

Issues relating to the timing of emissions from bioenergy systems



David Neil Bird
IEA Bioenergy Conference 2012
Nov. 13 – 15 2012, Vienna

THE INNOVATION COMPANY

www.joanneum.at

Outline

2

- Introduction
- General concepts
 - The problem
 - The juggler
- An example
- Points of contention
 - The forest or the trees?
 - When does the juggler start?
- Sensitivity
- Emerging issues
 - Disturbances
 - Albedo
- Policy indicators
- Conclusions

Disclaimer

The views expressed herein are those of the author only. They should in no way be taken to reflect the official opinion of the institutions for which the author works or organizations with which the author may be affiliated.

THE INNOVATION COMPANY

Introduction

3


1. Analysis of the impacts of bioenergy generally uses conventional LCA
 - Ignores the timing of emissions and removals (life-cycle)
 - Emissions from biomass use = 0
 - Over the lifetime biomass used will regrow
2. Misconception - bioenergy has zero emissions ...
 - *bioenergy has zero emissions in the energy sector because loss of carbon stocks will be computed in the land use sector*
- Temporal dimension to emissions from bioenergy use
 - Specifically from woody biomass
 - A large emission from combustion followed by many small removals over many years during regrowth (or avoided decay)
 - A “carbon-debt” or a “carbon-investment” ?

THE INNOVATION COMPANY

Timing, the problem....

4

Even though bioenergy is in the long term a low carbon energy source, in the short term it may cause more emissions than fossil energy



Causes

1. Use existing carbon capital for bioenergy
2. Bioenergy is more carbon intense and less efficient than fossil energy
3. Accelerating the energy release phase causes a temporary increase of carbon in the atmosphere
4. Accelerating the absorption phase can compensate but it is difficult to accelerate at the same magnitude
5. Continuous or increasing use causes a persistent increase of carbon in the atmosphere

THE INNOVATION COMPANY

4

The Effect of Constant or Increasing Demand




5

- There is a persistent emission that is larger for bioenergy systems with a longer time to first benefit (*pay-back time*)
- Analogy to a juggler
 - A single ball when thrown in the air returns to Earth
 - A juggler continuously throws balls in the air
 - After a transition phase there is constant number of balls in the air
 - To influence the number of balls in the air
 - Throw the balls higher with the same frequency
"Use biomass with longer decay times or that regrows quickly"
 - Throw the balls more frequently with the same height
"Increase the biomass use"

THE INNOVATION COMPANY

An Example Forest residues to biorefinery for bioethanol

6



- Bioenergy System
 - Biorefinery producing bioethanol and phenols
 - Approx. 30% conversion efficiency
 - Supply-chain emissions = 18 gCO₂/MJ
- Reference System
 - Residues decay, average lifetime = 12.9 years
 - Gasoline, process emissions = 85 gCO₂/MJ


From Cherubini et al – Task 38 Case Study
In press.

THE INNOVATION COMPANY

The Juggler Effect

If this example provides all EU biofuel demand

7



THE INNOVATION COMPANY

Point of Contention

The forest or the trees?

8

- **Foresters' view**
 - The forest stock is increasing. How can bioenergy be causing an emission?
 - Landscape approach versus a stand approach
 - Forest management can increase carbon stocks
 - increasing forest area
 - Short rotation forestry

- **The consequences of bioenergy**
 - Comparing *with* bioenergy to *without* bioenergy
 1. The forest stock will continue to increase, but less than without bioenergy
 - See reference list
 2. If the forest is harvested in individual blocks then most of the forest is the same in both the *with* and *without* scenarios. Only the harvested blocks are important.
 3. Forest management needs to change because of bioenergy

THE INNOVATION COMPANY

Point of Contention

When does the juggler start?



9

- Why start counting from existing carbon capital forward?
- The consequences of bioenergy
 - Comparing *with* bioenergy to *without* bioenergy
 1. Past growth of stocks appears in both the *with* and *without* scenarios
 2. Analogy to financial analysis. We have capital, how do we invest it?
 3. To be consistent if we count from the past, why not count the sequestration of biomass to create fossil fuel deposits? (*Reductio ad absurdum*)
- Problem compounded by increasing bioenergy demand
- Solutions
 1. Plant first then there is no problem (Schulze et al, Sedjo)
 2. Cascading systems

THE INNOVATION COMPANY


Sensitivity Technology

10



- Bioenergy System
 - Residues to wood chips to CHP
 - Approx. 27% conversion efficiency
 - Supply-chain emissions = 22 gCO2/MJ
- Reference System
 - Residues decay, average lifetime = 12.9 years
 - Coal burning CHP
 - Conversion efficiency 43.5%
 - Emissions = 248 gCO2/MJ



From GEMIS



THE INNOVATION COMPANY


Sensitivity Fossil energy replaced

11



- Bioenergy System
 - Residues to wood chips to CHP
 - Approx. 27% conversion efficiency
 - Supply-chain emissions = 22 gCO₂/MJ
- Reference System
 - Residues decay, average lifetime = 12.9 years
 - **Natural gas CHP**
 - Conversion efficiency 42.3%
 - Emissions = 173 gCO₂/MJ



From GEMIS



THE INNOVATION COMPANY


Sensitivity Efficiency

12



- Bioenergy System
 - Residues to wood chips to CHP
 - **Approx. 42% conversion efficiency**
 - Supply-chain emissions = 22 gCO₂/MJ
- Reference System
 - Residues decay, average lifetime = 12.9 years
 - Natural gas CHP
 - Conversion efficiency 42.3%
 - Emissions = 173 gCO₂/MJ



From GEMIS



THE INNOVATION COMPANY


Sensitivity Biomass

13



- Bioenergy System
 - Whole trees to wood chips to CHP
 - Optimal rotation length = 30 years
 - Approx. 42.3% conversion efficiency
 - Supply-chain emissions = 40 gCO₂/MJ
- Reference System
 - Continued forest growth
 - Natural gas CHP
 - Conversion efficiency 42.3%
 - Emissions = 173 gCO₂/MJ

From GEMIS





THE INNOVATION COMPANY

Work in Progress !!

This diagram is work in progress. It involves a very simplistic disturbance model and assumption. This diagram should be taken to illustrate the importance and potential impacts of disturbances only.


Emerging Issues Disturbance

14



- Bioenergy System
 - Whole trees to wood chips to CHP
 - Optimal rotation length = 30 years
 - Approx. 42.3% conversion efficiency
 - Supply-chain emissions = 40 gCO₂/MJ
- Reference System
 - Continued forest growth, with 2% chance of total loss
 - Natural gas CHP
 - Conversion efficiency 42.3%
 - Emissions = 173 gCO₂/MJ


From GEMIS



THE INNOVATION COMPANY

Emerging Issues Albedo

15



Coniferous
forest and
snow
High latitudes
(Austria)



Pine plantations
and savanna
Low latitudes
(South Africa)

Neil Bird, 2009

THE INNOVATION COMPANY

Policy Indicators

16

- Current policy provides incentives for bioenergy systems that reach a specific emission intensity
 - Emission intensities are time dependent
- Policy should provide incentives for bioenergy that meets a specific time to payback

$$T_{\text{payback}} = f(I_B, I_S, I_F, T_{\text{return}})$$

I_B Conversion emission intensity

I_S Supply-chain emission intensity

I_F Displaced fossil fuel intensity

T_{return} Recovery time (e.g. decay rate, rotation length)

THE INNOVATION COMPANY

Conclusions

17

- Even though bioenergy is in the long term a low carbon energy source, in the short term it may cause more emissions than fossil energy
 - Is this a carbon investment or a carbon debt?
- This occurs because:
 - Bioenergy often starts with existing carbon capital.
 - Bioenergy tends to be more carbon intense and less efficient than fossil energy
 - Accelerating the energy release phase causes a temporary increase of carbon in the atmosphere
- Increasing bioenergy demand increases the length of time before the bioenergy has less emissions than fossil energy
- This period of time can be minimised by using bioenergy
 - From purpose grown biomass (e.g. new short rotation forests)
 - To replace appropriate technology
 - To replace carbon intense fossil energy
 - With high efficiency
 - With quick recovery or natural return
- Disturbances and albedo should be considered in the analysis

THE INNOVATION COMPANY

Suggested Reading

18

- Timing
 - Biomass Energy Resource Center. 2012. Biomass Supply and Carbon Accounting for Southeastern Forests.
 - Holtmark, B. 2010. Use of wood fuels from boreal forests will create a biofuel carbon debt with a long payback time. Statistics Norway, Research Department.
 - McKechnie J, Colombo S, Cheng J, Mabee W, MacLean HL. 2011. Forest bioenergy or forest carbon? Assessing trade-offs in greenhouse gas mitigation with wood-based fuels. Environmental Science and Technology, 45, 2, 789-95.
 - Repo A, Tuomi M, Liski J. 2011. Indirect carbon dioxide emissions from producing bioenergy from forest harvest residues. GCB Bioenergy, 3, 2, 107–115.
 - Walker, T., Cardellicchio, P., Colnes, A., Gunn, J., Kittler, B., Perschel, R., Recchia, C., Saah, D., 2010. Biomass Sustainability and Carbon Policy Study: Report to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources. Manomet Center for Conservation Sciences. Report No.: NCI-2010-03.
 - Zanchi, G., Pena, N and *Bird D.N. 2010. The upfront carbon debt of bioenergy. Report for Birdlife International by Joanneum Research. http://www.birdlife.org/eu/pdfs/Bioenergy_Joanneum_Research.pdf
 - Zanchi, G., Pena, N and *Bird D.N. 2012. Is Woody Bioenergy Carbon Neutral? A Comparative Assessment of Emissions from Consumption of Woody Bioenergy and Fossil Fuel. GCB Bioenergy. In press.
 - Holtmark, B. 2012. Harvesting in boreal forests and the biofuel carbon debt. Climatic Change, 112, 415-428.

THE INNOVATION COMPANY

Suggested Reading

19

- Forest level impacts of bioenergy
 - Biomass Energy Resource Center. 2012. Biomass Supply and Carbon Accounting for Southeastern Forests.
 - Böttcher, H., Verkerk, P.J., Gusti, M., Havlík, P., Grassi, G. 2012. Projection of the future EU forest CO2 sink as affected by recent bioenergy policies using two advanced forest management models. GCB Bioenergy Early View. Published 9 January 2012.
 - Haberl H. et al. 2012. Correcting a fundamental error in greenhouse gas accounting related to bioenergy. Energy Policy. In press.
 - Hudiburg T., Law B.E., Wirth C., Luyssaert S. 2011. Regional carbon dioxide implications of forest bioenergy production. Nature Climate Change, 1, 419-423.
 - Lippke, B.; Oneil, E.; Harrison, R.; Skog, K.; Gustavsson, L.; Sathre, R. Life cycle impacts of forest management and wood utilisation on carbon mitigation; knowns and unknowns. Carbon Management 2011, 2(3), 303-333.
 - McKechnie J, Colombo S, Cheng J, Mabee W, MacLean HL. 2011. Forest bioenergy or forest carbon? Assessing trade-offs in greenhouse gas mitigation with wood-based fuels. Environmental Science and Technology, 45, 2, 789-95.
 - Mitchell, S. R., Harmon, M. E., and O'Connell, K. E. B. (2012). Carbon debt and carbon sequestration parity in forest bioenergy production. GCB Bioenergy. doi: 10.1111/j.1757-1707.2012.01173.x
 - Schulze, E-D, et al 2012. Large-scale bioenergy from additional harvest of forest biomass is neither sustainable nor greenhouse gas neutral. Global Change Biology. In press.
 - Schwarzbauer, P and Stern T. 2010. Energy vs. material: Economic impacts of a "wood-for-energy scenario" on the forest-based sector in Austria — A simulation approach. Forest Policy and Economics, 12, 31–38.

THE INNOVATION COMPANY

20

Thank-you for your attention

neil.bird@joanneum.at

THE INNOVATION COMPANY