [16]
- Dynamic rollout of slow and fast charging worldwide
- Leading countries end of 2016 are China, the United States and the Netherlands
- For fast charging options (Modes 3 and 4) highest dynamic and absolute number in China



Sources: [16]

META ANALYSIS

Selection criteria of scenario studies

- Focus on Germany (broader context studies for EU, worldwide) and quantitative results; parameters: number of hydrogen fueling stations and charging points, cumulative investment for infrastructure set-up
- Total number of scanned literature sources: 79
- Selected studies for meta analysis: **25** (12 hydrogen and 13 electric charging)

Lessons learned of the meta analysis

- Mostly aggregated results and, in many cases without provision of techno-economic assumptions
- Lack of information in literature of important infrastructure parameters, e.g., hydrogen pipeline length, number of trucks for hydrogen transport => no meta-analysis possible
- Regarding electric charging studies: lack of studies concerning high xEV penetration scenarios, investment for infrastructure build-up, demand for fast-charging and impacts on the distribution grid

META ANALYSIS

Hydrogen Infrastructure – Vehicle Specific Cumulative Investment



- Cumulative investment differs significantly due to different assumptions e.g. consideration of power plant investment or number of fueling stations
- Specific cumulative investment per FCEV in the range of €2,000 to 4,000 per FCEV
- Expected decreasing specific investment per FCEV with increasing FCEV stock (due to learning curve and economy of scale) is not observed



Mitglied der Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft

META ANALYSIS

Electric Charging Infrastructure – Vehicle Specific Cumulative Investment



investment for public/semipublic normal & fast charging, private charging not included

- According to specific cumulative infrastructure investment per BEV is approx.
 € 500 per BEV stable for small BEV stocks
- Highest specific investment per BEV occur in the 30 million BEV scenario by Grube et al. => investment for additional grid reinforcements considered and high number of charging points (on-street and additional fast charging)



HYDROGEN SUPPLY PATHWAYS



Mitglied der Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft

NUMBER OF BEV AND CHARGING POINTS





- Number of overnight chargers (Mode 1 & 2) increases with BEV number but with decreasing ratio:
 - 1 by 1 in the first two scenarios (all BEV have an overnight charging option)
 - 1 by 2 in the last scenario (only 58 % of all BEV have an overnight charging option)
- The ratio of BEV per Mode 4 charger increase due to decreasing charging frequency caused by higher driving range (battery capacity)

INFRASTRUCTURE DESIGNS

	Ramp up	Mass market			
	0.1 million	3 million	10 million	20 million	
cable length		1,800 km	28,000 km	183,000 km	
transformer		6,100	55,000	187,000	
slow chargers	100,000 @ 3.7 kW	2.8 million	6.5 million	11 million @ 22 kw	
fast chargers	6,000 @ 150 kW	81,000	175,000	245,000 @ 350 kW	
storage capacity		2 TWh	5 TWh	10 TWh	
electrolysis		3 GW	10 GW	19 GW	
truck trailer	42	730	1,500	3,000	
pipeline		12,000 km	12,000 km	12,000 km	
fueling	400	1,500	3,800	7,000	
		Ĺ			

Mitglied der Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft

Institute of Electrochemical Process Engineering IEK-3

CH

Forschungszentrum

TOTAL CUMULATIVE INVESTMENT

Hydrogen Infrastructure





Mitglied der Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft

TOTAL AND SPECIFIC INVESTMENT



Institute of Electrochemical Process Engineering IEK-3

Forschungszentrum

CUMULATIVE INVESTMENT

Infrastructure Roll-Out



- Hydrogen more expensive during the transition period to renewable electricity-based generation
- High market penetration: battery charging needs more investment than hydrogen fueling
- For both infrastructures investment low compared to other infrastructures

Investment [€ billion]			
Renewable electricity generation scenario	374		
Electric grid enhancement plan 2030	34		
Federal transport infrastructure plan 2030	265		
Hydrogen fueling infrastructure	40		
Electric charging infrastructure	51		



COMPARISON MOBILITY COSTS

specific mobility costs [€Ct/km]



- For small vehicle fleets, i.e. 0.1 million cars, BEV fuel costs are significantly lower compared to FCEVs.
- Increase for hydrogen between 1 and 3 million cars results of switching to exclusive utilization of renewable energy for hydrogen production via electrolysis
- Mobility costs per kilometer are roughly same in the high market penetration scenario at 4.5 €ct/km for electric charging and 4.6 €ct/km => the lower efficiency of the hydrogen pathway is offset by lower surplus electricity costs.



Mitglied der Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft

CO₂ EMISSIONS & ELECTRICITY DEMAND



- Efficiency of charging infrastructure is higher, but limited in flexibility and use of surplus electricity
- Fueling infrastructure for hydrogen with inherent seasonal storage option
- Low specific CO₂ emissions for both options in high penetration scenarios with advantage for hydrogen, well below the EU emission target after 2020: 95 g_{CO2}/km



CONCLUSIONS

- Hydrogen and controlled charging key to integration of renewable electricity in transportation
- Complementary development of both infrastructures maximize energy efficiency, optimize the use of renewable energy and minimize CO₂ emissions
- Hydrogen infrastructure roll-out for transportation sector enables further large-scale applications in other sectors

NEED FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

- Integrated analysis of infrastructures and energy systems to identify win-win situations
- Modeling of **BEV charging require in depth analysis**: high uncertainties regarding number of chargers, siting and impact of fast charging on electric distribution grid
- Analyze the impact of new mobility and vehicle ownership concepts as well as autonomous driving on future transport supply concepts





http://hdl.handle.net/2128/16709



Project team:

Martin Robinius, Jochen Linßen, Thomas Grube, Markus Reuß, Peter Stenzel, Konstantinos Syranidis, Patrick Kuckertz and Detlef Stolten





REFERENCES

[7] IEA: Energy Technology Perspectives 2012 - Pathways to a Clean Energy System. International Energy Agency - OECD: Paris, 2012. ISBN 978-92-64-17488-7

[9] HyARC: *Hydrogen Data Book.* Hydrogen Analysis Reserach Center, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory & Department of Energy, 2017. http://hydrogen.pnl.gov/hydrogen-data/hydrogen-delivery, access date: 2017-05-11.

[10] Adolf, J.; Balzer, C.; Louis, J.; Schabla, U.; Fischedick, M.; Arnold, K.; Pastowski, A.; Schüwer, D.: Shell Wasserstoff-Studie -

Energie der Zukunft? Nachhaltige Mobilität durch Brennstoffzelle und H2. 37. Shell Deutschland Oil GmbH, Hamburg, 2017.

https://www.shell.de/medien/shell-publikationen/shell-hydrogen-study/, access date: 2017-10-11.

[12] MOBILITY, H.: H2-Stations. http://h2-mobility.de/en/h2-stations/. Aktualisierungsdatum: 18.07.2017. H2 MOBILITY.

[14] Linde Gas, Der sauberste Energieträger, den es je gab. Hydrogen Solutions von Linde Gas, Linde AG, Höllriegelskreuth, 2005.

[15] Wild, J.; Freymann, R.; Zenner, M.: Wasserstoff - Schlüssel zu weltweit nachhaltiger Energiewirtschaft - Beispiele aus Nordrhein-Westfalen von der Produktion zur Anwendung. EnergieRegion.NRW - Netzwerk Brennstoffzelle und Wasserstoff c/o Ministerium für Wirtschaft, Mittelstand und Energie des Landes Nordrhein-Westfahlen, 12/2009.

https://broschueren.nordrheinwestfalendirekt.de/herunterladen/der/datei/wasserstoff2009-pdf/von/wasserstoff-schluessel-zu-weltweitnachhaltiger-energiewirtschaft/vom/energieagentur/1162.

[16] IEA: Global EV Outlook 2017. International Energy Agency - OECD, Paris, 2017.

https://www.iea.org/publications/freepublications/publication/GlobalEVOutlook2017.pdf, access date: 2017-06-25.

[24] Robinius, M.: Strom- und Gasmarktdesign zur Versorgung des deutschen Straßenverkehrs mit Wasserstoff. RWTH Aachen, Institut für elektrochemische Verfahrenstechnik, Dissertation. 2015.

[26] Seydel, P.: Entwicklung und Bewertung einer langfristigen regionalen Strategie zum Aufbau einer Wasserstoffinfrastruktur - aus Basis der Modellverknüpfung eines Geografischen Informationssystems und eines Energiesystemmodells. In: (2008).

[27] BMVBS; NOW: GermanHy - Woher kommt der Wasserstoff in Deutschland bis 2050? Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung (BMVBS), 2009.

http://www.dena.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Publikationen/Verkehr/Dokumente/germanHy_Abschlussbericht.pdf, access date: 2017-04-15.

[30] McKinsey & Co.: A Portfolio of Powertrains for Europe: a Fact Based Analysis – The Role of Battery Electric Vehicles, Plug-in-Hybrids and Fuel Cell Electric Vehicles. McKinsey & Co., 2010.

[[45] BDEW: Aktualisierung und Fortführung der Studie "Die zukünftige Elektromobilitätsinfrastruktur gestalten". Bundesverband der Energie- und Wasserwirtschaft e.V. (BDEW), Berlin, 2013.

[47] Grube, T.; Linke, A.; Xu, D.; Robinius, M.; Stolten, D.: Kosten von Ladeinfrastrukturen für Batteriefahrzeuge in Deutschland. In proceedings: 10. Internationale Energiewirtschaftstagung Wien, 2017, Vienna, 15.-17.02.2017, TU Wien, 2017.



Mitglied der Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft