CONCEPT STUDY OF SMALL-SCALE BIOMASS-TO-SNG SYSTEMS WITH EXCESS POWER INTEGRATION
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ABSTRACT: In times of fluctuating renewable energies and overstrained electrical grids, the production of synthetic natural gas (SNG) and thus the utilization of the existing natural gas grid for power distribution is promising option for renewable energy systems. Innovative concepts are developed focusing on the integration of an electrolysis unit into the biomass-derived SNG production process (thermochemical pathway). Different system designs and configurations are analyzed containing the following components: Fluidized and entrained flow biomass gasifiers, gas cleaning, methanation, and gas upgrading as well as state-of-the-art electrolysis units. Process concepts are modeled using the process simulation software AspenPlus allowing the modeling of the complete process, with the aim to provide feasible solutions and the evaluation and comparision of those concepts among each other. Main focus of the study is on the integration of mass and heat flows and the optimal process design as well as operation conditions. Results show a diverse and complex situation: Methane yields vary from 28.2 to 97.5 % depending mainly on the hydrogen addition from electrolysis with advantages when using entrained flow gasifiers. However, almost complete carbon conversion to SNG can be reached with almost no loss of CO2 within the process. Cold gas efficiencies vary from 54.2 to 73.8 % which is above the stand-alone systems proving the positive synergetic effects. Overall efficiencies are between 68.4 and 75.3 % but show a decreasing trend with increasing hydrogen addition and increasing electrolysis size, respectively. However, performance data, efficiencies and methane yields have to be considered closely and properly before coming to a conclusion because of different scale effects and large deviations in electrolyzer size between 170 and 2600 KW. Thus, an economic evaluation has to be done in order to give a complete evaluation. Furthermore, all concepts depend largely on a very cheap supply to excess power into the electrical grid.

Keywords: Synthetic natural gas (SNG), biomass, alithermal gasification, catalytic conversion, small scale application, innovative concepts

1 INTRODUCTION

The production of synthetic natural gas (SNG) is a promising option for future renewable energy systems. Today the electrical grid is used for the distribution of energy, but with increasing power feed-in from fluctuating renewable sources like wind and solar, the electrical grid becomes more and more overstrained. Long-term storage regarding seasonal fluctuations cannot be addressed sufficiently with existing technology (PHS, CAES, Batteries, Flywheels, etc.) [1]. Using chemical energy carriers and SNG respectively, the existing natural gas grid can be used for storage and distribution of energy and thus the energy from biomass and excess power can be stored and distributed in an efficient way.

SNG can basically be produced by three different routes:
• Biochemical SNG production (upgrading of biogas from wet agricultural biomass)
• Thermochemical SNG production (gasification of dry biomass with subsequent synthesis and gas upgrade)  
• Power-to-Gas concept (electrolysis of water and subsequent methanation of the hydrogen with CO2).

Today SNG production from biomass slowly develops from research to pilot-scale applications. Appropriate biomass gasifiers (alithermal fluidized bed gasifiers) are nowadays operated in full-scale with thousands of full-load hours per year. However, gas cleaning and the conversion of biogenic synthesis gas to SNG is still state-of-the-art for (small- to medium-scale) biomass applications but is researched intensively in various projects [2], [3]. In addition, there is increasing interest in entrained flow gasification of biomass (state-of-the-art for coal gasification) but feed preparation (tertorization, hydrothermal carbonization or pyrolysis) and the ash melting behavior still have to be addressed and researched properly.

Apart from that, electrolysis units are nowadays commercially available from various suppliers with long-term experience for most technologies but mostly no, to very small experience regarding part load operation or load-change behavior, which is crucial for applications using fluctuating surplus electric power from renewable sources. However, more and more suppliers have realized the new requirements and are adapting to that (see e.g. NEF [4]). Furthermore, different technologies (PEM and Alkaline electrolysis) are on the market or in near-commercial stage which have to be adapted and proven for dynamic load change and part load behavior (Alkaline electrolysis) as well as scale-up to the MW-size (PEM electrolysis).

However, the link between the two technologies is still widely disregarded. Conventional electrolysis concepts and pilot projects mostly investigate hydrogen production and the direct utilization of renewable hydrogen or addition of hydrogen to the natural gas grid. But there are some limitations to these concepts e.g. given by the injection specifications (DVGV). Biomass gasification on the other hand suffers from complex and cost intensive gas cleaning and upgrading steps in order to reach injection quality.

Due to the composition of biomass (e.g. CH12O16) all biomass-based gasification processes supply a syngas with a ratio of nitrogen and a surplus of oxygen when compared to the required composition of methane (CH4). During the SNG production process the appropriate ratio has to be adjusted by separation of CO2 (standard) or addition of H2 (see Figure 1).
Furthermore, the integration of an electrolysis unit requires the electrolysis stack with appropriate periphery. Main process steps required for the integration of the concept are briefly described in the following. Fluidized bed and entrained flow gasification are considered within this study.

2.1 Fluidized bed gasification (FBG)
Fluidized bed gasification is a well-known technology for small- to medium-scale biomass applications (~0.5-50 MWa). Small-scale applications favor bubbling beds whereas larger-scale applications mainly use circulating fluidized beds (see reference plant in Grazing, Austria). Relatively low carbon conversion rates between 90 and 97% are typical for fluidized beds, with some major impact on the cold gas efficiency. The formation of organic impurities (tars) is the other main barrier for FBG technology due to severe problems downstream of the gasifier, where the tars cause blocking and formation of coke which again causes operational interruption. FBGs are known to have tar loads of 2-10 g/m³ [7]. Most gasifiers operate under atmospheric pressure but there are experiences even with pressures as high as 20 bar (single bed, e.g. Virmamo) so that a pressurized operation at 5 bar seems to be feasible without major difficulties.

A detailed review of fluidized bed gasification for biomass applications can be found elsewhere [7]. In this study an allthermal fluidized bed gasifier with heat pipes (HPR = Heat Pipe Reformer) developed at the TUM is used as model for the simulations. This gasifier is market ready and available at the required size of about 1 MWa [8].

2.2 Entrained flow gasification (EFG)
The technology of entrained flow gasification is well researched and proven for coal gasification and by far most gasification plants currently under operation are using entrained flow technology [7]. However, the adoption of EFG for biogenic feedstock is still under development because of challenging fuel pre-treatment, ash melting behavior and the poor economics of oxygen supply in small-scale applications by air separation units (ASU).

Fuel pre-treatment can be carried out by drying, torrefaction, HTC (hydrothermal carbonization), fast pyrolysis and dissolution in organic solvents. Due to various reasons discussed elsewhere in detail [7], torrefaction seems to be a very promising option for the near future when it comes to pre-treatment of relatively dry, woody biomass. However, this technology is not yet state-of-the-art but expected to be on the market in near-commercial scale in the next few years. The torrefied wood has an improved grindability, good storability and enhanced dry feeding ability. At relatively mild temperatures (200-300 °C) and atmospheric pressure, the fuel properties can be improved while integration in the overall process can safely be carried out. After grinding to typical particle sizes of approx. 30-400 μm [7], the pulverized fuel can be fed to the gasifier by pneumatic dense fluid feeding.

Entrained flow gasifiers are operated with oxygen/steam mixtures as gasification agents. For small-scale applications, oxygen supply from conventional ASU, cryogenic air separation or pressure swing adsorption (PSA) is not state-of-the-art, not available at the small size or due to poor economics not applied so
far. Entrained flow gasifiers can be designed for slugging or non-slugging operation mode either quite below (< 1200 °C) or above the ash melting temperature (1200 - 1400 °C) depending mainly on the biomass composition. However, slugging operation mode for example at approx. 1300 °C seems to be more likely suited for biomass EFG.

2.3 Gas cleaning, synthesis and upgrading

Gas cleaning can be done by cold (wet) or hot/hot gas cleaning configuration. Whereas cold gas cleaning by scrubbing technology is more or less state-of-the-art for similar processes, hot gas cleaning is not yet applied in a commercial scale. However, due to higher potential efficiency and advancement in process management hot gas cleaning seems advantageous for small-scale applications [2]. Process steps include particle removal with cyclone and filter systems, catalytic tar reforming and fixed bed sulphur- and chlorine-adsorption.

After initial gas cleaning, the conversion of synthesis gas to raw SNG takes place. The reaction of mainly carbon monoxide and hydrogen to methane and water (methanation) is a strongly exothermic, catalytic reaction at temperatures between 250 - 700 °C and pressures around 1 - 80 bar. Catalyst stability, reactor design and especially heat removal and utilization are the most complex issues to be solved. Commercial processes use adiabatic fixed bed reactors in series with intercooling and recycle streams to adjust temperatures and inhibit catalysts degradation (e.g. by Lurgi, Haldor Topsoe, Davy Process Technology) [9]. Also one-stage fluidized bed methanation is being investigated but not market-ready.

The final steps to SNG injection into the NG grid are the raw-gas upgrading steps. Drying and if necessary CO2 separation has to be applied to fulfill injection requirements. Commercial technology is available for small-scale solutions developed for biogas upgrade like pressure swing adsorption (PSA), water scrubbing or chemical as well as physical washes and membrane processes.

2.4 Electrolysis (EL)

In general, there are three main types of cells with two technologies available commercially: High temperature electrolysis (HTEL with solid oxide electrolysis cell (SOEC)), polymer electrolyte membrane electrolysis (PEMEL) and alkaline electrolysis (AEL).

Alkaline electrolysis is by far the most mature technology, features moderate investment costs, high durability and is available over a broad power range (MW). It is a proven technology up to the size of 160 MWd but suffers from low energy densities. AEL systems operate with electrolyte (KOH or potassium carbonate) and at mild temperatures, often below 100 °C. Furthermore, AEL proved sufficient dynamic behavior and by modularization part-load restrictions can be avoided.

PEM electrolysis (polymer electrolyte membrane) is a younger technology which is more and more becoming available commercially. Operating below 100 °C, PEM has the advantage to be taxavantage for dynamic operation. Electrolysis systems up to 160 kWd are available with significant growth [10].

SOECs operate at high temperatures, typically around 800 °C but are not available on a commercial scale. However research suggests high potential especially regarding integration in high temperature processes like gasification.

3 CONCEPT AND METHODOLOGY

As mentioned above, all biomass-based SNG processes have an inherent lack of hydrogen. This can either be compensated by downstream carbon separation (e.g. CO2 separation by PSA) or hydrogen addition (see Figure 1). Excess energy utilization via electrolysis and subsequent methanation on the other hand needs a carbon source (CO or CO2). By combining both processes, the synergies like excess oxygen production can be used which enhances the chance for economic investments and operation.

In order to evaluate different concept designs, the process chains are developed for most promising combinations of gasification, methanation, electrolysis and gas cleaning/upgrading. Process parameters are validated by literature and reported data from suppliers. The concepts are modeled and optimized in AspenPlus.

3.1 Integration

There are basically four points in the process from biogas to SNG where either H2 or O2 from the electrolysis can be integrated into the process for different reasons:

- Gasifier (H2 as gasification agent)
- Catalytic tar reforming (O2 for high-temperature heat supply)
- Methanation (H2 to suppress carbon formation and/or reach optimal SN number for total stoichiometric methanation)
- Gas upgrading (O2 for post-combustion of off-gas from CO2 separation and subsequent utilization of the flue gas as purge gas)

Figure 3: Combination of the Biomass-to-SNG process with an electrolysis unit for excess power integration and possible integration points

Figure 3 shows the possible process designs and integration points by combining these technologies

Overall goal of this study is to examine the efficiency potential, the technical feasibility and whether it is reasonable to think about the direct utilization of surplus power from renewable sources in such a hybrid thermochemical conversion process beyond the oxygen supply for gasification. At the end, all process configurations have to be proven both for technical feasibility and economics (not part of this study).

3.2 Evaluation

For the evaluation and discussion of results, three
parameters are analyzed: the methane yield, which gives a good indication of the yield of carbon from biomass to methane, the cold gas efficiency (CGE) for simple gas efficiency and the overall efficiency, which gives the evaluation of the processes including heat production and extraction (above 130 °C) including auxiliary power demand as well as power demand of the electrolysis unit. Formulas are given below:

\[ \eta_{\text{CH}_4} = \frac{n_{\text{CH}_4}}{n_{C,\text{fuel}}} \]

\[ \eta_{\text{CGE}} = \frac{\dot{m}_{\text{NG}} \cdot \text{LHV}_{\text{NG}}}{\dot{m}_{\text{biomass}} \cdot \text{LHV}_{\text{biomass}} + \dot{m}_{\text{H}_2} \cdot \text{LHV}_{\text{H}_2}} \]

\[ \eta_{\text{overall}} = \frac{\dot{m}_{\text{NG}} \cdot \text{LHV}_{\text{NG}} + \dot{Q}_{\text{out}}}{\dot{m}_{\text{biomass}} \cdot \text{LHV}_{\text{biomass}} + P_{\text{in}} + P_{\text{out}}} \]

Elaborate energy analysis can perhaps help for a more adequate evaluation but for such small-scale systems, economics are much more important. For reasons of clarity, the efficiency calculations like cold gas and overall efficiency are supposed to be sufficient for a qualitative, comparative study like this. Special focus is on the comparison between the cases and thus the relative evaluation and not the absolute determination of exergetic efficiencies.

4 SIMULATIONS

Process simulations are carried out using ASPEN PLUS V7.3 process simulations software with user-defined subroutines implemented by Fortran and Excel codes. All models are based on already published simulation models with some additional extensions. Validation and verification is carried out according to literature and supplier data (for further information see [7], [11]). Reference plants for validation and verification with experimental data are the biomass gasification plant in Gränges and a modified Choren-type plant for the LGT-technology (see [7], [11]). For decentralized, small-scale applications a plant size of 1 MW thermal biomass input is modeled. Due to the size, all simulations do not regard elaborate heat utilization (steam cycle, ORC, etc.) and only heat extraction above 130 °C for e.g. district heating systems is considered.

Output specifications are given by the DGNV specification for natural gas injection regulation [12] concerning gas quality and by an injection pressure of 16 bar. Heat losses are considered (determined through heat transfer calculation based on reactor volumes and pressure levels). Uniform biomass composition is assumed for all cases for reasons of comparability with following biomass composition (according to BIOBID database, TU Wien [13]).

Table I: Biomass composition (from [13])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Ash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wt% (dry)</td>
<td>47.97</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>45.39</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main components of the process flowsheet are gasifier, gas cleaning, methanation, gas upgrading and electrolysis units.

According to the process description in chapter 2, the modeling of the single process models is carried out. Exact description of the modeling of the single process steps can be found elsewhere [11].

Table II shows an overview of the simulation cases put together containing the single process steps as indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GT</th>
<th>FP</th>
<th>GC</th>
<th>Me</th>
<th>GU</th>
<th>El</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table II: Simulation cases with associated process configuration and notation

---

The main two types of complete flowsheet options (HPR- and EF-based) are described briefly in the following:

---
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4.1 HPR-based models

For the HPR models, no fuel pretreatment is necessary due to fluidized bed characteristics which can handle wide spread fuel particle size with higher moisture content. The feeding system is purged using CO₂ in order to reduce the contamination with nitrogen. The gasifier itself consists of two separated reactors, where the combustion bed provides the heat supply for the gasification bed (via heat pipes), air or a combination of air and oxygen is used for the combustion process, while steam is used as gasification agent in the gasifier. Both reactors are modeled as equilibrium reactors at 850 °C and 5 bar where the product gas composition is adapted via a restricted equilibrium approach (REA) and further adjusted by external reactions to account for methane and higher hydrocarbons (e.g. tars). The model is based on [11], where a more detailed description can be found. The heat of the flue gas is recovered and used for steam generation.

Hot gas cleaning process is carried out by cyclone separation of large coke and ash particles. These particles are recycled and fed into the combustion reactor. Subsequent catalytic tar reforming is modeled as an equilibrium reactor (RTGibbs) at 850 °C (with REA). Oxygen (from the electrolyzer) is used in the reactor for partially oxidizing the gas and maintaining the temperature of 850 °C. After cooling down to 350 °C, a filter separates small dust particles before the trace substances (mainly sulfur and chloride components) are removed in chemical adsorption processes.

The syngas is mixed with steam or hydrogen (or combination thereof), before it is fed into the methanation reactor. Steam/hydrogen addition is adapted to avoid carbon formation in the reactor and to adjust the stoichiometric number \( SN = (H_2 + CO_2) / (CO + CO_2) \). The methanation reactor is modeled as a cooled, quasi-isothermal reactor at 300 °C and approx. 4 bar. Heat from the exothermic reactions is used for water evaporation.

The final upgrading of raw-SNG consists at least of a compression and a condensation for water removal. The additional CO₂-removal is modeled using a membrane process. The membrane’s permeate contains small amounts of methane and hydrogen which requires post-combustion (using either oxygen from the electrolyzer or air). The upgraded SNG fulfills the grid injection requirements.

Figure 4 shows the process flowsheet of the HPR cases.

Figure 4: General flowsheet configuration of allothermal fluidized bed gasification (HPR) with hot gas cleaning, membrane upgrade and electrolysis unit for excess power integration (HPR HGC EL)

The different configurations only deviate in the final membrane separation step and the amount of supplied hydrogen to the methanation reactor (replacing steam addition).

4.2 EF-based models

Biomass pre-treatment is considered in the EF-based models by combining a torrefaction process with pulverization and dry-feeding system. Torrefaction is modeled in several steps. After heating and drying at 200 °C (until a water content of 3 wt% is reached), the decomposition of the biomass is modeled in a reactor. The energetic loss of biomass during the torrefaction is set to 5%, based on the LHV. This is in accordance with literature [14]. Pulverization to reach particle sizes of less than 0.5 mm is modeled in a mill with a defined energy demand of 36 kWh/t. The pulverized and sieved fuel is fed into the gasifier with small amounts of purge air. Oxygen from the electrolyzer is fed into the gasifier together with steam as gasification agent, which also homogenizes the temperature distribution within the gasifier. The required, superheated steam is generated internally, using heat from the cooling of the hot product gas. The gasifier is modeled as an equilibrium reactor with restricted equilibrium approach (REA), based on the entrained flow model described in [7].

The gasification is modeled at a temperature of 1350 °C (REA of -300 °C) and a pressure of 20 bar. The resulting gas composition is in close accordance to the data of the reference entrained flow gasifier [7].

Slag is removed from the gasifier by a particle separator and an energy loss for melting the ash is considered by an enthalpy stream. Heat losses through the walls are considered.

The hot product gas from the gasifier is cooled down stepwise to the required temperature of 350 °C. This is done either with a gas quench and a recirculation of cooled product gas or with a water quench.

Trace substances (mainly sulphur and chloride components) are removed in chemical adsorption processes, modeled as separators.

The syngas is mixed with steam, hydrogen or a combination of both before it is fed into the methanation reactor. Again, carbon formation is avoided and the stoichiometric number is adjusted. The reactor itself is modeled as a cooled, quasi-isothermal reactor at 300 °C and 18 bar, considering energy losses.

The upgrading of raw-SNG is modeled similar to the concept described in section 4.1, except for the compression that is not needed, due to the high pressure in the methanation reactor.

Figure 5 shows the process flowsheet of the EF cases.
The different configurations deviate mainly due to the different quench systems (water or gas) and again in the final membrane separation step and the amount of supplied hydrogen to the methanation reactor (replacing steam addition). Electrolysis unit is applied for all cases as replacement for the industrial-scale state-of-the-art ASU.

4.3 Electrolysis

The electrolysis unit is not modeled in detail but considered as "black box" in an excel-sheet. With 4.9 kWh/Nm³ H₂ and approximately 61 % efficiency (power to hydrogen), the container-based solution is commercially deliverable and thus state-of-the-art [4]. Different scale of hydrogen and oxygen demand is considered by modularization (parallel units).

5 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results are shown in the following chapter regarding methane yield and efficiencies defined in chapter 3. Furthermore, an analysis is given for important performance parameters for a better understanding of the results.

Figure 6 shows the simulation results of the nine configurations (4 x HPR, 5 x EF) for methane yield, cold gas efficiency and overall efficiency.

For the methane yield, highest values can be reached by the EF-cases (48.5 - 97.5 %), with the absolute best yield for the entrained flow gasifier with gas quench and optimized hydrogen addition for methanation (EF_GQ_EL-OM, 97.5 %). The HPR-cases only reach lower values (28.2 - 64.9 %) mainly due to the fact that part of the biomass has to be burned in the combustion chamber to supply the required heat for the gasification. This part of the carbon of course is lost for SNG conversion. Also there is a clear trend that by increasing hydrogen addition and increasing electrolysis output respectively, the methane yield increases too. With this, up to 97.5 % of the carbon from the biomass is captured in the energy carrier SNG and nearly no CO₂ is released into the air over the complete process.

Cold gas efficiencies show a similar trend with smaller deviations between the cases. Highest CGE is reached by the entrained flow gasification case with water quench and optimized hydrogen addition for methanation (EF_WQ_EL-OM) with 73.8 % followed by the corresponding case with gas quench (73.7 %). Again, the efficiency increases with increasing hydrogen addition and EF-cases reach slightly higher values (64.5 - 73.8 %) compared to HPR cases (54.2 - 70.0 %). For all combined processes this findings show, that by combining biogas digestion and excess power utilization a synergy effect can be reached. Two stand-alone processes for Biomass-to-SNG and Power-to-SNG reach smaller efficiencies than an optimized combination.

Overall efficiencies however show a slightly different trend with increasing hydrogen addition. Here, the base cases with no or only minimal hydrogen addition reach the best values and the absolute best case is the HPR base case with no electrolysis at all (HPR_HGC_BC, 75.3 %). Also the HPR-cases (68.4 - 75.3 %) in general reach higher overall efficiencies than EF-cases (63.8 - 71.8 %) but only by little.

To give a better understanding of the results, a further performance analysis is given in the following, showing some more detailed parameters for the overall evaluation. Figure 7 shows some performance characteristics regarding output and input streams.

It can be seen from Figure 7, that there is quite a deviation between the cases and configurations regarding e.g. SNG output. Keeping the biomass input constant at 1 MW, the SNG output varies from 540 kW (HPR_HGC_BC) to 1900 kW (EF_WQ_GQ_EL-OM). Also the size of the electrolysis unit (power demand electrolyzer) compared to the gasifier is quite different for the single cases. The HPR-cases have significantly less power demand of the electrolyzer due to no need of
oxygen supply only in case of optimized methanation the
electrolyzer reaches 1.3 MW. The base case of the EF-
cases with only oxygen supply to the gasifier already
needs an electrolyzer with nearly 1 MW.

Summing up, performance data, efficiencies and
yields have to be considered closely and properly before
coming to an absolute conclusion. Size effects and
relative scale of the gasifier and the electrolyzer are
varying over a wide range (0.17 – 2.6 MW) which has
to be taken into account when it comes to economics.
Only after an elaborate economical study, the best overall
concept and configuration can be chosen. This study is
still ongoing.

6 CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

Following conclusions can be drawn from the
findings discussed in chapter 5:

All concepts depend largely on a very cheap supply
and local access to excess power in the electrical grid.
The HPR-based cases show more flexibility due to
the O₂ utilization at three integration points (gasifier, tar
reforming and partial oxidation) instead of two (EF-based
concepts). Furthermore, the EF-based cases have huge O₂
supplies for the H₂-demand driven cases. Economic
calculations have to show whether the O₂ supplies can
be sold and turned into an economic advantage. However,
as cold gas efficiencies and methane yield increase with
increasing hydrogen addition, the overall efficiency
decreases at the same time, so that the optimal
configuration may not be the most efficient and the other
way round.

SNG outputs differ significantly between 0.54 and
1.9 MW) with electrolysis size and methane yields
improve due to H₂ input by electrolysis. That is why an
elaborate economic evaluation has to show, whether the
magnitude of output increase is sufficient for the higher
investment in the electrolysis unit. In general, the
required sizes of the electrolysis units are substantial
larger than the gasification part in many cases. This is
enhanced by the fact, that due to fluctuating supply, the
electrolyzer has to be designed for about 1500 h/a in
comparison to the approx. 7500 h/a of the gasifier (in
connection with an adequate buffer storage). However, in
case of the EF-based concepts, the electrolyzer unit
replaces the cost-intensive ASU which would be
necessary otherwise.

Summarizing, up to nearly 98 % of the carbon
present in the biomass can be converted and captured in
the SNG, which makes these processes carbon-negative.
Furthermore, synergies of biomass gasification and
electrolysis exist and can be used efficiently. However,
local conditions and requirements will in the end
determine the best economical concept.
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