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Introduction
What is PyPSA-Eur-Sec?

Need to decarbonize all sectors in Europe... while obeying spatial and temporal constraints.
What is PyPSA-Eur-Sec?

Represents all energy flows...

**Sources**
- Wind & Solar PV
- Hydroelectricity
- Biogas
- Fossil gas
- Other biomass
- Atmosphere
- Fossil oil

**Grids & Storage**
- Electricity
- Hydrogen
- Methane
- Carbon Dioxide
- Liquid hydrocarbons

**Demand**
- Electric devices
- Resistive heaters
- Heat pumps
- Gas boilers
- CHP
- Electric
- Fuel cell
- Internal combustion
- Industry

and bottlenecks in clustered network.

Today's transmission
- 10 GW
- 5 GW
Goals of This Presentation

- Explain workflow management with **snakemake**
- Show concretely how this works for the open model of the European transmission system **PyPSA-Eur**
- Explain the modelling choices behind the sector-coupled version of the model, **PyPSA-Eur-Sec** (what is exogenous and what is determined endogenously inside the model)
Workflow Management with Snakemake
Data-Driven Modelling

Lots of different types of data come together for the modelling...

- Clustered network model
- Power plants & technology assumptions
- Renewable potentials & decades of hourly time series for each point in space
- Demand forecasts & time series

Analysis and optimisation
Problems

- Many different data sources
- Many data sources need cleaning and processing before they can be used
- Many intermediate scripts and datasets
- Many colleagues hack something together in a folder - hard to reproduce later
- Often dependencies are not clear (both data and software)
- Data and code change over time
- Want to run many parameteric scenarios for same model
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What we need is a workflow management tool.
“The Snakemake workflow management system is a tool to create **reproducible and scalable data analyses**. Workflows are described via a human readable, Python based language. They can be seamlessly scaled to server, cluster, grid and cloud environments, without the need to modify the workflow definition. Finally, Snakemake workflows can entail a description of required software, which will be automatically deployed to any execution environment.”

See [snakemake presentation](snakemake-presentation).
A graphical unpacking of the dependencies in the PyPSA-Eur Snakemake file:
See other slidedeck for breakdown of PyPSA-Eur snakemake rules.
PyPSA-Eur-Sec
Sector coupling: A new source of flexibility

**Sources**
- Wind & Solar PV
- Hydroelectricity
- Biogas
- Fossil gas
- Other biomass
- Atmosphere
- Fossil oil

**Grids & Storage**
- Electricity
  - Electrolysis
  - Fuel cell
- Hydrogen
  - Methanation
  - Steam reforming
- Methane
- Carbon Dioxide
  - Direct air capture
  - Carbon capture
  - Fischer-Tropsch
- Liquid hydrocarbons

**Demand**
- Electric devices
- Resistive heaters
- Heat pumps
- Gas boilers
- CHP
- Electric
- Fuel cell
- Internal combustion
- Industry

**Sectors**
- Heating
- Transport
- Industry
PyPSA-Eur-Sec builds on PyPSA-Eur

- PyPSA-Eur-Sec includes PyPSA-Eur as a **snakemake subworkflow**.
- PyPSA-Eur builds the clustered power grid and renewable generators.
- Then PyPSA-Eur-Sec adds other sectors.
In PyPSA other sectors are represented with buses for energy carriers, demand time series, (multi-)links for energy conversion and material flow, stores and generators. Partial graph:
Technology Choices: Exogenous Versus Endogenous

The model **minimises total costs given constraints** (CO₂ budgets, renewable targets, limits on wind/solar potentials, etc.). The model can choose some technologies itself, i.e. **endogenously**, while others we choose beforehand, i.e. **exogenously**.

Endogenous:

- electricity generation
- transmission reinforcement
- space and water heating technologies (including building renovations)
- supply of process heat for industry
- carbon capture

Exogenous:

- energy carrier for road transport (2050: BEV for light-duty, BEV or FCEV for heavy-duty)
- kerosene for aviation
- energy carrier for shipping (2050: LH₂)
- steel production: DRI with hydrogen, then electric arc (could make it compete with blast furnace)
- electrification in industry
Rationale?

It depends where study is focused.

In some areas we know where things are going (e.g. electric vehicles for light-duty vehicles), and want to limit computation times.

Many things determined by external considerations (electric vehicles driven by air pollution, building renovations by comfort, etc.).

Choices all debatable (iron with CCS versus DRI with H₂, whether retrofitting is fixed or not, shipping fuels, etc.).
Transport sector: Electrification of Transport

- Road and rail transport is fully electrified (vehicle costs are not considered)
- Because of higher efficiency of electric motors, final energy consumption 3.5 times lower than today at 1100 TWh_{el}/a for Europe
- In model can replace Battery Electric Vehicles (BEVs) with Fuel Cell Electric Vehicles (FCEVs) consuming hydrogen. Advantage: hydrogen cheap to store. Disadvantage: efficiency of fuel cell only 60%, compared to 90% for battery discharging.

Weekly profile for the transport demand based on statistics gathered by the German Federal Highway Research Institute (BASt).
Transport sector: Battery Electric Vehicles

- Passenger cars to Battery Electric Vehicles (BEVs), 50 kWh battery available and 11 kW charging power
- Can participate in DSM and V2G, depending on scenario (state of charge returns to at least 75% every morning)
- All BEVs have time-dependent availability, averaging 80%, max 95% (at night)
- No changes in consumer behaviour assumed (e.g. car-sharing/pooling)
- BEVs are treated as exogenous (capital costs NOT included in calculation)

Availability (i.e. fraction of vehicles plugged in) of Battery Electric Vehicles (BEV).
Heat demand profile from 2011 in each region using population-weighted average daily T in each region, degree-day approx. and scaled to Eurostat total heating demand.

- All space and water heating in the residential and services sectors is considered, with no additional efficiency measures (conservative) - total heating demand is 3585 TWh\(_{th}\)/a.

- Heating demand can be met by heat pumps, resistive heaters, gas boilers, solar thermal, Combined-Heat-and-Power (CHP) units. No industrial waste heat.

- Thermal Energy Storage (TES) is available to the system as hot water tanks.
We model both fully decentralised heating and cases where up to 45% of heat demand is met with district heating in northern countries. Heating technology options for buildings:

**Decentral individual heating** can be supplied by:
- Air- or Ground-sourced heat pumps
- Resistive heaters
- Gas boilers
- Small solar thermal
- Water tanks with short time constant $\tau = 3$ days

**Central heating** can be supplied via district heating networks by:
- Air-sourced heat pumps
- Resistive heaters
- Gas boilers
- Large solar thermal
- Water tanks with long time constant $\tau = 180$ days
- CHPs

Building renovations can be co-optimised to reduce space heating demand.
For ‘hard-to-defossilise’ sectors, we assume some process- and fuel-switching (under review):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron &amp; Steel</td>
<td>70% from scrap, rest from direct reduction with 1.7 MWhH₂/tSteel + electric arc (process emissions 0.03 tCO₂/tSteel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminium</td>
<td>80% recycling, for rest: methane for high-enthalpy heat (bauxite to alumina) followed by electrolysis (process emissions 1.5 tCO₂/tAl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement</td>
<td>Waste and solid biomass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics &amp; other NMM</td>
<td>Electrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals</td>
<td>Synthetic methane, synthetic naphtha and hydrogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other industry</td>
<td>Electrification; process heat from biomass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping</td>
<td>Liquid hydrogen (could be replaced by other liquid fuels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td>Kerosene from Fischer-Tropsch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carbon is tracked through system: 90% of industrial emissions are captured; direct air capture (DAC); synthetic methane and liquid hydrocarbons; transport and sequestration 20 €/tCO₂
PyPSA-Eur-Sec: Preliminary Results
Electrification is essential to decarbonise sectors such as transport, heating and industry. Some scenarios show a doubling or more of electricity demand.
Sustainability doesn’t just mean taking account of environmental constraints.

There are also social and political constraints, particularly for transmission grid and onshore wind development.
Fortunately other sectors offer flexibility back to grid

Other sectors offer **flexibility** (e.g. battery electric vehicles, power-to-gas, thermal storage), enabling energy to be **stored cheaply** and **transported easily** (e.g. using gas networks).
The Issue: Most cross-sectoral studies are at country level, but don’t have the resolution to resolve transmission bottlenecks or the variability of renewables

Our Goal: Model full energy system over Europe with enough resolution to understand the effects of congestion and the cost-benefits of transmission reinforcement

The Challenge: Enormous datasets, computability, complexity

Today: Some preliminary results from my group and our cooperation partners
Some brief, preliminary results from our sector-coupled, 181-node model of the European energy system.

- Couple all energy sectors (power, heat, transport industry)
- Reduce CO₂ emissions to zero
- Assume smaller bidding zones and widespread dynamic pricing
- Conservative technology assumptions
- Examine effect of acceptance for grid expansion and onshore wind
Distribution of technologies: No grid expansion

- **System cost**
  - $5 \text{ bEUR/a}$
  - $1 \text{ bEUR/a}$

- **Transmission reinforcement**
  - $10 \text{ GW}$
  - $5 \text{ GW}$

Key technologies:
- hydroelectricity
- onshore wind
- offshore wind
- solar
- power-to-heat
- gas-to-power/heat
- power-to-gas
- hot water storage
### Distribution of technologies: 25% more grid volume - similar to TYNDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>System cost</th>
<th>Transmission reinforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 bEUR/a</td>
<td>10 GW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 bEUR/a</td>
<td>5 GW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- hydroelectricity
- onshore wind
- offshore wind
- solar
- power-to-heat
- gas-to-power/heat
- power-to-gas
- hot water storage

[Map showing distribution of technologies across Europe]
Distribution of technologies: 50% more grid volume - double the TYNDP

System cost
- 5 bEUR/a
- 1 bEUR/a

Transmission reinforcement
- 10 GW
- 5 GW

- hydroelectricity
- onshore wind
- offshore wind
- solar
- power-to-heat
- gas-to-power/heat
- power-to-gas
- hot water storage
Benefit of grid expansion for sector-coupled system

- Direct system costs **bit higher than today’s system** (€ 700 billion per year with same assumptions)
- Systems **without grid expansion** are feasible, but more costly
- As grid is expanded, **costs reduce** from solar and power-to-gas; more offshore wind
- Total cost benefit of extra grid: ~ € 47 billion per year
- **Over half of benefit available at 25% expansion** (like TYNDP)
Benefit of full onshore wind potentials

- **Technical potentials** for onshore wind respect land usage
- However, they do not represent the **socially-acceptable potentials**
- Technical potential of $\sim 400$ GW in Germany is **unlikely to be built**
- Costs rise by $\sim € 42$ billion per year as we **eliminate onshore wind** (with no grid expansion)
- Rise is only $\sim € 14$ billion per year if we **allow a quarter of technical potential** ($\sim 100$ GW for Germany)
Role of hydrogen network

- New hydrogen network takes over role of transporting energy around Europe when no electricity grid expansion allowed
- Annualised cost of network: € 8 billion per year
- Largest H2 pipeline capacity: 81 GW in GB
- Largest H2 electrolyzer capacity: 178 GW in DK
- Energy moved per hour: AC is 99 TWhkm/h, DC is 3.3 TWhkm/h, H2 is 209 TWhkm/h
Should also consider indirect costs, which change the picture.

Costs increase as we reduce emissions and accommodate public acceptance...
Should also consider indirect costs, which change the picture.

Costs increase as we reduce emissions and accommodate public acceptance...

but not if we include indirect environmental, health and social costs (schematic example)
Large Space of Near-Optimal Solutions

\[ f(x) \leq (1+\delta) \cdot f(x^*) \]

Feasible space

Optimal solution

Decision variable

Objective function

\[ f(x) \]

\[ x^* \]
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