

Research Title

Techno-Economic Analysis of Direct Combustion and Gasification Systems for Off-grid Energy Supply: A Case for Organic Rankine Cycle and Dual Fluidized-Bed

Mohammad Ali Bagherian^{1,2} , Kamyar Mehranzamir^{2,*}, Jubaer Ahmed³, Marwan Nafea², Hadi Nabipour-Afrouzi³, Chin-leong Wooi⁴, Amin Beiranvand Pour⁵, Shahabaldin Rezanian⁶, Seyed Morteza Alizadeh⁷

¹ École Polytechnique de Louvain, Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium, mohammad.bagherian@student.uclouvain.be

² Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Faculty of Science and Engineering, University of Nottingham Malaysia , Jalan Broga, 43500 Semenyih, Selangor, Malaysia, Kamyar.mehranzamir@nottingham.edu.my, Marwan.Nafea@nottingham.edu.my

³ Faculty of Engineering, computing and science, Swinburne University of Technology Sarawak, Kuching, Malaysia, JA Ahmed@swinburne.edu.my, HAFrouzi@swinburne.edu.my

⁴ Centre of Excellence for Renewable Energy School of Electrical Systems, Engineering, Universiti Malaysia Perlis Pauh, Putra Campus 02600 Arau, Perlis, Malaysia, clwooi@unimap.edu.my

⁵ Institute of Oceanography and Environment (INOS), Universiti Malaysia Terengganu (UMT), 21030, Kuala Nerus, Terengganu, Malaysia, beiranvand.pour@umt.edu.my

⁶ Department of Environment and Energy, Sejong University, Seoul 05006, South Korea, shahab.rezanian@sejong.ac.kr

⁷ Engineering Institute of Technology, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia, morteza.alizadeh@eit.edu.au

ABSTRACT

Biomass is one of the most versatile sustainable energy sources. This versatility allows utilization of different biomass feedstock using a variety of conversion techniques. Often, a biomass-to-bioenergy conversion method is selected depending on the application, end use product, and the type of feedstock. In many applications such as residential energy supply, it is possible to select amongst various technologies. Although, there exist several challenges such as cost-effectiveness and sustainability that constrains bioenergy development. To this end, this research elaborates on the impacts of different conversion methods on techno-economic performance of bioenergy systems for residential energy supply. In this context, Organic Rankine Cycle based on direct combustion, and Dual Fluidized-Bed technology based on gasification were selected for that purpose. A techno-economic comparative analysis illustrates that the primary product of the system and fuel cost are the two most important factors in feasibility assessment. The negative impact of feedstock price was more severe on the Organic Rankine Cycle. For wood chips prices below 55\$/t, Organic Rankine Cycle could be the better option due to lower capital and maintenance costs. In contrast, Dual Fluidized-Bed could better tolerate the variation of feedstock price; offering 8% lower cost of energy at 65\$/t wood chips.

KEYWORDS

Combined Heat and Power (CHP)
HOMER PRO
Off-grid Electrification
Techno-economic Assessment
Organic Rankine Cycle (ORC)
Dual Fluidized-Bed (DFB)

HIGHLIGHTS

- Direct combustion and gasification are the two most-utilized technologies for biomass conversion
 - Two bioenergy systems based on Organic Rankine Cycle and Dual Fluidized-Bed are developed
 - The two systems are implemented in a case study for off-grid combined heat and power production
 - Feedstock price and primary product are the two most important factors in technology selection
-

Abbreviations

CHP	Combined Heat and Power	LCOE	Levelized Cost of Electricity
CCHP	Combined Cooling Heating and Power	NPV	Net Present Value
CRF	Capital Recovery Factor	ORC	Organic Rankine Cycle
DH	District Heating	OPH	Operating Hours
FC	Fuel Cell	PEC	Primary Energy Consumption
GHG	Greenhouse Gases	PBP	Payback Period
HHV	Higher Heating Value	LHV	Lower Heating Value
ICE	Internal Combustion Engine	IES	Integrated Energy System
RES	Renewable Energy Sources		

Variables

$\dot{m}$	Mass flow rate (kg/s)	η_{gasifier}	Gasifier efficiency (%)
W	Output power (kJ/s)	η_{el}	Electrical efficiency (%)
$\dot{Q}$	Rate of input heat (kJ/s)	η_{ex}	Heat exchanger efficiency (%)
$\dot{C}$	Cost flow	L_{res}	Operating Reserve (W)
T	Temperature (K)	C_p	Specific heat capacity (kJ/kg K)
$\bar{L}_{\text{primary}}$	Average primary load (kWh)	η_{CHP}	CHP efficiency (%)
C_i	Capital cost for unit i (\$)	C_{total}	Total capital cost
c_{dep}	Cost of development (\$/MWh)	c_{int}	Capital Interest (\$/MWh)
θ_{int}	Interest factor	θ_{dev}	Development factor
$C_{\text{opm},i}$	Operating cost for unit i (\$)	c_{fuel}	Specific cost of fuel (\$/t)

1 Introduction

Over the past decade, global energy demand has been increasing at a fluctuating rate; experiencing 2.9% annual growth in 2018 which was the fastest rate seen since 2010. Various influencing parameters such as population growth, economic improvements, and weather-related effects have contributed to the increase of energy demand over the years. Weather-related effects are the direct consequence of climate change which has led to unforeseeable climate characteristics, and unexpected growth in energy demand for cooling and heating purposes. Rising energy demand is accompanied by greater challenges, concerning energy security and environmental impacts. Unfortunately, the growing energy consumption has resulted in excessive utilization of energy resources and accelerated the carbon emissions. This is due to the fact that the fossil fuels are still dominant in the energy sector, and they have established their dependency for power and heat generation. In the power sector, despite significant growth in renewable penetration, the fuel mix in the global power market remains relatively the same, as coal maintains its precedence over non-fossil fuel resources at 38% in 2018 [1]. Power generation is the single largest source of carbon emissions, and it should play the central role in the energy transition plan towards low carbon society. Decarbonization of the power sector, with regards to increasing the share of renewable resources in the fuel mix, highlights a crucial point that many institutions and researchers have emphasized recently. A sustainable and clean energy future will require a transformation in the way we generate, deliver, and consume electricity as well as other forms of energy. Diminishing fossil fuels intensity of the energy sector seeks for more versatile sustainable resources in order to replace fossil fuels not just for electricity generation, but also heating, cooling, and transportation as well. Among renewable resources, biomass is the one accompanied by greater prosperity in every country around the world.

Availability of forestry, agricultural residues, and all kinds of wastes in every country provided the opportunity for biomass resources to become the largest renewable source on the planet. In 2017, bioenergy was responsible for 70% of the renewable energy consumption, in which biomass dominated the third place on the most utilized RES for power generation, after hydropower and wind [2]. The versatility of biomass resources to be utilized in gaseous, liquid, and solid forms has featured bioenergy in all the energy future scenarios for addressing climate change and global warming. With regards to energy transition strategies for 2030 and 2050, biomass will become the most prominent source of energy accounting for 26% of the primary energy supply in 2050 [3]. Being the first source of energy to be realized by mankind, the utilization of biomass in today's world is primarily evolved around heat generation. In the heat market, biomass was responsible for 96% share of renewable heating production in 2017, while this was only 9% and 3% in the electricity and transportation sector, respectively [4]. This owes to the fact that the most common technique for utilization of biomass is the conventional burning of solid biofuels such as wood pellet. Although this method is associated with economic advantages due to commercial availability, it suffers from higher environmental consequences and limited type of feedstock to be utilized.

In this regard, significant contributions have been made over the past decades to introduce other methods of utilization with the intention to improve conversion efficiency, lower environmental impacts, and broaden the classification of biomass for energy generation. This introduced various techniques, including, but not limited to: Gasification, Pyrolysis, and Fermentation; each being suitable for different types of biomass feedstock.

There is no doubt that renewable technologies have experienced significant progress driven by international policies, innovation, and financial investments. However, this development has not been progressive in all countries or sectors. The energy sector is primarily comprised of power, heat, and transportation, in which heat and transportation make up around 80% of the total global energy demand, while being the two most neglected sectors concerning renewable development and decarbonization. In this context, energy systems integration which combines different energy carriers has been one of the most promising solutions to energy-related problems. This method makes for a very strong proposition given that it maximizes efficiency, lowers environmental impacts, improves economic aspects, and increases renewable share across all energy sectors. One of the first attempts towards energy systems integration was combined heat and power (CHP) production. In this method of energy generation, electrical and thermal energy are being produced simultaneously. Originally, the main idea was to recover and store the waste heat from power generation in order to be utilized during winter for residential applications [4]. Today, commercial CHP systems are being developed with different prime movers, sizes, and energy sequences so as to satisfy both electricity as well as process heat, space heating, or hot water demand. Combined heat and power is associated with several advantages over the conventional stand-alone generation, including: fuel diversification, improved overall efficiency, and lower environmental impacts. Integration of renewable resources into CHP systems as fuel for generation, such as biomass, represents an alternative for the combination of an efficient energy technology and a sustainable fuel [5].

Worthwhile contributions have been made to design, optimize, and implement various types of biomass-fueled CHP systems for domestic and industrial applications aiming at environmental protection and energy saving. Although, there are very limited contributions to justifying and comparing different biomass to bioenergy conversion techniques from technical, environmental, and economic aspects. In the subject of biomass gasification, several studies carried out thermo-economic assessment of gasification systems in integration with other energy generation technologies such as Fuel Cell (FC) [6, 7], Stirling engines [8, 9], and micro-turbines [10, 11]. Often, optimizing the Levelized Cost of Energy (LCOE) and exergy efficiency, by performing sensitivity analyses on several thermodynamic parameters, was the main objective in these studies. Different studies utilized different biomass resources, however, woody biomass and animal manure were of interest to many researchers [11–13]. Availability of manure and wet waste in majority of countries has made them an interesting source not just for power generation, but also for syngas and biomethane production using technologies such as anaerobic digestion (AD) [14, 15]. In an alternative

approach, implementation of biomass gasification CHP systems has also gained prominence in wastewater treatment plants (WWTP) for electricity and heating generation [16–18]. In such systems, heating demand was the priority since wet sludges had to be dried in order to be utilized for gasification and combustion purposes. Self-sufficiency in such systems was the main objective; producing enough energy from dried sludge to perform wastewater treatment process.

In recent studies, significant advantages of gasification and ORC integration have been emphasized numerously. Possible utilization of low temperature thermal sources by ORC systems has made them a promising CHP source in biomass gasification systems. In gasification systems, temperature of flue gas and raw syngas can drop as much as 70% after treatment and cleaning. ORC systems can utilize the remaining waste thermal energy for auxiliary power and heat generation. High overall efficiency of ORC systems gained prominence in District Heating (DH) applications as well as saturated steam production in industry [4]. In general, the integration of gasification and ORC systems can be divided into two primary groups depending on the application. For domestic applications (district heating), gasification is the suitable choice for electricity generation, while ORC is more responsible for thermal energy production. This is due to gasification and ORC having higher conversion efficiency and overall efficiency, respectively. On the other hand, for industrial applications (e.g., drying or superheated steam production), thermal content of syngas from gasification is utilized for thermal energy production, while ORC is mainly implemented for powering up the facility. **Error! Reference source not found.** presents recent studies on integration of gasification with ORC systems for cogeneration applications.

Table 1. Summary of preliminary studies on biomass-fueled CHP systems.

Reference	Research Objective(s)	CHP System	Key Findings
[19]	Conducting exergoeconomic analysis on an integrated system consisted of downdraft gasifier and Kalina cycle with carbon capture facility and district heating system.	ORC Gasification	Unit cost of product declines with the increment of ammonia concentration and temperature difference at air preheater terminal. Higher ammonia concentration lowers the exergy efficiency and net power output.
[20]	Integrating biomass gasification with solar thermal energy for power and steam generation. Optimizing the performance by modelling the heat exchanger network precisely.	Gasification Solar Thermal ORC	Oxygen/steam mixture gasification agent could yield the highest cold gas efficiency. Increasing the heat input from the solar thermal system to 15 MW _{th} could significantly increase the power production.
[21]	Conducting techno-economic analysis and environmental assessment of a biomass-based gasification system integrated with FC, gas turbine, and ORC.	ORC Gasification FC	Current density of the FC modules can influence the electrical specific biomass composition. The inlet temperature of the ORC expander has a strong impact on the power generation of the ORC system.

[10]	Investigating the possible integration of a steam injected micro gas turbine with ORC for improving environmental performance.	ORC Gasification	Despite increasing net power production, the electrical efficiency was penalized by adopting the wet cycle, however, thermal energy production could increase significantly.
[22]	Thermo-economic assessment of a bioenergy system that is based on the integration of a gasification system running on rice husk with an ORC.	ORC Gasification	Equivalent ratio of the gasifier had significant impacts on electricity and heat generation. This value should be set based on the primary energy product that is required.
[23]	Investigating the thermo-economic performance of an integrated solar-biomass energy system that is consisted of gasification, ORC, and concentrating solar power (CSP).	ORC Gasification CSP	Coupling CSP with the biomass-fueled system could increase the overall conversion efficiency at the cost of economic improvement. Net present value and internal rate of return influenced negatively by CSP operation.

There is no deniability on the advantages of biomass resources over fossil fuels. Lowering environmental impacts and providing energy security are the primary reasons that attracted a great deal of attention towards bioenergy systems. Despite its renewability, biomass sustainability is constrained by influencing factors concerning practical, environmental, and economic feasibility. With various conversion techniques and possible utilization in different states of matter, cost-effectiveness and sustainability are the current challenges that any biofueled energy system is faced today. Several factors such as resource availability, transportation costs, size of plant, and type of feedstock should be taken into consideration while implementing a biomass-fueled energy system. **These parameters along with influencing factors of CHP systems can cause complexity and discouragement for further developments of biofueled-CHP systems.** The costly nature of such configurations, lack of information on renewable development, and absence of comprehensive research on economic and environmental perspectives of biofueled-CHP systems, particularly for mini-grid applications, have had more severe impacts on remote locations. In this regard, the current research elaborates on the integration of biomass resources for combined heat and power production in off-grid locations using two well-known conversion technologies, namely: Direct Combustion and Gasification. Although the two methods are different in the principle of operation and fundamental characteristics, each one of these techniques has its own merits. Thus, it is of utmost importance to address the economic and environmental challenges of adopting these technologies for domestic applications. To this end, different energy scenarios are implemented, in which biomass-to-energy conversion is carried out using Direct Combustion or Gasification. These two configurations are presented to investigate the effect of biomass energy conversion on both technical and economic aspects. Further, the practical viability of each system is being analyzed when biomass is consumed for

cogeneration applications in mini-grids. For that purpose, a case study is presented in which the suggested structures are responsible for satisfying the energy demands of Masset village located in Haida Gwaii, Canada. The primary contributions of this research can be summarized as follow:

- Realizing the two most-well known biomass conversion techniques for satisfying residential energy demands in remote locations
- Developing a direct combustion system based on Organic Rankine Cycle (ORC), and a gasification system based on Dual Fluidized Bed (DFB).
- Conducting a comparative analysis to evaluating the performance of each system concerning technical and economic aspects
- Implementing the energy systems in a case study with realistic data in terms of energy profile, capital cost, and economic incentives

In this study, [Section 1](#) was focused on previous research works and introduced the objectives of this study. Given that there are very limited research works in the relevant literature, which performed such precise comparative analysis between direct combustion and gasification for this particular application, the literature review was primarily fixated on model development and optimization of gasification and ORC systems. The most recent designs are realized and analyzed thoroughly. [Section 2](#) looks into the model description and the methods that are utilized to carry out the current research. This section presents a comprehensive description of ORC and gasification systems, and lays out the suggested energy scenarios. In [Section 3](#), the case study properties are discussed in terms of technical and economic aspects. [Section 4](#) presents the simulation results, in which the two configurations are being compared technically and economically. [Section 5](#) concludes this research by emphasizing the key findings and the results.

2 Methods and Materials

Developing biomass-to-bioenergy systems requires careful consideration of upstream as well as downstream supply chain. This is done to account for all the influencing factors involving the supply of biomass and generating energy. These factors include technical, environmental, and economic parameters which may vary depending on the conversion technology that is being implemented. In this section, the choice of biomass feedstock, the conversion technologies, economic indices, and environmental incentives are discussed thoroughly.

2.1 Biomass Feedstock

Physical and chemical characteristics of biomass resources have strong impacts on the method of utilization and the required end-use product. Influencing parameters such as particle size, ash content, and moisture level may vary from one type of biomass to another, or even within a feedstock lot. Often, small-scale energy systems require feedstock quality control, as opposed to large-scale systems [24]. To this end,

high-quality briquettes or pellets were the first options for energy generation. One of the key parameters in the selection of feedstock was the moisture content (MC). This parameter can affect syngas content and gasification time, or increase burn-out time in combustion. Provided that both methods of energy conversion require a limited level of moisture, it was intended to select a type of feedstock with limited MC. Another important factor in the selection of proper feedstock was the calorific value which expressed the energy content of the biomass feedstock. Considering the upstream biomass supply chain, several parameters including: cost and ease of transportation, bulk density, storage capacity, and availability of feedstock in that particular location were taken into consideration. In accordance with **Table 2**, dried wood chips were the best option as fuel for generation in both conversion technologies. The limited MC, high calorific value, low ash content, and high availability were the primary reasons that made this type of feedstock suitable for the application in this study. In general, the lower ash and MC would be advantageous for utilization in the gasification and combustion process, respectively. Another important fact that made wood chips a better option over other resources such as Pine Wood and Sawdust Pellet was availability and lower cost on the dry basis. Wood chips is the first choice for large-scale CHP gasification systems.

Transporting energy resources and its associated costs is an influencing factor in any energy system, particularly for biomass due to the lower energy density compared to that of fossil fuels. In this study, similar quantification analysis that was conducted in Ref. [25] was employed in order to determine the true cost of wood chips for power and heat generation. Evaluating the influence of transportation cost on the overall price of feedstock requires an understanding of two cost components, namely: distance variable cost (DVC) and distance fixed cost (DFC). While DVC depends directly on the distance and mode of transportation, DFC is an independent component to distance which is mainly relied on the type of biomass feedstock [26]. DVC was the parameter that was considered in this study due to the fact that such evaluation takes into account the mode of transportation as well as feedstock characteristics. The value of DVC for wood chips was recorded at 0.07, 0.017, and 0.01 \$/tonnes/km by means of truck, rail, and ship transportation, respectively.

Table 2. Characteristics of common woody biomass feedstock (wt%) [27]

Type	MC (%)	Ash Content (%)	C (%)	H (%)	N (%)	LHV (MJ/kg)	Bulk Density (kg/m ³)
Pine Wood	9.5	0.7	49.7	6.5	0.2	18.9	750
Sawdust Pellet	10.0	0.8	49.8	6.4	0.3	17.4	650
Wood Chips [28]	23.0	0.8	46.6	5.5	0.27	19.0	250
Birch Wood	7.4	2.6	48.3	8.3	0.1	19.3	600
Fire Wood	7.7	5.8	48.6	6.5	0.2	18.9	700-800

2.2 Biomass Gasification

The suggested gasification system in this study was based on a dual fluidized-bed (DFB) gasifier coupled with internal combustion engines (ICEs). For the application considered, a fluidized-bed gasifier was the best option since the possibility of up-scaling within a wide power range is provided [29]. In comparison with the fixed-bed technology, changes in fuel characteristics are more tolerable since the ratio of biomass to oxygen can be varied independently to maintain the temperature uniform throughout the bed [30]. The major drawback of such a compact and economic arrangement is the contamination of syngas with nitrogen, tars, and particles which drastically reduces the heating value of gaseous fuel. This is due to the fact that conventional fluidized-bed gasifiers involve bed materials and biomass in a single reactor. Dual fluidized-bed gasifier can overcome this issue by employing two physically separated reaction zones (reactors), namely: gasifier and combustor, with a possible circulation of bed material (**Figure 1**) [31]. The implemented DFB gasification system (**Figure 2**) was based on an operational biomass CHP plant in Güssing, Austria [32], including the improvements that were carried out in Ref. [33]. In this system, a controlled feeder transfers biomass feedstock to the gasifier, which is operated in bubbling bed regime and fluidized with a portion of recycled syngas. Thermal decomposing of woody feedstock into char and gas takes place in this reactor at 760°C. Further, the char is transferred to the combustion reactor through the circulation of fluidized bed material. The combustion process is carried out in the presence of air and a portion of cleaned syngas at 980°C. This process leads to the formation of hot flue gas and ashes, in which the flue gas is utilized for maintaining the temperature of the catalytic tar reformer at 900°C. After combustion, the heated sand bed is circulated back to the top of the gasifier reactor, providing the required heat for the endothermic gasification reaction (950°C) through heat transfer between descending sand particles and ascending pyrolysis gas.

The produced raw syngas contains nitrogen, tar, and solid particles which should be removed for its utilization in ICEs. To this end, a gas cleaning facility based on tar cracking and Venturi Scrubber was considered for this purpose. There are numerous catalysts that could be utilized for tar reforming application, amongst which, a natural mineral (olivine) was considered in this study. After tar reduction, the syngas should be cooled down to a temperature level below 150°C in order to meet the temperature requirement for Venturi Scrubber. This process was carried out using a radiant cooler, in which the recovered heat was utilized for district heating application (80/105°C). Clean syngas for combustion in ICEs could be extracted after the Venturi Scrubber at 40°C temperature with 13.6 MJ/kg lower heating value (LHV).

Electrical energy could be generated by means of any natural gas engine. The selection of the JMS 620 Jenbacher gas engine was considered in this study due to the fact that such ICE was capable of generating 3,044 kW power (running on biogas) with 43% electrical efficiency, and 2,982 kW heat with 42.1% thermal efficiency. Gasifier efficiency is often described in terms of cold gas efficiency which presents the

ratio between energy contained in the syngas and the energy contained in the biomass feedstock [34]. This can be calculated using Equation (1), in which $\dot{m}_{\text{gas}}$ and $\dot{m}_{\text{bio}}$ are the mass flow rate of syngas and biomass feedstock, respectively. The LHV of the syngas can be determined using Equation (2) based on the molar fraction (Y_z) and LHV of the different gas constituents [35]. The net electric and thermal efficiencies of CHP system can be calculated based on Equations (3), (4) and (5). The syngas consumption of biogas engine (f_{syngas}) can be determined using Equation (6), in which f_{engine} , $\text{LHV}_{\text{natural gas}}$, and $\text{LHV}_{\text{syngas}}$ indicate natural gas consumption of engine, LHV of natural gas, and LHV of syngas, respectively. **Table 3** provides technical specifications of the gasification CHP system. Rated values of biogas engine are given at full-load condition.

$$\eta_{\text{gasifier}} = \frac{\dot{m}_{\text{gas}} \cdot \text{LHV}_{\text{gas}}}{\dot{m}_{\text{bio}} \cdot \text{LHV}_{\text{bio}}} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{LHV}_{\text{gas}} = \sum Y_z \cdot \text{LHV}_z \quad (z = \text{CO}, \text{CH}_4, \text{H}_2) \quad (2)$$

$$\eta_e = \frac{\dot{W}_{\text{engine}} - \dot{W}_{\text{input}}}{\text{LHV}_{\text{bio}} \times \dot{m}_{\text{bio}}} \quad (3)$$

$$\eta_{\text{th}} = \frac{\dot{Q}_{\text{DH}} - \dot{Q}_{\text{input}}}{\text{LHV}_{\text{bio}} \times \dot{m}_{\text{bio}}} \quad (4)$$

$$\eta_{\text{CHP}} = \eta_e + \eta_{\text{th}} \quad (5)$$

$$f_{\text{syngas}} = \frac{f_{\text{engine}} \times \text{LHV}_{\text{natural gas}}}{\text{LHV}_{\text{syngas}}} \quad (6)$$

Table 3. Technical properties of the CHP system based on gasification (100% rated).

Properties	Unit	Value
Clean Syngas Temperature	°C	40.0
Clean Syngas LHV [36]	MJ/kg	13.6
Cold Gas Efficiency [37]	%	75.0
Temperature of the Gasifier Bed	°C	760
Temperature of the Combustion	°C	980
Temperature of the Raw Syngas	°C	960
Recycled Syngas to Gasifier	[vol%]	14.0
Clean Syngas to Combustor	[vol%]	12.6
Electrical output of JMS 620 Engine	kW	3,044
Thermal output of JMS 620 Engine	kW	2,982
Electrical Efficiency of JMS 620 Engine	%	43
Thermal Efficiency of JMS 620 Engine	%	42.1
Fuel Consumption of JMS 620 Engine (Fuel LHV: 44 MJ/kg)	kg/h	615
Fuel Consumption of JMS 620 Engine (Fuel LHV: 13.6 MJ/kg)	kg/h	1,986
Hot water flow rate of JMS 620 Engine	m ³ /h	89.9
Overall electric efficiency [33]	%	27%
Overall heat efficiency [38]	%	53%




Figure 1. Block diagram representation of dual fluidized-bed gasification process [39].




Figure 2. Schematic representation of the suggested CHP system based on gasification.

2.3 Biomass Combustion

Extracted heat in the direct combustion of biomass is often utilized in circulation loops such as Rankine Cycles to convert the heat into mechanical energy for power generation. In this study, the use of Organic Rankine Cycle was suggested to take advantage of the thermodynamic properties of organic working fluids. The developed model was comprised of grate biomass boiler, ORC system, MEA-based carbon capture facility, and a number of pumps and inter-connected pipelines for thermal oil circulation (**Figure 3**). The principle of operation in the ORC-based CHP system is much simpler than the gasification process. The thermal efficiency of the boiler was in the range of 85 to 90%, and the combustion would take place once the boiler's temperature would reach as high as 850°C. The heat produced during combustion of biomass in the boiler was transferred to the pressurized thermal oil (Therminol 66) that circulated between the boiler and the evaporator. The organic working fluid (octamethyltrisiloxane) would then absorb the heat from the pressurized thermal oil in the evaporator in order to flow into the expander and generate power.

Thermal energy production for domestic use would take place in the condenser and economizer. The inlet water to the DH system was at 50°C and it was split using between the economizer and condenser. In the economizer, hot water for DH application (above 80°C) was produced by recovering the thermal energy of flue gas before entering the carbon capture facility. In the condenser, heat recovery would take place between the working fluid and water during condensation. **In this system, the flue gas exiting out of the boiler was at 950°C temperature. Its thermal energy was utilized for preheating the air entering into the**

boiler, while flowing into the economizer at 170°C. The flue gas would then continue into the carbon capture facility based on monoethanolamine (MEA) in order to limit CO₂ emissions as much as possible. Given the maturity and simplicity of this technology, MEA was the best option for this application, even though, it required thermal energy to regenerate MEA. The input heat to the ORC system ($\dot{Q}_{in}$) can be described based on the total input heat rate to the boiler ($\dot{Q}_{bio}$) and the boiler's efficiency (η_{boiler}) using Equation 7. $\dot{Q}_{in}$ can also be expressed in terms of the average specific heat capacity of boiler thermal oil (c_{oil}), its mass flow rate ($\dot{m}_{oil}$), and the temperature difference of the pressurized thermal oil when entering and exiting out of the boiler [40]. The following Equations (7)-(14) indicate heat transfer and the work done by evaporator ($\dot{Q}_{ev}$), expander ($\dot{W}_{exp}$), condenser ($\dot{Q}_{con}$), and pumps ($\dot{W}_{pump}$). The overall efficiency of the ORC system can be calculated using Equation (15) and (16). **Table 4** provides the technical properties of the CHP system based on direct combustion.

$$\dot{Q}_{bio} = \dot{m}_{bio} \cdot LHV_{bio} \quad (7)$$

$$\dot{Q}_{in} = \dot{Q}_{bio} \cdot \eta_{boiler} \quad (8)$$

$$\dot{Q}_{in} = c_{oil} \cdot \dot{m}_{oil} \cdot (T_{out} - T_{in}) \quad (9)$$

$$\dot{Q}_{ev} = c_{ORC} \cdot \dot{m}_{ORC} \cdot (T_{out} - T_{in}) \quad (10)$$

$$\dot{W}_{exp} = c_{ORC} \cdot \dot{m}_{ORC} \cdot (T_{out} - T_{in}) \cdot \eta_{turbine} \quad (11)$$

$$\dot{Q}_{con} = c_{ORC} \cdot \dot{m}_{ORC} \cdot (T_{out} - T_{in}) \quad (12)$$

$$\dot{W}_{pump} = c_{ORC} \cdot \dot{m}_{ORC} \cdot (T_{out} - T_{in}) \cdot \eta_{pump} \quad (13)$$

$$\dot{W}_{pump} = c_{water} \cdot \dot{m}_{water} \cdot (T_{out} - T_{in}) \cdot \eta_{pump} \quad (14)$$

$$\eta_{el} = \frac{\dot{W}_{exp} - 3 \times \dot{W}_{pump}}{\dot{Q}_{bio}} \quad (15)$$

$$\eta_{th} = \frac{(\dot{W}_{exp} - 3 \times \dot{W}_{pump}) + \dot{Q}_{DH}}{\dot{Q}_{bio}} \quad (16)$$

Table 4. Technical properties of the CHP system based on direct combustion (100% rated).

Parameter	Unit	Value
Turbine Isentropic Efficiency	%	80
Pump Efficiency	%	75
Grate Boiler Efficiency	%	85
Thermal Oil Fluid	-	Therminol 66
Working Fluid	-	Octamethyltrisiloxane C ₈ H ₂₄ Si ₃ O ₂
Flue Gas Outlet Temperature	°C	950
Thermal Oil Loop Temperature (inlet/outlet)	°C	320/250
Evaporation Temperature	°C	<300
Condensation Temperature	°C	90
Domestic Hot Water Temperature (inlet/outlet)	°C	50/80
Electrical Efficiency	%	18




Figure 3. Schematic representation of the suggested CHP system based on ORC.

2.4 Economic Incentives and Environmental Policies

Economic indices concern all financial factors that impacts the operation of the system over the project lifetime. Economic parameters include: financial availability, expenses, and government incentives that influence the cost of energy. Environmental incentives can also affect the economic feasibility of an energy system. Sustainability and carbon emissions are the two most important factors that are associated with significant penalties if domestic and international limitations are not met. In this context, both economic and environmental perspectives are tied, therefore, it is of utmost importance to consider both aspects when implementing such biofuel energy systems. Although, economic indices and environmental incentives might vary depending on the domestic and international policies in different countries. The majority of developed countries have firm regulations to limit GHG emissions as well as encourage the energy sectors to adopt more sustainable methods of generation. Carbon tax and federal tax return were the two government incentives that were considered in this study.

Economic analysis was performed taking into consideration all the stages of the biomass-to-energy supply chain. All the economic parameters fell into four main categories namely: investment cost,

operating and maintenance cost, development cost, and fuel cost. In accordance with the net present cost (NPC) and levelized cost of energy (LCOE), system attractiveness and feasibility could be compared between the two configurations. Given that practical viability was one of the primary objectives, cost allocation for gasification and ORC systems was based on operational plants or the existing units in the market. In this context, the Gothenburg Biogas Gasification project located in Sweden [41], and the Scharnhäuser Park ORC project located in Germany [42] were considered as the reference systems for unit cost allocation (investment, operating, and maintenance), development cost calculation, and fuel price estimation for the two proposed configurations; this was carried out using Equations (17)-(30).

Investment cost (C_i) allocation for the primary units (i) in each system was performed using Equation (17); knowing the reference plant investment cost (C_r), its capacity (S_r), incidence factor (m), and the capacity required (S). The sum of investment costs for the primary units would result in the total investment cost of the system (C_{total}), which then would be used for specific capital cost calculation related to the depreciation (c_{dep}) and the interest from the investment (c_{int}). These two costs are the function of project lifetime (LT), interest factor (θ_{int}), and full-load hours (FLH) operation. The same cost allocation method was used in Equations (23)-(25) for operating and maintenance cost calculation. Specific fuel cost (c_{fuel}) and the specific cost of production ($c_{production}$) were determined using Equation (26) and Equation (27), respectively. The LCOE and NPC could be represented based on the specific cost of production, the total electrical energy produced ($W_{produced}$), boiler marginal cost (c_{boiler}), total thermal load served (Q_{served}), total electrical load served (W_{served}), interest rate (i_r), and inflation rate (i_f).

$$C_i = C_{r,i} \cdot \left(\frac{S}{S_r}\right)^{m,i} \quad (17)$$

$$C_{total} = \sum_i C_i \quad (18)$$

$$c_{dep} = \frac{C_{total}}{(S \cdot LT \cdot FLH)} \quad (19)$$

$$c_{int} = \frac{C_{total} \cdot \theta_{int}}{(S \cdot LT \cdot FLH)} \quad (20)$$

$$\theta_{int} = \frac{LT \cdot int}{1 - (1 + int)^{-LT}} - 1 \quad (21)$$

$$c_{dev} = \frac{C_{total} \cdot \theta_{dev}}{(S \cdot LT \cdot FLH)} \quad (22)$$

$$C_{opm,i} = C_{opm,r,i} \cdot \left(\frac{S}{S_r}\right)^{m,i} \quad (23)$$

$$c_{opm,i} = \frac{C_{opm,i}}{(S \cdot FLH)} \quad (24)$$

$$C_{opm_total} = \sum_i C_{opm,i} \quad (25)$$

$$C_{\text{fuel}} = C_{\text{fuel}} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{MC_{\text{bio}}}{1 - MC_{\text{bio}}} \cdot \frac{2.4}{LHV_{\text{bio}}}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{\eta_{\text{conv}}} \quad (26)$$

$$C_{\text{production}} = C_{\text{dep}} + C_{\text{int}} + C_{\text{dev}} + C_{\text{opm}} + C_{\text{fuel}} \quad (27)$$

$$LCOE = \frac{C_{\text{production}} \cdot W_{\text{produced}} - C_{\text{boiler}} \cdot Q_{\text{served}}}{W_{\text{served}}} \quad (28)$$

$$C_{\text{boiler}} = \frac{3.6 \cdot (C_{\text{fuel}} + C_{\text{boiler,emission}})}{\eta_{\text{boiler}} \cdot LHV_{\text{bio}}} \quad (29)$$

$$NPC = \sum_{t=1}^N \frac{C_{\text{production}} \cdot W_{\text{produced,year}} \cdot (1+i_r)^N}{(1+i_r)^N} + C_{\text{total}} \quad (30)$$

3 Case Study

Comparative analysis, in terms of technical viability and economic attractiveness, between the DFB and ORC system is carried out in a case study under similar operating circumstances. In this case study, both systems were implemented for off-grid electrification in a mini-grid scaled power system. The two configurations are subjected to similar energy profile, governmental incentives, and environmental policies. In this section, information concerning the location, energy demand, renewable energy subsidy, and carbon emission tax are provided.

3.1 Location


Masset is an Aboriginal Canadian village located on the northern Pacific coast of Canada in Haida Gwaii Island, British Columbia province. The Masset population was recorded at 793 in 2016, however, the village provides amenities and services to a larger rural area with a population nearing 2,300, including the unincorporated area of Tow Hill. The current population reside in approximately 400 private dwellings that were constructed in the 1970's. Agriculture and forestry are the primary contributors to the economic activities of the island. Thus, residues associated with these two industries can be the primary source of energy in the near future. Selecting this location for the case study is due to the fact that this village is heavily relied on diesel fuel for energy generation. The carbon dioxide equivalent emission was 6,784 tons in 2009, in which residential energy generation was responsible for almost 15% of that amount. The GHG emissions per person was 30 times more than any location within the British Columbia province.

3.2 Energy Profile


Over the past decades, the electrical energy demand of Haida Gwaii Island has been supplied by BC Hydro Company via two unconnected distribution systems located in the northern and southern parts of the island. The northern power system includes Masset Village and the surrounding areas. In 2014, the northern power grid was comprised of five diesel generators with a combined capacity of 10.445 MW. Three stationary diesel-fueled generators with an individual rated power of 2.865 MW were the primary units, while the two road-mobile generators rated at 1.00 MW and 0.85 MW were considered as an

operating reserve. Electricity load profile of the northern grid is only provided for the period of 2001 to 2011. In this 10-year interval, electricity demand witnessed an uptrend fluctuation, increasing moderately at 0.98% in the first 4 years, following with a 4.3% growth in the next 6 years (**Figure 4**). In accordance with the population growth, number of households, and industrial activities, similar growth rate is subjected for the period of 2011 to 2019 in order to estimate the electricity supply in 2019. Similar approach was taken for the monthly generation data (**Figure 5**), projecting the total electricity generation for every month based on available monthly generation data between 2001 to 2011. Gross daily generation illustrates a significant difference in daily demand for months with higher electricity consumption such as January, while on the other hand, this variation is limited for months with lower demand such as June (**Figure 5**). In accordance to the energy profile, the suggested bioenergy systems were sized based on the electrical peak demand with 15% margin of safety, resulting in a combined capacity of 6.088 MW.

The thermal energy profile of this island is mainly comprised of space heating and hot water consumption for residential usage, and the drying process for the sawmill facility in the industrial sector. The residential power and heat demand in a typical day in mid-January is presented in **Figure 6**. Unlike electrical energy demand, there is no annual or monthly generation data available for heating consumption. Although, a logical demand profile can be structured for the residential sector based on the number of households on the island, average property area, and climate characteristics. In accordance with a preliminary study conducted in British Columbia [43], the average energy demand in the residential sector is 213 kWh/m².year; in which 37% is used for space heating purposes. Provided that there are 464 private dwellings with an average area of 200 m², the annual heating consumption can reach up to 7,313.5 MWh (**Figure 7 (a)**). Concerning the industrial heating demand, the island has two sawmill facilities that each are capable of processing 40,000 m³ lambers per year [44]. Based on energy flowcharts in typical sawmill facilities, a thermal energy demand of 350 kWh/m³ at 75°C is expected for drying purposes [45]. To this end, the sawmill facility in Masset village can consume approximately 28,000 MWh thermal energy in a year (**Figure 7 (b)**) [46].



(a)



(b)

Figure 4. Annual (a) and monthly (b) electricity generation in 2019.





Figure 5. Gross electricity generation of a typical day in January (a) and June (b).




Figure 6. Residential power and heat demand in a typical day in mid-January.




Figure 7. Monthly heating demand profile in residential (a) and industrial sector (b).

3.3 Economic Incentives and Cost Analysis

Evaluating the economic performance of any energy system relies on numerous influencing factors that may vary depending on the domestic and regional policies or conditions. For the case of Masset Village, British Columbia offers various forms of subsidy to support energy planning, energy efficiency, and clean energy generation projects. There exist several funding opportunities for the Haida Gwaii that support sustainable development in different forms. One of the available programs that target energy generation is Renewable Energy for Remote Communities (RERC), which aims to reduce diesel fuel dependency for energy generation in Haida Gwaii. This strategy was designed for large-scale capital intensive projects, in which the responsible councils are bound to deliver up to \$16.5 million to remote communities for electricity generation using sustainable resources [47]. Other economic influencing parameters such as inflation rate, nominal discount rate, and carbon tax were defined at a more domestic level; these values were recorded at 2%, 5%, and 30 \$/ton, respectively [48, 49].

Table 5 presents the economic and technical parameters that were subjected to both systems over the project lifetime. Electricity is considered as the main product of the bioenergy systems, while heat is only a byproduct. In this context, full load hour represents the amount of time that the system would theoretically have to be operated at full output in order to achieve its annual energy yield. This value was then used in the calculation of development, operating, and maintenance costs for each system. In both configurations, similar battery storage technology as well as bidirectional power converter units were implemented in order to improve flexibility and ramp rate depending on the technology utilized. A model optimizer was used with the intention to determine the best number of storage units for each bioenergy system, considering the ramp rate of each technology. The energy storage units were based on sodium-sulfur (NaS) technology, in which a single unit was rated at 1200 kWh with 85% round-trip efficiency [50]. The project finance scheme indicates that 30% of the capital cost for each system should be financed by the owner (cash), while the remaining 70% can be paid over the project lifetime at a 4% interest rate.

Table 5. Economic parameters over the project lifetime.

Parameter	Unit	Amount
Full load hour	h	4578
Project lifetime	years	20
Commercial loan payback period	years	10
Battery storage unit capacity	kWh	1200
Battery storage unit cost	M\$	1.20
Power converter rated capacity	kW	250
Power converter cost	M\$	0.125
Cost of Water	\$/m ³	0.61
Environmental Cost	\$/GJ	0.089
Carbon tax	\$/t	30
Cost of Feedstock (incl. 200 km transportation) [28]	\$/ton	65
Discount rate	%	5
Inflation rate	%	2
Interest rate	%	4
Insurance	[%] Investment	0.5

Energy systems cost analysis often include all the associated costs with the site preparation, construction, installation, operation, and maintenance. In this case study, site preparation and construction were not taken into account since such assessments depend on various regional regulations entailing safety precautions and hazardous limitations. Assuming that both bioenergy systems can be developed in the same construction area by the same number of workers taking the same amount of time, cost analysis for each system can be carried out with regards to the reference plants mentioned in Section 2.4. **Table 6** and **Table 7** provide comprehensive details on economic conditions of the CHP-gasification and CHP-ORC systems, respectively. The key points are:

- Specific investment cost is in accordance with the latest information provided by the International Renewable Energy Agency (IREA)
- Specific investment cost is related to the net electrical output

- Specific cost of fuel is related to the conversion efficiency (not electricity generation efficiency)
- Development, operating, and maintenance costs are related to the annual electricity generation
- Similar fuel feeding system was considered for both configurations

Table 6. Cost analysis of the CHP-gasification system

Parameter	Unit	Scale Factor	Reference Plant [41]	Suggested Plant
Rated biomass power	MW	-	32.00	22.55
Specific investment cost [51, 52]	\$/kW _{prod}	-	8093.5	8000
Specific Cost of Fuel	\$/ton	-	215.49	83.40
Fuel feeding	M\$	0.65	9.87	6.82
Gasifier	M\$	0.80	13.16	9.17
Cooling and treatment	M\$	0.80	5.38	3.75
Flue gas cleaning	M\$	0.60	9.87	6.81
Syngas compressor	M\$	0.60	16.27	11.21
Development	\$/MWh _{prod}	0.40	5.06	8.74
Operating and Maintenance	\$/MWh _{prod}	0.70	50.38	179.72
Combustion engines [53]	\$/kW _{prod}	-	-	1156

Table 7. Cost analysis of the CHP-ORC system

Parameter	Unit	Scale Factor	Reference Plant [42, 54]	Suggested Plant
Rated biomass power	MW	-	6	33.82
Specific investment cost [51]	\$/kW _{prod}	-	6000	5080
Specific Cost of Fuel	\$/ton	-	50	73.58
Evaporator	M\$	0.8	0.57	1.51
Condenser	M\$	0.8	1.15	3.07
ORC module	M\$	0.8	1.93	5.13
Thermal oil circuit	M\$	0.8	0.79	1.24
Pumps and heat exchangers	M\$	0.6	0.66	1.24
Development	\$/MWh _{prod}	0.4	8.22	10.26
Operating and Maintenance	\$/MWh _{prod}	0.7	32.90	47.08
MEA-based gas cleaning [55]	M\$	0.8	-	13.92
Gas cleaning maintenance [55]	M\$/year	0.6	-	2.36
Fuel feeding	M\$	-	-	6.82


4 Results

The model development and simulation of the characteristics of each bioenergy system was carried out using HOMER PRO Software, which is focused on technical, environmental, and economic aspects of energy systems. In this context, the two suggested configurations were sized at 6.088 MW electrical output power, and simulated under similar economic circumstances. The comparative analysis between the two plants is conducted in terms of energy generation, energy storage performance, fuel consumption, and economic feasibility.


4.1 Energy Generation

In this study, the suggested systems were prioritized for electricity generation, and the electrical output of the system was fixated on the electrical load to avoid any power shortages or excess electricity

generation. Despite the limited efficiency of ORC-CHP configuration at full-load electrical generation, thermal energy production in this system was associated with significant excess output, roughly 3 times that of the gasification system (Figure 8 (a)). The high thermal efficiency in both systems, allowed excess thermal energy production during low power demand periods, providing the possibility of thermal storage and supplying the thermal loads during higher demands. The simulation results illustrate the fact that the ORC system can be the best possible choice for locations with thermal energy intensity (high heat-to-power ratio). This type of system can provide the possibility for implementation of long-term thermal energy storage (TES) and heat pumps, which can result in significant flexibility improvements of the system. Considering the total output (power and heat) of both systems with respect to the total demand, average excess heat production was higher during low power demand, particularly from May to September (Figure 8 (b)). This is due to inverse proportionality between thermal and power efficiency, and the constrained minimum load ratio (MLR). One of the most important factors in technical operation and economic feasibility is minimum generation level. While ICE units can take advantage of lower MLR (10-20%), steam turbines are subjected to higher ratios (25-60%). Technical constrained in heat-recovery steam generators (HRSGs) poses a challenge for steam turbines to lower the MLR, in which multi-pressure level steam turbines can be a solution. Although such method can lower the minimum load level, but it negatively affects the economics of system in such small-sized plants. In this study, the minimum load level for ICE units in gasification system was set on 20%, whereas, the expander in the ORC system was subjected to 40%. It is evident from the results that the gasification system could affectively respond to low power demand periods. On the contrary, the ORC system was fixated on minimum 40% of the rated power. Higher thermal efficiency and constrained MLR were the primary reasons for higher excess generation. High thermal excess generation can pose economic disadvantages if suitable storage or application is not considered. To this end, electrical efficiency of ORC system should be improved (results in lower thermal efficiency), and the MLR should be lowered to its minimum practical value.



(a)



(b)

Figure 8. Energy generation (a) and thermal excess production (b) of gasification and ORC systems.

4.2 Energy Storage Performance

Storage capacity depends on several factors in which generating unit ramp rate, start-up time, and MLR are important factors. To this end, an optimizer was implemented in order to determine the best storage capacity. In this study, ICE units could take advantage of 100% P_{rated}/min ramp rate, maximum 5 minutes start-up time, and minimum load level of 20%. On the other hand, ORC system ramp rate was set on 8% P_{rated}/min , minimum start-up time of 2 hours, and minimum load level of 40%. The optimizer suggested 4 storage units (NaS technology in Section 3.3) for the gasification system, whereas, no units for the ORC system. The possibility of dispatching generating units in the gasification system allowed economic implementation of battery units for low power demand periods throughout a day. In contrast, the ORC system could achieve the best economic performance when the system could take advantage of 24 hours operation. One of the main reasons for continuous operation of ORC was the lower marginal generation cost at 0.146 \$/kWh, in comparison to the ICEs at 0.165 \$/kWh. The average energy cost of battery units (0.205 \$/kWh) could compete with the marginal generation cost of ICE units at a given time interval (low power demand periods), however, it could not reach as low as that of the ORC system. To this end, no storage system was suggested for the ORC system; even with 3 minor and 2 major maintenance tasks the system could generate excess electricity at minimum marginal generation cost to cover the entire maintenance plan over the project lifetime. Although, an important factor that can result in implementation of battery units is higher MLR. This value is not only constrained by technical properties of the equipment, but also can be limited due to environmental impacts of the system. The MLR can be a trade-off between environmental impacts and the financial investments on improving environmental performance of a system. In this study, a carbon capture facility with 90% efficiency was designed for the ORC system. Lowering carbon capture ratio can result in higher economic benefits, while the MLR should be increased to meet the emission regulations. In this particular case, the ORC system required storage units if the MLR

was increased above 75%. With MLR value at 80%, the system required 12 battery units, in which case the LCOE would increase by 32.7%, compared to the default MLR at 40%. The battery input power illustrates the energy transfer in the storage system throughout a year (Figure 9). The difference in time of utilization between the gasification and ORC system is mainly arise from the battery energy cost and minimum generation level. It is more economic for the ORC system to operate continuously during high power demand, while the generation throughout May to September is constrained by the MLR. On the other hand, gasification system could dispatch generating units (ICEs) based on the electric load profile. This allowed the gasification system to take advantage of battery storage units for improving the flexibility and economic of the system. In this regard, the storage units were mostly utilized during winter for periods with low power demand, particularly between hour 0 to 7 every day. The sodium-sulfur technology provided the possibility of long discharge as much as 6 hours in a day.




Figure 9. Battery unit input power in connection to gasification and ORC system.

4.3 Fuel Consumption

Fuel consumption in any energy system is the primary factor in economic and environmental feasibility. In this case study, gasification could take advantage of lower fuel consumption due to its higher power efficiency. Given the fact that exergy destruction is lower in such system compared to the ORC, fuel consumption was half of the direct combustion method. In Figure 10, the fuel consumption is presented based on the delivered feedstock at 23% moisture content. The main contributor to the higher fuel consumption of the ORC system was the power efficiency since electricity was the primary product of the system. The huge power efficiency difference between the two systems could increase the fuel consumption of ORC by two times that of the gasification one. The destructive result of such characteristic can be observed in the economic performance and energy cost. Another important factor that lowered the fuel consumption of gasification system was the integration of battery storage units. The storage units provided flexibility and lowered the operating hours of the generating units, while resulted in lower fuel

consumption by 4%. The fuel consumption in both systems follows the same pattern as the monthly energy demand, having the lowest consumption during summer.





Figure 10. Annual biomass feedstock consumption.

4.4 Economic Performance


Economic analysis was carried out as a comparative assessment between the two systems in terms of capital cost, initial capital, operating cost, fuel expenses, and total net present cost (NPC). This analysis was performed with regards to two different biomass feedstock prices. The prices that were presented in **Table 6** and **Table 7** correspond to specific cost of fuel including 200 km transportation. As established in the last section, fuel consumption for the case of ORC is noticeably higher, which resulted in 78% higher fuel expenses than gasification system (**Figure 11**). This effect could overcome the lower cost of operating and maintenance of the system (32% compared to gasification), and result in higher total NPC than the gasification system by approximately 5%. To this end, the energy cost was 7.5% higher than the cost of energy production by means of gasification.

If the transportation cost is to be halved, the economic performance with regards to the cost of energy can result in interesting outcomes. Decreasing the cost of feedstock by roughly 28% could reverse the economic profitability situation, meaning that the ORC could be associated with lower energy production cost than its gasification counterpart. The influence of biomass feedstock price did not affect both systems in a similar manner. Its impact on economic viability of the ORC system was more severe since such system was linked with higher fuel consumption (**Figure 12 (a)**). For any feedstock value above 55 \$/t, the practical implementation of the ORC could be questioned, and its development could only be feasible for communities with presence of thermal demand intensive industries (**Figure 12 (b)**). The high thermal efficiency of ORC would allow production of huge thermal energy that could provide high revenue and financial benefits, whereas, this was limited in gasification system. In contracts, if the fuel price is not a limitation, ORC development for community energy supply with presence of thermal intensive industries can in fact be financially viable. Subjecting the two systems to 35,313 MWh thermal demand and

considering the lower feedstock base price (47.32 \$/t), would result in 0.2256 \$/kWh LCOE by means of CHP-ORC, and 0.2469 \$/kWh by means of CHP-gasification system, which are in compliance with the global values for woody bioenergy systems [57]. The recorded LCOE prices are slightly higher than the global weighted average for bioenergy in North America. This is due to the fact that the considered specific investment cost for each conversion technology was at the higher-end values.



(a)



(b)

Figure 11. Economic performance of CHP-ORC and CHP-gasification with high (a) and low (b) feedstock price.




Figure 12. Variation of LCOE versus feedstock price (a) and annual heat demand (b).

5 Conclusion

Utilizing biomass resources for energy generation can be done using different methods, and the end-use product can take different forms depending on the demand or application. Direct combustion and gasification are the two widely used techniques for biomass to bioenergy conversion. The lower capital and maintenance cost make direct combustion a favorable choice for larger implementation, while gasification is selected for its higher conversion efficiency and lower environmental consequences. There exist several influencing factors such as feedstock type, plant size, cost of biomass, and primary energy form that can determine the viability of each conversion technique for residential energy supply.

In this research, Organic Rankine Cycle was selected as the suitable technique for direct combustion, while Dual Fluidized-Bed for that of gasification. Each system was developed with technical operating conditions based on reference operational plants around the world. The results suggested that the feedstock price is the primary factor in realizing the economic feasibility. The financial outcomes illustrated that each system could be advantageous under different operating conditions. For thermal demand intensive

locations (communities), ORC can be present higher economic advantageous than gasification. Although the system is associated with lower capital and maintenance cost, but the limited electrical efficiency can result in significantly higher fuel consumption, approximately 2 times than the gasification system. For the case of Masset Village this resulted in 8% higher LCOE price when utilizing biomass feedstock with 65.0 \$/t base value. Moreover, direct combustion can result in 190,549 kg/year CO₂ emissions which is approximately twice the gasification system. In contrast, the gasification system based on DFB could take advantage of higher conversion efficiency (27%) and better environmental performance (92,529 kg/year equivalent CO₂). Despite its higher capital cost (50% higher than ORC), the system can be advantageous when electricity is the primary product of the system, or providing biomass resources is costly. Given that the impact of feedstock price on such system is not as severe as the ORC, such method of bioenergy conversion can result in higher financial prosperity, particularly for smaller applications.

References

- [1 BP: 'BP Statistical Review of World Energy' (BP Energy Economics, 2019)
- 2 'GLOBAL BIOENERGY STATISTICS 2019' (World Bioenergy Association, 2019)
- 3 Reid, W.V., Ali, M.K., Field, C.B.: 'The future of bioenergy' *Global Change Biology*, 2020, **26**, (1), pp. 274–286.
- 4 Bagherian, M.A., Mehrazamir, K.: 'A comprehensive review on renewable energy integration for combined heat and power production' *Energy Conversion and Management*, 2020, **224**, p. 113454.
- 5 Börjesson, M., Ahlgren, E.O.: '5.07 - Biomass CHP Energy Systems: A Critical Assessment', in Sayigh, A. (Ed.): 'Comprehensive Renewable Energy' (Elsevier, 2012), pp. 87–97
- 6 Roy, D., Samanta, S., Ghosh, S.: 'Performance optimization through response surface methodology of an integrated biomass gasification based combined heat and power plant employing solid oxide fuel cell and externally fired gas turbine' *Energy Conversion and Management*, 2020, **222**, p. 113182.
- 7 Mojaver, P., Khalilarya, S., Chitsaz, A.: 'Performance assessment of a combined heat and power system: A novel integrated biomass gasification, solid oxide fuel cell and high-temperature sodium heat pipe system part I: Thermodynamic analysis' *Energy Conversion and Management*, 2018, **171**, (May), pp. 287–297.
- 8 Bartela, \Lukasz, Kotowicz, J., Dubiel-Jurgaś, K.: 'Investment risk for biomass integrated gasification combined heat and power unit with an internal combustion engine and a Stirling engine' *Energy*, 2018, **150**, pp. 601–616.
- 9 Skorek-Osikowska, A., Kotowicz, J., Uchman, W.: 'Thermodynamic assessment of the operation of a self-sufficient, biomass based district heating system integrated with a Stirling engine and biomass gasification' *Energy*, 2017, **141**, pp. 1764–1778.
- 10 Moradi, R., Marcantonio, V., Cioccolanti, L., Bocci, E.: 'Integrating biomass gasification with a steam-injected micro gas turbine and an Organic Rankine Cycle unit for combined heat and power production' *Energy Conversion and Management*, 2020, **205**, (December 2019), p. 112464.
- 11 Jia, J., Shu, L., Zang, G., Xu, L., Abudula, A., Ge, K.: 'Energy analysis and techno-economic assessment of a co-gasification of woody biomass and animal manure, solid oxide fuel cells and micro gas turbine hybrid system' *Energy*, 2018, **149**, pp. 750–761.

- 12 Brynda, J., Skoblia, S., Pohorelý, M., *et al.*: 'Wood chips gasification in a fixed-bed multi-stage gasifier for decentralized high-efficiency CHP and biochar production: Long-term commercial operation' *Fuel*, 2020, **281**, p. 118637.
- 13 Jeswani, H.K., Whiting, A., Martin, A., Azapagic, A.: 'Environmental and economic sustainability of poultry litter gasification for electricity and heat generation' *Waste Management*, 2019, **95**, pp. 182–191.
- 14 Akkouche, N., Loubar, K., Nepveu, F., Kadi, M.E.A., Tazerout, M.: 'Micro-combined heat and power using dual fuel engine and biogas from discontinuous anaerobic digestion' *Energy Conversion and Management*, 2020, **205**, p. 112407.
- 15 Sagastume Gutiérrez, A., Cabello Eras, J.J., Hens, L., Vandecasteele, C.: 'The energy potential of agriculture, agroindustrial, livestock, and slaughterhouse biomass wastes through direct combustion and anaerobic digestion. The case of Colombia' *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 2020, **269**, p. 122317.
- 16 Di Fraia, S., Massarotti, N., Vanoli, L., Costa, M.: 'Thermo-economic analysis of a novel cogeneration system for sewage sludge treatment' *Energy*, 2016, **115**, pp. 1560–1571.
- 17 Huang, Y.W., Chen, M.Q., Li, Q.H.: 'Decentralized drying-gasification scheme of sewage sludge with torrefied biomass as auxiliary feedstock' *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 2020, **45**, (46), pp. 24263–24274.
- 18 Elsner, W., Wysocki, M., Niegodajew, P., Borecki, R.: 'Experimental and economic study of small-scale CHP installation equipped with downdraft gasifier and internal combustion engine' *Applied Energy*, 2017, **202**, pp. 213–227.
- 19 Ji-chao, Y., Sobhani, B.: 'Integration of biomass gasification with a supercritical CO₂ and Kalina cycles in a combined heating and power system: A thermodynamic and exergoeconomic analysis' *Energy*, 2021, **222**, p. 119980.
- 20 Tanaka, Y., Mesfun, S., Umeki, K., Toffolo, A., Tamaura, Y., Yoshikawa, K.: 'Thermodynamic performance of a hybrid power generation system using biomass gasification and concentrated solar thermal processes' *Applied Energy*, 2015, **160**, pp. 664–672.
- 21 Roy, D., Samanta, S., Ghosh, S.: 'Techno-economic and environmental analyses of a biomass based system employing solid oxide fuel cell, externally fired gas turbine and organic Rankine cycle' *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 2019, **225**, pp. 36–57.
- 22 Chang, C.T., Costa, M., La Villetta, M., Macaluso, A., Piazzullo, D., Vanoli, L.: 'Thermo-economic analyses of a Taiwanese combined CHP system fuelled with syngas from rice husk gasification' *Energy*, 2019, **167**, pp. 766–780.
- 23 Pantaleo, A.M., Camporeale, S.M., Miliozzi, A., Russo, V., Shah, N., Markides, C.N.: 'Novel hybrid CSP-biomass CHP for flexible generation: Thermo-economic analysis and profitability assessment' *Applied Energy*, 2017, **204**, pp. 994–1006.
- 24 Nikolaisen, L.S., Jensen, P.D.: '3 - Biomass feedstocks: categorisation and preparation for combustion and gasification', in Rosendahl, L. (Ed.): 'Biomass Combustion Science, Technology and Engineering' (Woodhead Publishing, 2013), pp. 36–57
- 25 Searcy, E., Flynn, P., Ghafoori, E., Kumar, A.: 'The relative cost of biomass energy transport', in 'Applied Biochemistry and Biotechnology' (2007), pp. 639–652

- 26 Bagherian, M.A.: 'Modelling Combined Heat and Power System'. The University of Nottingham, 2020
- 27 'Phyllis2 - NTA 8003 classification', <https://phyllis.nl/Browse/Standard/NTA-8003##2929>, accessed November 2020
- 28 Thiffault, E., Sokhansanj, S., Ebadian, M., *et al.*: 'Biomass pre-treatment for bioenergy, Case study 2: Moisture, physical property, ash and density management as pre-treatment practices in Canadian forest biomass supply chains' 2018.
- 29 Bain, R.L., Broer, K.: 'Chapter 3: Gasification' (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 2011)
- 30 Reed, T.B., Das, A.: 'Handbook of Biomass Downdraft Gasifier Engine Systems' (Biomass Energy Foundation, 1988)
- 31 Heidenreich, S., Müller, M., Foscolo, P.U.: 'Chapter 5 - Advanced Process Combination Concepts', in Heidenreich, S., Müller, M., Foscolo, P.U. (Eds.): 'Advanced Biomass Gasification' (Academic Press, 2016), pp. 55–97
- 32 Kirnbauer, F., Hofbauer, H.: 'Investigations on Bed Material Changes in a Dual Fluidized Bed Steam Gasification Plant in Güssing, Austria' *Energy Fuels*, 2011, **25**, (8), pp. 3793–3798.
- 33 Francois, J., Abdelouahed, L., Mauviel, G., *et al.*: 'Detailed process modeling of a wood gasification combined heat and power plant' *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 2013, **51**, pp. 68–82.
- 34 Pérez, N.P., Machin, E.B., Pedroso, D.T., Roberts, J.J., Antunes, J.S., Silveira, J.L.: 'Biomass gasification for combined heat and power generation in the Cuban context: Energetic and economic analysis' *Applied Thermal Engineering*, 2015, **90**, pp. 1–12.
- 35 Soares, J., Oliveira, A.C.: 'Experimental assessment of pine wood chips gasification at steady and part-load performance' *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 2020, **139**, p. 105625.
- 36 Hermann, H., Reinhard, R., Klaus, B., *et al.*: 'Biomass CHP Plant Güssing – A Success Story' (no date)
- 37 Gassner, M., Maréchal, F.: 'Thermodynamic comparison of the FICFB and Viking gasification concepts' *Energy*, 2009, **34**, (10), pp. 1744–1753.
- 38 Bolhar-Nordenkamp, M., Hofbauer, H., Rauch, R., Tremmel, H., Aichernig, C.: 'Biomass CHP Plant Güssing – Using Gasification for Power Generation' (2003)
- 39 Basu, P.: 'Chapter 5 - Gasification Theory and Modeling of Gasifiers', in Basu, P. (Ed.): 'Biomass Gasification and Pyrolysis' (Academic Press, 2010), pp. 117–165
- 40 Zhu, Y., Li, W., Li, J., Li, H., Wang, Y., Li, S.: 'Thermodynamic analysis and economic assessment of biomass-fired organic Rankine cycle combined heat and power system integrated with CO₂ capture' *Energy Conversion and Management*, 2020, **204**, (June 2019), p. 112310.
- 41 Thunman, H., Seemann, M.: '17 - The GoBiGas plant', in Materazzi, M., Foscolo, P.U. (Eds.): 'Substitute Natural Gas from Waste' (Academic Press, 2019), pp. 455–474
- 42 Tańczuk, M., Ulbrich, R.: 'Implementation of a biomass-fired co-generation plant supplied with an ORC (Organic Rankine Cycle) as a heat source for small scale heat distribution system – A comparative analysis under Polish and German conditions' *Energy*, 2013, **62**, pp. 132–141.

- 43 Finch, G., Burnett, E., Knowles, W.: 'Energy Consumption in Mid and High Rise Residential Buildings in British Columbia' (2010)
- 44 'On-island wood industry "in tough straits"', <https://www.haidagwaiiobserver.com/news/on-island-wood-industry-in-tough-straits/>, accessed November 2020
- 45 Anderson, J.-O., Westerlund, L.: 'Improved energy efficiency in sawmill drying system' *Applied Energy*, 2014, **113**, pp. 891–901.
- 46 Anderson, J.-O., Toffolo, A.: 'Improving energy efficiency of sawmill industrial sites by integration with pellet and CHP plants' *Applied Energy*, 2013, **111**, pp. 791–800.
- 47 Mines, M. of E. and: 'Renewable Energy for Remote Communities (RERC) Program - Province of British Columbia', <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/industry/electricity-alternative-energy/community-energy-solutions/renewable-energy-remote-communities>, accessed November 2020
- 48 Woolf, D., Lehmann, J., Lee, D.R.: 'Optimal bioenergy power generation for climate change mitigation with or without carbon sequestration' *Nat Commun*, 2016, **7**.
- 49 Government of Canada, N.E.B.: 'NEB – Chapter 2. Key Assumptions', <https://www.cer-rec.gc.ca/en/data-analysis/canada-energy-future/2017/chapter-2-key-assumptions.html>, accessed November 2020
- 50 Fax, T.: 'NAS batteries are the # 1 choice worldwide for large-capacity energy storage' 2018, (July).
- 51 'Renewable Energy Cost Analysis - Biomass for Power Generation', </publications/2012/Jun/Renewable-Energy-Cost-Analysis---Biomass-for-Power-Generation>, accessed November 2020
- 52 'Capital Cost Estimates for Utility Scale Electricity Generating Plants' 2016, p. 141.
- 53 'Electricity generator cost data from survey form EIA-860', <https://www.eia.gov/electricity/generatorcosts/>, accessed November 2020
- 54 'Program - POLYCITY', <http://www.polycity.net/en/index.html>, accessed November 2020
- 55 Singh, D., Croiset, E., Douglas, P.L., Douglas, M.A.: 'Techno-economic study of CO₂ capture from an existing coal-fired power plant: MEA scrubbing vs. O₂/CO₂ recycle combustion' *Energy Conversion and Management*, 2003, **44**, (19), pp. 3073–3091.
- 56 Denholm, P., Brinkman, G., Mai, T.: 'How low can you go? The importance of quantifying minimum generation levels for renewable integration' *Energy Policy*, 2018, **115**, pp. 249–257.
- 57 International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA): 'RENEWABLE POWER GENERATION COSTS IN 2018' (2019)

Development of biomass-fueled cogeneration systems for off-grid electrification

1st Mohammad Ali Bagherian
Department of Electrical and Electronic
Engineering
University of Nottingham Malaysia
Selangor, Malaysia
kecy6mab@nottingham.edu.my

4th Marwan Nafea
Department of Electrical and Electronic
Engineering
University of Nottingham Malaysia
Selangor, Malaysia
Marwan.Nafea@nottingham.edu.my

2nd Kamyar Mehranzamir
Department of Electrical and Electronic
Engineering
University of Nottingham Malaysia
Selangor, Malaysia
kamyar.mehranzamir@nottingham.edu.
my

5th Hadi Nabipour-Afrouzi
Faculty of Engineering, computing and
science
Swinburne University of Technology
Sarawak
Kuching, Malaysia
HAfrouzi@swinburne.edu.my

3rd Jubaer Ahmed*
Faculty of Engineering, computing and
science
Swinburne University of Technology
Sarawak
Kuching, Malaysia
JAhmed@swinburne.edu.my
6th Chin-leong Wooi
Centre of Excellence for Renewable
Energy School of Electrical Systems
Engineering, Universiti Malaysia Perlis
Pauh Putra Campus 02600 Arau, Perlis,
Malaysia
elwooi@unimap.edu.my

Abstract—Over the past centuries, discovery and utilization of fossil fuels has revolutionized the world pushing societies towards modernization. This source of energy that is being referred as black gold, has faced extensive consumption which consequently started to underpin the acceptance of the negative effects of our carbon society and its likely demise. Fossil fuels have costed the safety and overall health of our environment, causing serious consequences such as global warming and unsustainability. To this end, in the search for alternative generation, the potential of renewables was realized and hence, exploited in the energy sector. In recent times, development of efficient prime movers and possible utilization of renewable energy resources for both power and heat production introduced the concept of cogeneration to the energy sector. Accordingly, this comparative research elaborates on utilization of the most available and versatile renewable energy, biomass, in combined heat and power technology. There is no doubt that the integration of bioenergy and cogeneration is associated with significant advantages, namely: lower environmental impacts and primary energy savings. In this context, four different biomass-fueled configurations are developed for the purpose of electrifying the Masset village in Canada. Two well-known methods of: Direct Combustion and Gasification are considered in the model development. Further, a comparative conclusion is drawn from economic perspective.

Keywords—combined heat and power, biomass, gasification, direct combustion, HOMER PRO

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

Industrial revolution introduced the potential of fossil fuels to the world in almost every sector. Soon, this source of energy reformed every aspects of industry including: energy generation, planning, and operation. With development of reliable equipment and efficient central power plants, fossil fuels' consumption witnessed a considerable increase, and it seemed that nothing could stop their utilization. Although, the 21st century has brought growing concerns about their long-term sustainability and environmental impacts. Today, conservation of energy resources, sustainable developments,

and environmental protections are considered as the primary challenges in the energy sector. A general agreement amongst countries of the world is that, greater emphasis should be given to sustainable developments and promote the use of renewable energy resources (RES) for energy generation. One of the most available and versatile of such energy sources is biomass. This source describes the type of fuel that derives directly from waste, plants, and trees which considers as non-fossilized and biologically degradable material. Although biomass shaped the whole concept of energy generation throughout the world before industrial revolution, its utilization was decreased after, since it could not compete with the specific energy rate that the fossil fuels were providing.

1.2 Biomass and Combined Heat and Power (CHP)

The statistical report of biomass consumption around the world suggests that the use of bioenergy is considerably expanding, making it the largest source for production of renewable energy (60-70%). Developed countries, particularly in European Union and North America, are taking advantage of biofuels in almost every sector including: power, heat, and transportation. Although, majority of countries with higher biomass penetration are investigating different methods of utilization so as to replace the traditional biomass combustion in furnaces with modernized efficient techniques. In this context, the application of combined heat and power (CHP) was introduced, and a great deal of emphasis has been given for further research and developments. Developing adequate capacity of renewable energy plants is associated with many barriers such as time and availability of investment. Fossil energy and Greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction is possible with measures like energy saving and efficient generation. CHP systems play a key role in this regard and contributes to efficient generation by simultaneous production of power and heat within a single process. Today, application of CHP can be observed in oil-refineries, distilleries, and steel industry, in which some part of their fuel is supplied by their own wastes or by-products such as black liquor or Sugarcane bagasse. This has resulted in higher self-sufficiency and hence, reduction of fuel consumption and environmental

impacts. Integrating this method of generation with renewable energies is truly a remarkable approach towards energy transition and it represents major savings in fuel cost and in environmental degradation.

1.3 Structure

Biomass energy conversion can be carried out using different technologies. This process is classified in terms of its method of conversion or its end-product into three main categories, namely: Thermochemical, Biological, and Chemical/Mechanical Conversion. In this study, the thermochemical method of conversion, particularly direct combustion and gasification, is of interest. A comparative analysis is performed evaluating the economic viability of direct combustion and gasification in electrification of an off-grid rural area. With this regard, the current available system along with three other suggested models are developed. Further, the models are compared from economic point of view; highlighting the possible applications of each system based on its economic viability.

2 BIOMASS ENERGY CONVERSION

Combined heat and power systems offer a higher carbon saving ratio than the current centralized power plants. In CHP configurations, the heat recovery system is capable of recapturing the waste heat for further utilization in industrial processes, district heating, or space heating. There are numerous types of prime movers and heat recovery systems, providing the possibility to structure different configurations based on the required demands. Availability of diverse technologies in terms of energy conversion and generation provides a great opportunity for a versatile fuel like biomass to be utilized in variety of forms. Solid biomass can be derived from variety of feedstock in different sectors, including: agricultural, forestry, or wastes. Each sector produces a unique biomass which is mainly classified based its moisture content, elemental composition, and specific energy. In order to implement an efficient biomass-fueled structure, one requires to perform proximate analysis, ultimate analysis, and calculation of calorific value. Such analyses can influence the heating value of the fuel, stickiness of the ash, and the corrosiveness of the flue gas [1]. To this end, there exist different conversion technologies that take advantage of various processes and components aiming at higher efficiency. In this study, particularly for power and heat production in CHP systems, two methods are given significant emphasis, namely: direct combustion and gasification.

2.1 Direct Combustion

Combustion is defined as the exothermic chemical reaction between biomass and air or oxygen [2]. The generated heat from this chemical reaction is utilized in a Rankine Cycle for power, heat, and even cooling production. Direct combustion is the most well-known and common way of converting biomass to energy. In this technique, any type of biomass with moisture content of ca. 50% or lower could be burned and the thermal energy could be extracted. Such method is comprised of three stages, in which a solid biomass is dried, devolatilized, and combusted. In model development of combustion facilities, the efficiency of each process should be account for and the complete combustion should be ensured. One of the aspects which can significantly influence the process is timing. This parameter should be arranged in a way to ensure that the volatile matter of the fuel is burnt to completion, and also, the slow rate of char combustion stage

is taken into consideration. It is true that this method of energy conversion is currently the most available and economically viable option. It is capable of accepting a wider range of biomass types with variety of moisture levels, however, its impacts on environment is critical if appropriate post-combustion cleaning and disposal is not taken into account. With this regard, modern combustion systems are as varied as biomass fuels themselves. Overall, direct combustion is of five types in different arrangements. This study considers combustion in a boiler integrated with an Organic Rankine Cycle (ORC).

2.2 GASIFICATION

Gasification is the process of converting a carbonaceous solid material into gaseous fuel by heating the input source in a gasifier with a gasification agent, such as air or oxygen. In a two-stage process, the carbon content of biomass is converted into combustible gas which consisted of various contaminants. The quality of this gaseous energy carrier provides this opportunity to deploy gas engines and gas turbines, or utilize it for biofuel production. The overall process is characterized into three steps, including: upstream process, gasification, and downstream process. Upstream process modifies the input biomass into a suitable fuel for gasification. This technique involves size reduction, drying, and densification. Gasification is the primary stage, in which the process can be structured in various types based on different operating parameters such as gasifier type, gasification agent, or gasification temperature [2]. At last, the downstream process makes use of gas reforming and clean-up for effective utilization. In today's power systems, gasification technology, providing environmental-friendly biomass conversion, is a promising approach not just for power generation, but also producing by-products such as syngas for higher revenue. There is no doubt that Direct Combustion has been more successful in the market, while Gasification has been struggling with limited commercial impacts due to economic feasibility. Although, its application attracted a wide range of private industries for small- and micro-scale implementations. Reliable and highly efficient prime movers such as Internal Combustion and Stirling engines, provided this opportunity to deploy this method of energy generation in larger scales and values from improved performance and environmental benefits.

3 METHODOLOGY

In this research, HOMER PRO software is used to implement the biomass-fueled CHP systems in different scenarios. This software is one of the best applications for developing hybrid energy systems across the world. Availability of renewable data, variety types of prime movers, and possibility of CHP integration are the well-known advantages of HOMER PRO. In this context, developing a hybrid energy system for rural electrification and drawing comparisons between various methods of generation are the primary objectives which are elaborated in this study.

Masset is an Aboriginal Canadian village located in the norther Pacific coast of Canada in Haida Gwaii, British Columbia province. In 2016, the total area of village was estimated 19.45 km² with the population of 793. The variation of annual temperature is measured between -18.9 °C to 28.9 °C, being the lowest in January and highest in August. Unconnected from the main grid, the required electricity for Haida Gwaii island, to power nearly 5000 residents, is provide

by BC Hydro company, using two diesel generating stations. In Canada, this island is described as one of the most unsustainable and mystical energy-intensive places, since it possesses high diesel generation capacity considering the low population density. The energy profile of Masset is provided in Table I. according to the obtained data in 2012 [3]. The energy profile of 2011 is projected to determine the generation in 2019 while following the same monthly and daily variations. Table II presents the operating units of the Masset power system, comprising of three stationary generators, two road-mobile generators, and a semi-mobile generator with a combined capacity of 12.945 MW_e [4]. For better understanding of the current operating system, a model utilizing the available data is developed in HOMER PRO to investigate the operation of Masset power system in different scenarios under diverse circumstances. The suggested scenarios are responsible for satisfying the same electrical and thermal energy demand, while the economic and environmental aspects of each scenario are being compared.

ELECTRICAL ENERGY PROFILE OF MASSET

Year	Energy Profile		
	Annual generation	Average daily	Peak load
2011	27,215 MWh	74,561.64 kWh	5,260 kW
2019	29,220.39 MWh	80,055.86 kWh	5,016 kW

MASSET DIESEL STATION OPERATING UNITS

Generator	Specifications		
	Capacity	Number of units	Total capacity
Stationary	2.865 MW	3	8.595 MW
Road-mobile	0.85 MW	1	1.45 MW
Road-mobile	0.65 MW	1	
Semi-mobile	2.5 MW	1	2.5 MW

3.1 Base-Scenario

In Base-Scenario, the integration of generating units was done in accordance with the estimated energy profile of 2019 and the existing power generator units in the island. Expectedly, the variations of energy demand throughout a year indicates slightly higher electricity consumption in January and February, while it starts to descend in the beginning of Spring, reaching the lowest value in September (Fig 13). Similar variation could be observed in a single day, in which hours 16 to 20 account for the peak demand (Fig 14). To meet the electrical energy demand, the implemented power system was based on the existing units in the Masset power station. In model development, the closest option to the existing stationary generators was CAT-C175-16 diesel generator with maximum prime capacity of 2.725 MW_e. The general specifications of this generator, including: electrical efficiency, fuel consumption, NO_x emission, and Minimum load Ratio (MLR) are presented in TABLE III.

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS OF C175-16

Parameter	Specifications	
	Unit	Value
Maximum rate	kW	2,800
Fuel consumption	kg/hr	614.02 (100% load)

Parameter	Specifications	
	Unit	Value
Electrical efficiency	%	32% (100% load)
Emission (NO _x)	g/kg _{diesel}	45.65
MLR	%	40
Lifetime	hr	90,000
Price	\$	2,520,000.00 (900\$/kW)




Fig 13. Load variations throughout a year




Fig 14. Load variations in a typical day in January

3.2 Diesel-Biomass Scenario

The second scenario is based on the concept of co-firing. This phenomenon expresses the possibility of generation with two different fuel types, particularly mixture of fossil fuels and biomass resources. Although, in majority of systems the idea is to mix two fuels in a similar state of matter. Co-firing of solid biomass and liquid diesel might not be the solution to energy-related issues. This method adds to system's complexity and the structure is not efficient and cost effective in comparison with other available options. Therefore, the integrated model in this study is considered for replacing one of the existing stationary power units with a biogas-based generator.

CHEMICAL PROPERTIES OF THREE MOST COMMON BIOMASS FEEDSTOCK

Pellet source	Properties		
	Moisture content	Heating value	Carbon content
Sawdust	7.8 %	18.5	50.0
Straw	7.6 %	17.0	43.5
Corn cob	5.8 %	17.0	49.0

HOMER PRO is programmed to evaluate the operation of biomass-fueled generators based on the method of gasification. To this end, adding a biogas generator along with

current diesel engines provides this opportunity to cover a portion of energy demand by utilizing RES. For developing this model, it is required to estimate the renewable penetration in terms of generated capacity from consuming biomass resources. In a country such as Canada with a vast amount of organic materials from a wide range of agricultural, forestry, and wastes resources, selecting a proper feedstock considering price, heating value, and moisture content is of utmost importance. Taking the location of Masset into consideration and accounting for the fact that the forestry feedstock is the largest biomass source in British Columbia province, the best possible choice for energy generation is a forestry-based feedstock with low moisture content; out of which sawdust wood pellet is the most promising one [5, 6].

Determining the renewable penetration in a power system requires information regarding total electrical output of the renewable energy and the total load that is being served in a certain time step. This value can be either fixated or estimated using MLR percentage of the biogas generator. Fixating this value would allow realizing the needed power from bioenergy, and consequently, the required amount of biomass resources. Submitting the penetration value (K) and the total served load (L_{total}) in equation (1) can determine the required bioenergy for a year. Further, this specifies the required amount of biomass feedstock using equation (2). This equation represents the efficiency of electrical energy generation. Since HOMER PRO considers bioenergy production with gasification method, it is only necessary to determine the overall electrical efficiency of power generating unit and calculate the mass flow rate of biogas ($\dot{m}_B$) using its lower heating value (LHV).

$$K = \frac{P_B}{L_{total}} \quad (1)$$

$$\eta_{el} = \frac{P_B}{\dot{m}_B \cdot LHV_B} \cdot 100\% \quad (2)$$

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS OF CG260-12

Parameter	Specifications	
	Unit	Value
Electrical power	kW	2,530
Fuel consumption	kg/hr	3,577.83 (100% load)
Electrical efficiency	%	42.2% (100% load)
Emission (NO _x)	g/kg _{diesel}	0.95
MLR	%	40
Lifetime	hr	90,000
Price	\$	2,783,000.00 (1100\$/kW)

In this study, it is assumed that the biogas generator was forced to operate for 12 hours a day, while supplying a minimum load equal to 40% of its rated capacity. This method allowed to foresee the minimum renewable penetration that could be achieved, operating biogas engine under specific circumstances. Based on the rated capacity of engine, one can calculate the hourly minimum energy generation and further, determine the daily production. The ratio of this value and the total daily consumption is the minimum renewable penetration. The biogas-fueled generator in this scenario is based on CAT-CG260-12, which the technical specifications are provided in TABLE VI. This generating unit is capable of

operating continuously at 2,530 kW_e with an electrical efficiency of 44.2%. One of the primary advantages of such generator is the utilization of low calorific solid biomass resources. Vast majority of biogas-based systems require an LHV of at least 23.0 MJ/kg, which urges the consumers to purchase the resources at higher price, or possess a drying facility for moisture reduction. This scenario also elaborates on installation of electrical energy storage systems to provide a better flexibility and account for any sudden increase in the electric load, similar to that of abnormal load spike in January 2012. For that purpose, two parallel strings each comprising of two 1,250 kWh BASF-NAS batteries are connected across DC bus, while a bidirectional 1,019 kW_e system converter is responsible for inverting and rectifying.

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS OF BASF-NAS

Parameter	Specifications	
	Unit	Value
Capacity	kWh	1,250
Voltage	V	192
Efficiency	%	85
Minimum state of charge	%	20
Price	\$	330,000.00

3.3 Biomass Gasification

This scenario depicts the situation in which all the stationary generators are replaced with biogas-fueled generators in the last case. This setting eliminates diesel utilization and assess the operation of a fully bioenergy-based gasification system with heat recovery benefits. The CAT-CG260-12 generators are integrated with heat recovery system that allows them to operate as a CHP unit with overall efficiency of 82.5%. In HOMER PRO, deploying CHP units is done by initializing the heat recovery ratio in generator settings. According to the efficiency graph of the generator and the provided datasheet, the heat recovery ratio is supposed to be 72% to provide a maximum thermal efficiency of 43.2%. In general, the overall efficiency of a CHP systems is defined according to:

$$\eta_{CHP} = \eta_{el} + \eta_q \quad (3)$$

Owing to the fact that the overall capacity of power system is well above the electrical load and the system is considered as a topping cycle, the two generators are scheduled in a way to not operate simultaneously. This allows sufficient fuel consumption, and it spreads the energy-burden on the three generators evenly so as to avoid shortening their lifespans. The implementation of BASF-NAS batteries with the same structure and number of units as diesel-biomass scenario is also considered in this system. The significant aspect of this scenario is adding two extra loads in form of thermal energy demand. Although there is no clear heating energy profile for the case of Masset, but the community thermal load is projected based on the obtained data from a case study conducted in British Columbia province on 4,400 residential suits (Fig 15) [7]. The energy profile indicated the consumption of gas and electricity for heating purposes. This data was gathered and an estimation for the case of Masset (possibly the entire Haida Gwaii island) is provided. In addition, a load depicting the thermal demand for industrial

applications is added to this scenario (Fig 16). The energy profile is presented in TABLE VII.




Fig 15. Load variations of community load throughout a year




Fig 16. Load variations of industrial load throughout a year

PROJECTED THERMAL ENERGY PROFILE

Load type	Energy Profile		
	Average hourly	Average daily	Peak load
Community	4,334.46 kW	80,055.86 kW	5,016.30 kW
Industrial	8,333.3 kW	200,000 kW	15,277.60 kW

3.4 Biomass Direct Combustion (ORC)

Direct combustion is a well-known and preferred method of bioenergy generation. Providing the chance to consume biomass resources with higher moisture content and lower calorific value along with lower capital investment in comparison with gasification, are considered the significant advantages of this system. A common approach to integrate this technique in cogenerations systems is to couple a biomass-fueled boiler with an ORC structure. In an ORC structure, biomass is combusted in a boiler and the thermal energy is transferred to an organic working fluid for later evaporation and expansion in a turbine. Due to the fact that an ORC operates based on transferring heat to a working fluid and circulating it through various components, the electrical efficiency is very limited. A typical ORC-CHP system benefits from an overall efficiency of 88%, of which the electrical efficiency accounts for only 18-20% [8]. In this regard, the same configuration as the last scenario was integrated in this case as well. Although, the possibility of generator's heat recovery is increased to 80%, while the electrical efficiency is dropped to 18%. Further, the gasification ratio was improved to 100% indicating complete combustion of solid biomass. Every technical specification was remained the same.

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Economic viability in today's power systems is the most critical aspect. It has been only few years that environmental issues have attracted the attentions, but financial benefits have been the primary objective since the first development of power generating systems. Integrating energy systems that utilizes only renewable energies is a promising solution to energy related-issues, however, such systems are associated

with a crucial downside and that is the costly nature of such generation. Lower fossil fuel price, political advantages, and fewer efforts to implement renewable energies are holding the development of such systems back. Although in recent time, there have been significant contributions elaborating on the concept of hybridization and renewable implementation. This concept can be one of the most advantageous technique for rural area electrification. Since off-grid areas are associated with lower investment capabilities, people tend to choose the wrong option for the environment as long as the financial benefits are high and the payback period is at its minimum.

The obtained results from HOMER PRO simulation underlines the fact that the utilization of biomass in energy generation system for the case of Masset is associated with significant environmental benefits. Expectedly, gasification method possesses the lowest value of CO₂ emission, while on the other hand, base scenario releases almost 27,408 tons of carbon dioxide per year. Table VIII clearly indicates the advantage of gasification amongst the available methods. Given that such technique is associated with higher overall efficiency than Direct Combustion, biomass consumption is lower and so as the CO₂ emissions. There is no doubt that Direct Combustion and co-firing are also beneficial compared to the existing power system, however, the environmental impacts can be severe since no gas cleaning or reformation are being considered in such scenarios.

EMISSIONS RESULT OF EVERY SCENARIO

Scenario	Value [kg/year]		
	CO ₂	NO _x	PM
Base	27,408,450	389,177	256
Diesel-Biomass	20,033,106	284,094	187
Gasification	123,416	64.1	0
Combustion	199,548	104	0

In economic evaluation of energy systems, it is tended to analyze Net Present Cost (NPC), Levelized Cost of Electricity (LCOE), and operating costs (OPC). These parameters determine how costly a system can be and how much its products are valued considering the expenses. Complexity and modern technologies can extensively impact these parameters. Thus, it is clear that the clean technologies such as gasification and ORC are associated with higher NPC and OPC, while the base-scenario and co-firing system benefits from lower investment, operating, and maintenance expenditures. Commercial availability and financial incentives are also important factors that can determine the practical feasible of a power system.

ECONOMIC RESULTS OF EVERY SCENARIO

Scenario	Value [\$]		
	NPC	LCOE	NPC
Base	89,691,540	0.3136	8,391,606
Diesel-Biomass	94,915,310	0.3319	8,132,359
Gasification	134,514,700	0.3139	12,724,540
Combustion	207,550,800	0.4583	20,186,840

Taking advantages of renewable resources is not limited to development of a fully renewable-based plant. In majority of times, replacing a generator can have a significant impact on both environment and economic. Comparing the base-scenario and the co-firing system proves the fact that not in all situations the capital investment is major drawback for developing sustainable and cleaner energy systems. Renewable development in any energy system can be taken step by step towards reduction of fossil fuels consumption and increasing the renewable penetration. Moreover, integration of CHP systems with district heating networks would provide the opportunity to change the entire structure and develop a fully sustainable network, while receiving the entire investment back within 5 to 7 years. Amongst the suggested models, gasification is the only suitable option from both economic and environmental point of views. Since this conversion method is associated with lowest biomass consumption, the energy cost is relatively close to the base-scenario. Fuel expenditure is the primary and most influential factors that separates the feasibility of every scenario from one another.

Quantity	Value	Units
Total fuel consumed	8,525,245	kg
Avg fuel per day	23,357	kg/day
Avg fuel per hour	973	kg/hour




Fig 17. Diesel consumption of base-scenario throughout a year

Quantity	Value	Units
Total fuel consumed	6,223,008	kg
Avg fuel per day	17,049	kg/day
Avg fuel per hour	710	kg/hour




Fig 18. Diesel consumption of Diesel-Biomass scenario throughout a year

Quantity	Value	Units
Total feedstock consumed	67,433	tons
Avg feedstock per day	185	tons/day
Avg feedstock per hour	7.70	tons/hour




Fig 19. Biomass consumption of gasification scenario

Quantity	Value	Units
Total feedstock consumed	109,031	tons
Avg feedstock per day	299	tons/day
Avg feedstock per hour	12.4	tons/hour




Figure 20. Biomass consumption of ORC scenario

5 CONCLUSION

In this research, the possibility of biomass utilization for rural electrification was investigated and different configurations were simulated using HOMER PRO software. The methodology behind the biomass energy conversion was discussed and different types of conversion techniques were elaborated on. In particular, two methods, namely: direct combustion and gasification were precisely explained and a model was developed and simulated for each technique. In general, four scenarios were taken into consideration for Masset village in British Columbia province, Canada, in which the base scenario presented the existing power generation system, while the other three were suggested as improvements to sustainability and energy related issues. There is no doubt that the modern and clean technologies are capital intensive and may result in higher payback period, however, the future benefits including: sustainability, less environmental impacts, and efficient operation pays for the associated drawbacks in the long run. This research concluded that the gasification technique can be a promising approach for off-grid electrification. The clean, efficient, and economic viability of this method is advantageous for integration of cogeneration systems in rural areas.

6 ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors wish to thank University of Nottingham.

7 REFERENCES

- [1] M. Mandø, "4 - Direct combustion of biomass," in Biomass Combustion Science, Technology and Engineering, L. Rosendahl, Ed. Woodhead Publishing, 2013, pp. 61–83.
- [2] P. Bajpai, "Chapter 5 - Biomass conversion processes," in Biomass to Energy Conversion Technologies, P. Bajpai, Ed. Elsevier, 2020, pp. 41–151.
- [3] BC Hydro, "Haida Gwaii Request for Expression of Interest - Technical Information," no. September 2012, pp. 1–16, 2012.
- [4] EnergyBC, "B.C. Energy Maps," 2016. <http://www.energybc.ca/electricitymap.html> (accessed Mar. 19, 2020).
- [5] V. R. Surisetty, J. Kozinski, and A. K. Dalai, "Biomass, availability in Canada, and gasification: an overview," Biomass Conversion and Biorefinery, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 73–85, 2012, doi: 10.1007/s13399-011-0024-0.
- [6] "Canadian Biomass Pellet Map 2019," p. 4626, 2019.

- [7] RDHBuilding Engineering Ltd, “Energy Consumption and Conservation in Mid and High Rise Residential Buildings in British Columbia,” vol. 1, no. April 2010, p. 264, 2012, doi: 10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004.
- [8] S. Quoilin, M. Van Den Broek, S. Declaye, P. Dewallef, and V. Lemort, “Techno-economic survey of organic rankine cycle (ORC) systems,” *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 22, pp. 168–186, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2013.01.02

