


Perspectives on green hydrogen in Europe - during an energy crisis and towards future climate neutrality

Marie Münster ^{1,*}, Rasmus Bramstoft¹, Ioannis Kountouris¹, Lissy Langer¹, Dogan Keles¹, Ruth Schlautmann², Friedemann Mörs², Cesare Sacconi³, Alessandro Guzzini³, Marco Pellegrini³, Andreas Zauner⁴, Hans Böhm⁴, Darja Markova⁴, Shi You⁵, Martin Pumpa⁶, Frank Fischer⁶, Francesco Sergi⁷, Giovanni Brunaccini⁷, Davide Aloisio⁷, Marco Ferraro⁷, Machiel Mulder⁸, Hans Rasmusson⁹

¹DTU Technical University of Denmark, Department of Technology, Management and Economics, Kgs Lyngby, Denmark

²DVGW Research Center at Engler-Bunte-Institute of Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Gas Technology, Karlsruhe, Germany

³UNIBO, University of Bologna, Department of Industrial Engineering, Bologna, Italy

⁴Energieinstitut an der Johannes Kepler Universität Linz, Austria

⁵DTU Technical University of Denmark, Department of Wind Energy Systems, Kgs Lyngby, Denmark

⁶DBI-Gastechnologisches Institut gGmbH, Gasnetze und Gasanlagen, Freiberg, Germany

⁷CNR-ITAE, National Research Council of Italy, Institute of Advanced Energy Technologies (ITAE), , Messina, Italy

⁸University of Groningen, Faculty of Economics and Business, Groningen, Netherlands

⁹ERIG European Research Institute for Gas and Energy Innovation, Brussels, Belgium

*Corresponding address. Produktionstorvet, Building 424, room 012, DK-2800 Lyngby. E-mail: maem@dtu.dk

Abstract

Hydrogen and regional energy infrastructure are significant for the European Green Deal and was focus of the SuperP2G research Project (Synergies Utilising renewable Power Regionally by means of Power to Gas). Five national projects (Denmark, Netherlands, Germany, Austria, and Italy) cooperated to investigate Power-to-Gas feasibility. The energy crisis due to the war in Ukraine peaked during the project. The demand for green hydrogen increased as natural gas was reduced. In 2022, the cost of blue hydrogen was 9.5-12.6 EUR/kg. Higher electricity prices impacted the cost of green hydrogen less. Considering the 2021-2022 level of electricity and gas prices, and the potential flexibility of electrolyzers, electrolytic hydrogen was on a par with blue hydrogen. On the long term, green hydrogen is assumed to be competitive around 2030. A fast ramping up and favourable electricity cost development could halve the hydrogen production cost until 2040 with investment being the major contributor to a cost reduction. Meanwhile, the smart operation of a wind/electrolyser system might achieve 24% reduction of its operation cost. The following measures are recommended to introduce green hydrogen on large scale: 1) Certification of green and low carbon hydrogen and a uniform CO₂ price; 2) Ensuring a level playing field across markets; 3) Enabling policies to enhance European security of supply by increasing domestic production and diversifying imports; 4) Fast ramping of renewable electricity generation; 5) Coordinated planning of hydrogen, methane and electricity infrastructures.

© The Author(s) 2024. Published by Oxford University Press. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>, which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Lay Summary

Power-to-Gas is important to enable high renewable energy shares in the European Green Deal. This article provides perspectives from different analyses of feasibility of Power-to-Gas in Europe. Promising results were found about reduction of hydrogen costs through development of flexible and efficient operation, reduced investment costs driven by scaling and learning curves, optimised placement and improved infrastructure with dedicated hydrogen grids. Furthermore, increasing prices for natural gas due to the Russian invasion to Ukraine led to favourable conditions for renewable hydrogen compared to blue hydrogen based on natural gas with CCS.

Keywords: Renewable hydrogen, energy system analysis, hydrogen demand, energy crisis, electrolyser plant design, electrolyser operation optimisation, Power-to-Gas plant location

1 Introduction

Large investments in variable renewable energy and electrification are required to meet the Paris Agreement's targets and avoid excessive climate change. Electrolysis can enable flexible electricity consumption [1] and provide hydrogen as a storable, green fuel, reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and dependency on natural gas imports. Green hydrogen can substitute the use of conventional grey hydrogen from natural gas in the short term and be used to provide Power-to-X fuels for industry and heavy transport in the long term [2] [3]. Blue hydrogen produced from natural gas with carbon capture and storage may reduce GHG emissions compared to grey, but environmental benefits and security of supply are still debated [4]. However, the energy crisis triggered by the war in Ukraine led to dramatic increases in natural gas prices, affecting the electricity prices. Developing technologies for a renewable energy system is important, the urgency for reducing GHG emissions and meeting set climate targets requires sound technical and economic assessments to support purposeful decision-making. Therefore, to provide novel insights into the scale-up of green hydrogen technologies, while considering the competition between production technologies as well as synergies across the energy system, the European SuperP2G research project (Synergies Utilising renewable Power Regionally by means of Power to Gas) [5] aimed to minimize risks and estimate the feasibility of power-to-gas at different levels, focusing on the regional business case. The project was conducted before and during the energy crisis, and this article reflects on the project results and how the crisis impacted them. In this paper, we provide different perspectives on green hydrogen in Europe - during an energy crisis and towards future climate neutrality, based on research conducted during the SuperP2G research project. Compared to other studies in the literature, which often have a narrow and specific focus, e.g. on hydrogen production technologies, or using energy system models to address energy futures, this paper addresses the energy chain from supply through transmission and storage to demand, assessed both from technical, economical and systems perspective. By doing so, we summarize findings from a large variety of studies to address key perspectives related to 1) how the energy crisis impacted gas and electricity costs, 2) future development of hydrogen production, transmission, storage and use at European level towards 2050, 3) as well as five national case studies, which dive into technology development, industrial demands, and economical benefits.

2 The energy crisis and its impact on gas and electricity costs

As a direct effect of the war in Ukraine, Europe has turned away from obtaining Russian gas on short notice. The sudden displacement in the supply and demand balance has led to dramatic price increases while the member states are searching for new supply routes.

Historically, the Natural Gas EU Dutch Title Transfer Facility (TTF) [6] have reported natural gas prices around 18 €/MWh (+/- 10 €/MWh) before September 2021. Since then, until end of 2022, it has been above 66 €/MWh, with spikes in December 2021 (180 €/MWh), March 2022 (225 €/MWh) and peaking in August 2022 with 340 €/MWh. The natural gas price has declined since, reaching a level around 50 €/MWh in March 2023. However, still more than twice the former price level (Figure 1).

In the second half of 2019 an average total purchase cost of 33.1 €/MWh and 37.0 €/MWh is reported respectively for Italian and EU-27 non-household costumers including taxes and levies [6]. The database shows a price of 76.7 €/MWh for Italy (+130% respect to the beginning of the project) for the first half of 2022 and 76.4 €/MWh for EU-27 (+106%).

Being the main feedstock in the steam methane reforming process, the natural gas purchase cost greatly affects the economic competitiveness of grey hydrogen. Based on Hydrogen Europe reference, [7] a total average cost of 2.67 €/kg for grey hydrogen is estimated in EU-27 in 2021 i.e., a value aligned with those reported by other Authors in the literature like Stenberg et al. (2020) [8] and Pruvost et al. (2023) [9]. Almost 67% of this cost is referred to natural gas consumption. By conservatively assuming the same proportion, grey hydrogen production cost is estimated between 8.9-10.9 €/kg in the case that natural gas purchase cost ranges between 160-200 €/MWh, i.e., a set of values occurred during the crisis in 2022. A higher cost has to be considered in case of blue hydrogen production, including the carbon capture and storage sections. Specifically, the additional cost depends on several techno-economic factors that relies on the specific project like, for example, the adopted process, the plant capacity, the adopted solution for CO₂ management. However, a first tentative value in the range of 0.6-1.70 €/kg can be assumed in accordance with Gislam (2021) [10], resulting a production cost for blue hydrogen in the in the range of 9.5-12.6 €/kg.

Assuming that grid connected power to gas (P2G) will be the dominating case in Europe, a major portion of electrolytic hydrogen production costs stems from the cost of renewable electricity. Correspondingly, the impact of electricity price levels is high if the electricity is acquired from the electricity market. The projection of the build-up of renewable electricity production is therefore a defining factor, but similarly is the fact that the gas prices also influence the electricity prices. According to the data presented by EURELECTRIC [11] there was a close relation between changes in natural gas and electricity prices, where a change of the average gas price on a month-to-month basis in the period from January 2021 to April 2022 corresponded to a similar relative change in electricity price with only a +/- 20% difference.

In October 2022 the “Regulation on an emergency intervention to address high energy prices (EU 2022/1854)” [12] was adopted for EU. These measures were limited in time to start before 1 December 2022 and run until 31 March 2023. A review is announced for October 2023. The regulation introduces a price limit for inframarginal electricity generation technologies at 180€ on realised market revenues per MWh. The limitation of the revenues for the relevant generators of inframarginal plants leads to extra financial benefits for Member States, that can redistribute it to households, businesses and the industry at large, exposed to high electricity prices. In addition, a so called “Solidarity contribution from fossil fuel companies” was introduced, which would cover profits which are above a 20% increase on the average profits of the previous three year. This could be redirected to households, business and industry in a similar manner and measures fostering the green transition are explicitly mentioned. The regulation introduces a price limit for inframarginal electricity generation technologies at 180€ on realised market revenues per MWh. The limitation of the revenues for the relevant generators of inframarginal plants leads to extra financial benefits for Member States, that can redistribute it to households, businesses and the industry at large, exposed to high electricity prices. In addition, a so called “Solidarity contribution from fossil fuel companies” was introduced, which would cover profits which are above a 20% increase on the average profits of the previous three year. This could be redirected to households, business and industry in a similar manner and measures fostering the green transition are explicitly mentioned.

Looking at Denmark in 2019 [13], the average electricity price was 38 €/MWh. In 2022 average price was 219 €/MWh (476% increase). However, if considering electrolyser operation of only 1224 hours, the average electricity price would have been only 31 €/MWh (8,8% decrease), which illustrates the benefit of highly flexible electrolysers. In Austria the average price was 40.2 €/MWh in 2019 and 35 €/MWh in 2020. In 2021 it was 110 €/MWh (174 % increase to 2019) and in 2022 it was 265 €/MWh (559% increase to 2019) [14]. In Italy the average electricity price was 52.3, 38.9 and 125.5 €/MWh respectively in 2019, 2020 and 2021 [15]. In 2022 the average price was 304 €/MWh (533% increase respect to 2019). However, the Italian price cap mechanism [16], [17] would limit max electricity price to 210 €/MWh (338 % increase).




Figure 1 a and b: Illustrations how the war in Ukraine impacted the price of natural gas in Europe until end of 2022. A) Natural gas price the last 10 years and b) Natural gas price in 2022 [18]

3 Development of hydrogen demands and fluxes across Europe

Renewable hydrogen is expected to become increasingly important as a zero-emission option for all sectors that cannot be directly electrified or can only be electrified with great difficulty, such as some applications in industry (high-temperature processes, reduction processes) or in mobility, where battery electric drives are reaching their limits. In a European context, “A Hydrogen Strategy for a Climate-Neutral Europe” [19] was published in 2020 to accelerate the deployment of hydrogen technologies. The strategy aims to achieve 6 GW (1 Mt H₂ or 33 TWh) of hydrogen production by 2024, 40 GW (10 Mt H₂ or 333 TWh) by 2030, and 13-14% of the total energy mix by 2050. In 2022, the “REPowerEU” strategy [20] updated these targets to 65 GW of electrolyser capacity by 2030, with 10 Mt H₂ production in the EU and import possibilities of 10 Mt H₂. The European Hydrogen Backbone [21] and Ready4H₂ [22] initiatives by natural gas TSOs and DSOs aim to achieve a common European hydrogen grid. Hydrogen demand estimates vary widely depending on scenario conditions, but studies suggest that demand could be up to 3100 TWh by 2050.

In a European study, Kountouris et al. [23], investigate the future deployment of hydrogen production (green and blue), the benefits of a unified European hydrogen infrastructure, as well as considering the possibilities of importing hydrogen from outside Europe. The study applies the comprehensive, open source energy system model, Balmorel [24], which is well-know and validated [25] [26], and it covers all main energy sectors and is suitable for performing long-term scenarios.

In the study by Kountouris et al. [23] hydrogen demand projections for industry (feedstock and energy) and transport were estimated at 326 TWh and 1530 TWh by 2030 and 2050, respectively, based on the European Hydrogen Backbone. The results of the study [23], showed investments in electrolyzers in the range of 24-68 GW by 2030, increasing to 310-507 GW by 2050. The results also suggested that hydrogen produced in the South of Europe could become prominent by exploiting cheap solar PV potential. A hydrogen transmission infrastructure is expected to be part of the least-cost solution for transporting hydrogen from the South, mainly from Spain and Italy, but also to a limited extent from the Nordics around the North Sea. The study also identified hydrogen corridors from the South, in line with the Iberian corridor [23], and suggested that potential hydrogen import from North Africa could be possible (Figure 2). The study estimated that around 100 TWh of hydrogen would be imported from outside Europe by 2050, while reaching higher import levels by 2045 around 190 TWh, highlighting the competition in hydrogen production costs between the EU and its surroundings. Additionally, the study shed light on the potential lock-in effects of blue hydrogen, which can appear if investments are made in blue hydrogen production in early years, before green hydrogen become more economic viable. The study, furthermore, suggests that high natural gas or electricity prices could impact the competition between blue and green hydrogen.




Figure 2 Estimated hydrogen production potentials and fluxes across Europe according to analysis conducted in SuperP2G on basis of the market conditions of 2021 [23]

4 P2G case in Austria

The Austrian case aimed to promote the integration of renewable energy in the industry sector by assessing the future demand and cost of renewable hydrogen and synthetic natural gas (SNG) using the SuperP2G project in the WIVA P&G model region¹. The study conducted a literature review, held discussions with stakeholders, and used three tools developed by the Energieinstitut an der JKU Linz (CoLLeCT, PResTiGE, and MOVE2) to estimate future demand and costs for renewable gases.

Austrian chemical and steel industries will be the primary consumers of renewable gases, with a projected total demand of 60 TWh for hydrogen and 4.5 TWh for SNG by 2040 according to the Austrian Hydrogen Strategy [27]. Contrary to the historical trend of decreasing investment costs for hydrogen production units (electrolysers) due to learning curve and economies of scale effects, there has recently been an increase in investment costs due to global supply difficulties.

Recent studies [28, 29, 30] suggest that there is potential for an early and steep growth of global electrolysis capacities. Even though, investment costs have increased in recent years due to mentioned factors, further positive developments and the implementation of national or regional targets are expected to lead to significant cost reductions in the future (Figure 3).




Figure 3 Estimated ranges for cost reduction based on technological learning of electrolysis for global industrial deployment scenarios related to electric input power (a) and to hydrogen output with developing efficiencies (b). Based on and updated from [28]

To enable stakeholders to consider the business case of a Power-to-Gas plant, a calculator based on the model PResTiGE² allows for a parameter variation for calculating the hydrogen production costs. According to a wide

¹ WIVA P&G (Wasserstoffinitiative Vorzeigeregion Austria Power & Gas) is one of three Austrian energy model regions aiming for the demonstration of the transition of the Austrian economy towards climate neutrality with the production of renewable gases, particularly hydrogen. See <https://www.wiva.at/>.

² PResTiGE, an in-house development of the Energieinstitut an der JKU Linz, is a toolbox for current and prospective techno-economic and environmental benchmarking of PtG systems. The tool comprises data from demo sites and benchmark systems as options for electricity storage or applications of the gaseous products H₂ or SNG at different scales, in forms that are regionally adaptable overall process steps of the PtG system and product application. The assessment results reveal the optimal P2G system configuration and implementation (i.e., with minimal cost and maximal system benefits). Sensitivities can be systematically analysed to explore the robustness of the results. The quantitative economic assessment via PResTiGE is based on the specific production costs of hydrogen or SNG, which are calculated from the total annual costs in relation to the amount of annually produced energy. The total annual costs are calculated using the so-called “annuity method” following VDI 2067. Applied among others in [45] and [46]

range of parameters used, the hydrogen production costs for a 100 MW electrolysis plant in Europe in 2030 could range from about 4 to 23 €/kg, depending on the plant site and the development of future investment costs, electricity prices, technology performance, operation strategies, etc. However, analysing a range of hydrogen production costs and varying different parameters, production costs could be in the range of 9€/kg in 2030, 5€/kg in 2040, and 4€/kg in 2050 (Figure 4).




Figure 4 Range of hydrogen production costs due to parameter variation³. (Source: Energieinstitut an der JKU Linz)

According to the macro-economic analysis, integrating renewable hydrogen into industrial processes, defined in the Austrian National Hydrogen Strategy, will have positive effects on the Austrian economy. The study shows an average annual GDP increase of 0.5 billion euros and employment increase by about 20,000 employees between 2025 and 2030. Additional investment impulses through the expansion of hydrogen production and value added through hydrogen production as the main drivers of these effects was identified. Additionally, as net exports increases, along with more or less constant yearly investments, private consumptions are expected to increase.

It is obvious, that the higher the share of domestically produced hydrogen, the lower the value-added flows from hydrogen imports, and the higher the positive effects on GDP. The effects of hydrogen import quota intensity on GDP show a wide spread, with more intensive domestic hydrogen production leading to higher levels of investments and positive effects on the GDP of about +1,4% GDP increase until 2040 with 60% hydrogen import. The effects of hydrogen import price also show high impact on GDP, with a higher import price resulting in reduced positive effects on GDP and a lower import price resulting in a more positive effect on GDP. A hydrogen import price of 4 €/kg yielded a +1,4 bn€ GDP increase until 2040.

³ The investigation of the potential range of hydrogen production costs was carried out by systematically changing six key parameters, resulting in a comprehensive dataset with 486 annual data points for the years 2030, 2040 and 2050. The range of these data points is summarized by utilizing a boxplot diagram. The parameters include: 1. Renewable Energy Source: The choice between Photovoltaic and Wind power take into account different energy sources; 2. Full-Load Hour of the Electrolyzer: Investigating three sites with varying operational durations allows to discern the influence of electrolyzer full-load hours on costs. 3. Electricity Costs: Varied within +/- 20%, this parameter explores the sensitivity of hydrogen production costs to electricity costs. 4. Electrolyzer Technology: The selection of Alkaline Electrolyzer (AEC), Proton Ex-change Membrane Electrolyzer (PEMEC), or Solid Oxide Electrolyzer (SOEC) takes into account for each technology influencing factors like investment costs. 5. Investment Costs: With a variability of +/- 20%, account for uncertainties, reflecting potential economic fluctuations in estimating capital outlays. 6. Efficiency of Electrolyzer: Subject to a fluctuation of +/- 5%, this parameter considers practical operational aspects, such as how the electrolyzer is operated.

5 P2G case in the Netherlands

The University of Groningen's SuperP2G research projects have explored the economic value of Power to Gas (P2G) as a flexible source of energy that can aid in the transition to low-carbon energy systems. The projects examined the potential for P2G to provide flexibility services related to timing, location, and end-users, and analyzed the various economic benefits of these services.

Li et al. (2021) [29] developed a short-term partial equilibrium model of integrated electricity and hydrogen markets and analyzed the economic potential of P2G as a source of flexibility in electricity markets with high shares of renewables and high external demand for hydrogen. They found that P2G reduces the price volatility of electricity prices, but a high external demand for hydrogen reduces this impact. P2G can deliver positive benefits for some groups, but the fixed costs of P2G assets and the costs of replacing natural gas with more expensive hydrogen outweigh these benefits. Investments in P2G become profitable from a social-welfare perspective when the reduction in carbon emissions is valued at 150-750 euro/ton.

Ghaemi et al. (2023) [31] examined the extent to which producing green hydrogen through electrolyzers can contribute to congestion alleviation in medium-voltage distribution grids (MVDNs) in the presence of high amounts of renewable energy sources (RESs), flexible consumers of electricity, and a local heat system. They found that converting power to hydrogen can be an economically efficient way to reduce congestion in MVDNs when there is a high amount of RES, but the economic value of electrolyzers as providers of flexibility to MVDNs decreases when more other options for flexibility provision exist.

Perey et al. (2023) [32] analyzed the most competitive sources of low-carbon hydrogen for the Northwest European market, taking into account costs of local production, conversion, and transport. They found that local Steam Methane Reforming with Carbon Capture and Storage is the most competitive low-carbon hydrogen supply when international gas prices return to historical levels, while import from Morocco with electrolysis directly connected to offshore wind generation is the most competitive source when gas prices remain high. For distances above 10,000 km, import in the form of ammonia becomes a competitive option, while otherwise pipeline transport is preferable.

Overall, the research projects demonstrate the economic potential of P2G as a provider of flexibility to energy systems, although the economic value of P2G depends on various factors, such as carbon prices, installation costs, and the availability of other options for flexibility provision.

6 P2G case in Germany

The German case aimed to improve existing tools for hydrogen (H₂) analysis and optimal location of power-to-gas (P2G) value chains for regional development considering future H₂ demand and process engineering of P2G plants. EcoMeth [33], a tool developed by the DVGW Research Centre at Engler-Bunte-Institute, was enhanced to evaluate methanation and CO₂ capture technologies from a technical and economical point of view. For example, by optimizing the design of cooled fixed bed and three-phase methanation plants [34], EcoMeth was expanded with additional technologies to support individual consulting and project implementation. The tool calculates CAPEX and levelized costs using factor and annuity methods, enabling fast computation and adaptation to different scales of the plant. It utilizes three major factors for efficient cost minimization in the design of the plant: Adapting P2G plants to local site conditions, identifying cost drivers, and optimizing plant size in relation to storage capacities. The system analysis section focuses on utilizing heat sources and sinks with the pinch method, leading to high energy utilization through internal heat integration and integration into existing energy systems. During the analysis of the three-phase-methanation plant, it was found that the main equipment cost plus the catalyst cost only have a 20% share on the total CAPEX. The specific CAPEX for the methanation plant can be re-

duced significantly from €450/kW to €160/kW when increasing the scale of the plant from 5 MW to 100 MW (regarding methane output) [35]. These results are not expected to be impacted directly by changing conditions in the energy market but indirectly through inflation affecting prices of equipment and services. The dynamic operation of the plant is also an important factor impacting the results, especially in a situation where price fluctuations for natural gas and electricity increase as seen during the energy crisis.

DBI developed the DBI-MAT tool [36] as part of the German Case project to determine optimized scenarios for integrating renewable energy sources, hydrogen applications, or other processes in an economical and ecological feasible way.

Four different scenarios were analysed for a location in central Germany [37]. In scenario one, only wind power is used for the electrolysis plant, and grid electricity is used for the Balance of Plant (BoP). In scenario two, the electrolysis system is connected to the grid and operates at full load, with wind power taking priority over grid purchases. Scenario three includes a photovoltaic (PV) plant in addition to the wind farm and excludes grid electricity for electrolysis, while scenario four uses both wind and PV power, with the electrolysis system connected to the grid and electricity from renewable sources having priority.

The findings indicate that, in scenario one, the primary costs for producing hydrogen, are most significantly influenced by the wind farm's capital expenditure (CAPEX) and the imputed interest rate. In scenario two, electricity procurement is the largest cost, with the cost ranging from €5.23/kg to €8.23/kg for the produced hydrogen. Scenario three reveals the interest rate, Wind farm CAPEX, and PV plant CAPEX as major cost drivers, while scenario four finds that electricity prices from the grid are the most significant influence on hydrogen production costs. In summary, these findings collectively underscore that the cost of electricity emerges as the predominant driver impacting the overall production costs of hydrogen.

In the optimization investigation for scenario three, the size of the renewable energy sources is optimized with an electrolysis to wind ratio of 1.8:1 and an electrolysis to PV ratio of 3.5:1. These ratios come from a location with medium PV potential and onshore wind turbines and represent the situation in central Germany.

7 P2G case in Italy

The Italian case aimed to design a new tool to optimize P2G plants in size and location. For this purpose, a Geographic Information System (GIS) based approach was adopted. Developed and validated through the collaboration of the Italian partners, i.e., CNR-ITAE and UNIBO, the alpha version of the tool allows the users to identify the optimal Hydrogen Supply Chain (HSC) while minimizing the Levelized Cost of Hydrogen (LCOH), i.e., production and transport cost. Specifically, to investigate the transport cost, GIS data about the existing energy and road infrastructure are implemented in a database developed for the purpose.

The tool is not specifically dedicated or linked to a single application, so that (ideally) the hydrogen demand modelling can approach different usage sectors (e.g., industrial applications). So, the tool can be used by any interested stakeholder to investigate any scenario that is of interest. Furthermore, sensitivity analysis can also be performed by changing techno-economic input data. To date, state-of-the-art data have been used [38]. However, data obtained from experimental campaigns in testing facilities like, for example, the Green Hydrogen Lab at the University of Bologna [39] can be easily integrated.

Figure 5 schematically shows the concept map of the tool [40] and the development steps with the software used [41]. A detailed description of the methodology is reported in the project reports [38] [40] and in the paper by Guzzini et al. (2023) [41], where the SuperP2G-Italy tool was validated by investigating the penetration of hydrogen in the mobility sector. The SuperP2G-Italy tool was applied to study the hydrogen demand on Italian highways in 2030 and 2050. The baseline scenario predicts an annual hydrogen demand of 10,000 tons/year and

72,500 tons/year, for 2030 and 2050, respectively. However, the optimized case reduces demand to 7,000 tons/year and 32,600 tons/year. The results show a 2030 scenario analysis in which the LCOH ranges from €6.93/kg to €7.46/kg, whereas the LCOH ranges from €5.62/kg to €6.12/kg in the 2050 projection, and the P2H-plants' cost is the primary contributor to the LCOH. These ranges have been calculated in a baseline case LCOH that is lower than the optimized case, primarily because of the scale effect on the investment cost of the Power-to-Hydrogen (P2H)-plants. In all the four scenarios, the LCOH is dominated by plants' investments and operations, which account for more than 90% of the costs. As a mitigation measure, the effort to increase the truck autonomy would reduce the number of plants required to meet hydrogen demand, and, consequently, this indirectly reduces the LCOH (while keeping constant the aggregated hydrogen demand), to meet challenging and competitive cost targets. Moreover, the performed analysis shows that, regarding the location of P2H-plants, high-capacity plants are uniformly located in the Italian territory in the baseline case, whereas, in the optimized case, the highest capacity plants are mainly located close to high-demand hydrogen refuelling stations.




Figure 5 Illustration of SuperP2G-tool-Italy in regard to a) its conceptual structure and b) development process and supplementing plug-in applications. [40]

The current range of potential applications and stakeholders interested in using it is wide. Furthermore, since the geographical correlation between hydrogen and renewable energy production is paramount for the definition of renewable hydrogen in the new RED II Directive, new releases of the tool are expected. The development process is still ongoing to add new features, for example, but not limited to the design of renewable hydrogen cost maps or the investigation of the effect on local electric grid stability.

8 P2G case in Denmark

GreenLabSkive, in western Denmark, served as a testing ground for innovative technologies and features a complete 12MW electrolyser system to supply hydrogen to stakeholders and includes wind turbines and solar panels with a total capacity of 80 MW. The objective of the Danish case was to make it possible for the local multi-energy carrier-based business park to manage multiple value streams in real-time as well as optimize the infrastructure set-up by developing and testing advanced decision-support solutions.

From the operational perspective, GreenLabSkive is connected to the Nordic electricity market and faces multiple uncertainties from both the market and renewable power, leading to complex operational strategies. The Danish partners have developed a data-driven decision framework (DDF) using robust chance-constrained programming (DRCCP) to achieve an optimal operation of the wind/hydrogen system [42]. The proposed DRCCP framework considers multiple uncertainties of wind power production and electricity prices, embedded with short-term forecasts, data collection, and flexibility of the electrolyser and storage units. The proposed solution was validated based on onsite system parameters and market data. For a studied 30 days, the total operation cost was reduced by 24% using the proposed method in comparison with several other state of the art methods, demonstrating the effectiveness of the DRCCP and the feasibility of applying advanced optimization-based operation strategies to live operation and management of renewable-based hydrogen production facilities.

From the investment planning perspective, the team developed a two-layer multi-objective optimization framework to achieve optimal sizes of the electrolyser and storage units [43]. The framework is tested and validated based on today's platform data of GreenLabSkive. The results show that additional investment can improve the operational flexibility of the system, thereby increasing operating income but lowering project returns. For example, to gain an increase of 10% production in green hydrogen, the internal rate of return decreases by 1.2%, primarily owing to the current high capital cost of the electrolyser and hydrogen storage units. This concludes that lowering the technology cost and improving the valorization of flexibility are two key factors for achieving the maximum amount of green hydrogen at a competitive price in such an industrial park setup.

9 Summary and conclusions

The war between Russia and Ukraine has had a significant influence on several parameters, which may affect the competition between green and blue hydrogen in a European context.

First of all, the expected short-term demand for hydrogen has increased as the desire to reduce natural gas demand has surged. A high demand may impact the learning curve of green hydrogen, as well as the availability of European blue and green hydrogen and demands for hydrogen import. This, in turn, has an impact on required hydrogen infrastructures. Results show potential for production of green hydrogen in Southern Europe with transmission through partly refurbished gas grids and new hydrogen grids to central Europe, as well as a potential for imports either via hydrogen grids or as ammonia. The following parameters increase the feasibility of offshore

wind investments for green hydrogen production: limited availability or high price of natural gas, high hydrogen demands, limited PV implementation in South Europe, limited onshore wind implementation, and limited possibilities for import.

Availability of large-scale hydrogen storage increases the competitiveness of green hydrogen over blue. Because blue hydrogen decouples hydrogen production from renewable availability, it requires less hydrogen infrastructure in the form of underground storage and extended grid expansion. Meanwhile, increased CO₂ grids and storage assets would be required.

Secondly, increased natural gas prices affected the cost of blue hydrogen, which would be around 9-11 EUR/kg with the average European natural gas price in 2022, while increased electricity prices affected the cost of green hydrogen. A higher local variation is seen across Europe on green hydrogen costs than blue, due to uniform natural gas prices versus differing local electricity prices. Ensuring availability of sufficient renewable electricity production and hydrogen storage will be key to facilitate cheap, green hydrogen production. On the other hand, green hydrogen production will have benefits in terms of increasing security of supply with local production. Furthermore, it will be cost competitive in a situation with high natural gas prices or high CO₂ taxes. Considering the 2021-2022 level of electricity and gas prices, and the potential flexibility of electrolyzers, electrolytic hydrogen was on a par with blue hydrogen. An electricity price cap, green fuel premiums or power purchase agreements (PPAs) might further improve the competitiveness of green hydrogen.

A fast ramping up and favourable electricity costs developments could halve hydrogen production costs until 2040. Hereby, the technology improvements and reduction in needed investment (CAPEX) is the major contributor to such a cost reduction, as specific electrolysis costs are expected to decrease by >75 % due to scaling in numbers and unit size. Meanwhile, the smart operation of a wind/electrolyser system might achieve 24% reduction of its operation cost. Further research is required to ensure upscaling of electrolyzers in size and numbers in Europe, with smart designs and operation of the plants.

To ensure a level playing field, coordination is required at EU level in a number of areas between different types of hydrogen and other energy vectors:

- 1) Certification of green and low carbon hydrogen and a uniform CO₂ price. EU regulation, including certification, is required to ensure that all embedded greenhouse gas emissions are accounted for across all sectors. This is required to ensure that emissions in one sector (e.g. heavy transport utilising hydrogen) doesn't happen at the cost of emissions in another (e.g. electricity produced with fossil fuels).

- 2) Ensuring a level playing field across markets. There is a risk of sub-optimization if silo thinking persists within sectors. It is hence necessary to establish efficient markets, which ensure that cost-optimal solutions are chosen, when taking decarbonization of the full society into account. Hydrogen may provide value in one sector, but an even higher in another, where electrification is not possible.

- 3) Enabling policies to enhance European security of supply by increasing domestic production of fuels and diversifying imports. To ensure a cost-efficient system, national sub-optimization should be avoided, and energy carriers traded freely within Europe.

- 4) Fast ramping of renewable electricity generation, while respecting nature and local communities. The feasibility of green hydrogen will depend on the timely availability and price of renewable electricity.

- 5) Coordinated planning of hydrogen, methane, and electricity infrastructures. It will likely be feasible to move hydrogen across countries in Europe, from the outskirts of Europe to central Europe (consumption centres). To facilitate this, joint plans and implementations are required, also considering other energy infrastructures.

To summarise, green hydrogen production has a promising potential in terms of contributing to decarbonisation and self-sufficiency in a European context if the right regulatory frameworks are put in place, renewable electrici-

ty production is installed in time to meet hydrogen demand thereby enabling fast ramp up and technology learning of electrolysers, electrolyser plants are designed for flexible operation and adequate infrastructure to transport, distribute and store large volumes of hydrogen is established.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank GreenLab Skive, SNAM, Energinet, WIVA P&G, TERNA and HERA and other stakeholders for the support, serving the project with advice and feedback.

Funding

The research for this perspective article has been conducted in the SuperP2G project (Synergies Utilising renewable Power Regionally by means of Power to Gas). This project has received funding in the framework of the joint programming initiative ERA-Net Smart Energy Systems' focus initiative Integrated, Regional Energy Systems, with support from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 775970. The content and views expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views or opinion of the ERA-Net SES initiative. Any reference given does not necessarily imply the endorsement by ERA-Net SES.

Conflict of Interest

We declare that there are no conflicts of interest.

Data availability

Data available on request.

Author contributions

Münster, Marie: Conceptualization, Funding acquisitions, Project administration, Supervision, Writing (original draft, review & editing)

Bramstoft, Rasmus: Investigation, Formal analysis, Data curation, Software, Writing (original draft, review & editing)

Kountouris, Ioannis: Investigation, Formal analysis, Data curation, Software, Writing (original draft, review & editing)

Langer, Lissy: Investigation, Formal analysis, Writing (original draft, review & editing)

Keles, Dogan: Supervision, Writing – review & editing

Schlautmann, Ruth: Writing (original draft, review & editing)

Mörs, Friedemann: Writing (original draft, review & editing)

Rasmusson, Hans: Writing (original draft, review & editing), Project administration

Guzzini, Alessandro: Investigation, Methodology, Formal analysis, Data curation, Software, Writing (original draft, review & editing)

Pellegrini, Marco: Writing – review & editing

Saccani, Cesare: Supervision, Writing – review & editing

You, Shi: Writing (original draft, review & editing), supervision, carrying out analysis

Pumpa, Martin: Writing (original draft, review & editing)

Fischer, Frank: (Data curation)

Zauner, Andreas: Writing (original draft, review & editing)

Böhm, Hans: Writing (original draft, review & editing)

Markova, Darja: Writing (original draft, review & editing)

Sergi, Francesco, Writing (original draft, review & editing)

Brunaccini, Giovanni, Writing (original draft, review & editing)

Aloisio, Davide, Writing (original draft, review & editing)

Ferraro, Marco, Writing (original draft, review & editing)

Mulder, Machiel, Writing (conceptualisation, original draft, review & editing)

References

- [1] J. Gea-Bermúdez, R. Bramstoft, M. Koivisto, L. Kitzing and A. Ramos, “Going offshore or not: Where to generate hydrogen in future integrated energy systems?,” *Energy Policy*, vol. 174, p. 113382, March 2023.
- [2] R. Bramstoft, A. Pizarro Alonso, I. Graested Jensen, H. Ravn und M. Münster, „Modelling of renewable gas and fuels in future integrated energy systems,“ *Applied Energy*, Bd. 268, 2020.
- [3] M. Scott Lester, R. Bramstoft und M. Münster, „Analysis on electrofuels in future energy systems: 2050 case study,“ *Energy*, Bd. 199, 2020.
- [4] R. W. Howarth and M. Z. Jacobson, “How green is blue hydrogen?,” *Energy Science & Engineering*, 12 August 2021.
- [5] „SuperP2G website,“ [Online]. Available: <https://superp2g.eu/>.
- [6] “Eurostat. Gas prices for non-household consumers – bi-annual data (from 2007 onwards),” [Online]. Available: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/nrg_pc_203/default/table?lang=en . [Accessed March 2023].
- [7] Hydrogen Europe, “Clean Hydrogen Monitor,” Hydrogen Europe reference, 2022.
- [8] V. Stenberg, V. Spallina, T. Mattisson and M. Rydén, “Techno-economic analysis of H2 production processes using fluidized bed heat exchangers with steam reforming – Part 1: Oxygen carrier aided combustion,” *Int J Hydrogen Energy*, vol. 45, no. 11, pp. 6059-6081, 2020.
- [9] F. Pruvost, S. Cloete, C. Arnaiz del Pozo and A. Zabout, “Blue, green, and turquoise pathways for minimizing hydrogen production costs from steam methane reforming with CO2 capture,” *Energy Conversion Man-*

agement, vol. 274, p. 116458, 2022.

- [10] S. Gislam, “Green hydrogen now cheaper to produce than grey - ICIS report,” 16 November 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://industryeurope.com/sectors/energy-utilities/green-hydrogen-now-cheaper-to-produce-than-grey-icis-report/>. [Accessed March 2023].
- [11] “Power prices: causes, consequences & solutions,” Union of the Electricity Industry - Eurelectric aisbl, [Online]. Available: <https://www.eurelectric.org/power-prices/>. [Accessed March 2023].
- [12] THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION, „COUNCIL REGULATION (EU) 2022/1854 of 6 October 2022 on an emergency intervention to address high energy prices,“ 6 October 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2022/1854>. [Zugriff am March 2023].
- [13] “Day-ahead Prices, Denmark BZN-DK1,” 7th November 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://transparency.entsoe.eu/>. [Accessed March 2023].
- [14] [Online]. Available: <https://www.exaa.at/marktdaten/historische-marktdaten/>. [Accessed March 2023].
- [15] Gestore Mercati Energetici, “Esiti dei mercati e statistiche,” [Online]. Available: <https://www.mercatoelettrico.org/It/Default.aspx>. [Accessed March 2023].
- [16] “Decreto Legge 27 gennaio 2022, n. 4,” 2022.
- [17] Ministero della Transizione Ecologica, “Decreto 16 settembre 2022, n. 341”.
- [18] “Trading Economics - EU Natural Gas,” [Online]. Available: <https://tradingeconomics.com/commodity/eu-natural-gas>. [Accessed March 2023].
- [19] European Commission, “A hydrogen strategy for a climate-neutral Europe,” Brussels, 2020.
- [20] European Commission, „REPowerEU Plan,“ Brussels, 2022.
- [21] „The European Hydrogen Backbone (EHB) Initiative | EHB European Hydrogen Backbone,“ Guidehouse, Utrecht, [Online]. Available: <https://ehb.eu/>. [Zugriff am March 2023].
- [22] “Ready4H2 - Combining the hydrogen expertise and experiences,” H2SITE - Hydrogen Onsite, S.L, Bilbao, [Online]. Available: <https://www.ready4h2.com/>. [Accessed March 2023].
- [23] I. Kountouris, R. Bramstoft, T. Madsen, J. Gea-Bermúdez, M. Münster and D. Keles, “A unified European hydrogen infrastructure planning to support the rapid scale-up of hydrogen production,” 2023.
- [24] F. Wiese, R. Bramstoft, H. Koduvere, A. Pizarro Alonso, O. Balyk, J. G. Kirkerud, Å. Tveten, T. Bolkesjö, M. Münster and H. Raven, “Balmorel open source energy system model,” *Energy Strategy Reviews*, vol. 20, pp. pp. 26-34, 2018.
- [25] S. Candas, C. Muschner, S. Buchholz, R. Bramstoft, J. Van Ouwerkerk, K. Hainsch, K. Löffler, S. Günther, S. Berendes, S. Nguyen and J. Aparna, “Code exposed: Review of five open-source frameworks for modeling renewable energy systems,” *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 161, 2022.
- [26] J. Van Ouwerkerk, K. Hainsch, S. Candas, C. Muschner, S. Buchholz, S. Günther, H. Huyskens, S. Berendes, K. Löffler, C. Buřar, F. Tardasti, L. von Köckritz and R. Bramstoft, “Comparing open source power system models - Acase study focusing on fundamental modeling parameters for the German energy transition,” *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 161, 2022.
- [27] Federal Ministry for Climate Action, Environment, Energy Mobility, Innovation / Federal Minister for Digital and Economic Affairs, “Wasserstoffstrategie für Österreich,” 2022.
- [28] H. Böhm, “Techno-economic assessment of emerging power-to-gas technologies using advanced generic methods,” Leoben, 2022.
- [29] X. Li and M. Mulder, “Value of power-to-gas as a flexibility option in integrated electricity and hydrogen markets,” *Applied Energy*, vol. 304, no. 117863, 15 December 2021.

- [30] X. Li and M. Mulder, "International spillover effects of national hydrogen policies on carbon emissions and welfare," *under review*, 2023.
- [31] S. Ghaemi, X. Li and M. Mulder, "Economic feasibility of green hydrogen in providing flexibility to medium-voltage distribution grids in the presence of local-heat systems," *Applied Energy*, vol. 331, no. 120408, 1 February 2023.
- [32] P. Perey and M. Mulder, "International competitiveness of low-carbon hydrogen supply to the Northwest European market," *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 1241-1254, 12 January 2023.
- [33] F. Mörs, R. Schlutmann, J. Gorre and R. Leonhard, "D5.9 Final report on evaluation of technologies and processes," 2020.
- [34] M. Held, D. Schollenberger, S. Sauerschell, S. Bajohr and T. Kolb, "Power-to-Gas: CO₂ Methanation Concepts for SNG Production at the Engler-Bunte-Institut," *chemie Ingenieur Technik*, vol. 92, no. 5, pp. 595-602, April 2020.
- [35] R. Schlautmann, H. Böhm, A. Zauner, F. Mörs, R. Tischler, F. Graf and T. Kolb, "Renewable Power-to-Gas: A Technical and Economic Evaluation of Three Demo Sites Within the STORE&GO Project," *Chemie Ingenieur Technik*, vol. 93, no. 4, pp. 568-579, February 2021.
- [36] DBI-Gruppe, „DBI-MAT,“ Deutsches-Brennstoffinstitut, [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/Deutsches-Brennstoffinstitut/DBI-MAT>. [Zugriff am 31. 08. 2023].
- [37] M. Pampa, F. Fischer and M. Heckner, "SuperP2G Tool - Value Chains - DBI," [Online]. Available: <https://superp2g.external.dbi-gruppe.de/value-chains/DBI>. [Accessed 31. 08. 2023].
- [38] C. Saccan, A. Guzzini, G. Brunaccini, D. Aloisio, M. Ferraro, M. Pellegrini and F. Sergi, "Caso studio italiano: Valutazione del potenziale "Green Hydrogen" da Power-to-gas," *AMSActa Institutional Research Repository*, p. 35, 2023.
- [39] "SuperP2G-Italy: synergies Utilising Renewable Power Regionally by Means of Power to Gas: The Green Hydrogen Lab," March 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://site.unibo.it/superp2g-italy/en/the-green-hydrogen-lab>.
- [40] F. Sergi, C. Saccani, A. Guzzini, G. Brunaccini, D. Aloisio, M. Pellegrini and M. Ferraro, "Framework di pianificazione territoriale per lo sfruttamento del "Green Hydrogen" attraverso tecnologie P2G," p. 40.
- [41] A. Guzzini, G. Brunaccini, D. Aloisio, M. Pellegrini, C. Saccani and F. Sergi, "A New Geographic Information System (GIS) Tool for Hydrogen Value Chain Planning Optimization: Application to Italian Highways," *Sustainability* 2023, vol. 2080, p. 15.
- [42] Y. Zheng, J. Wang, S. You, X. Li, H. W. Bindner and M. Münster, "Data-driven scheme for optimal day-ahead operation of a wind/hydrogen system under multiple uncertainties," *Applied Energy*, no. 329, p. 120201, 2023.
- [43] Y. Zheng, S. You, H. W. Bindner and M. Münster, "Incorporating optimal operation strategies into investment planning for wind/electrolyser system," *CSEE Journal of Power and Energy Systems*, vol. 8(2), pp. 347-359, 2022.
- [44] "Projecting cost development for future large-scale power-to-gas implementations by scaling effects".
- [45] H. Böhm, A. Zauner, D. C. Rosenfeld and R. Tischler, "Projecting cost development for future large-scale power-to-gas implementations by scaling effects," *Applied Energy*, vol. 264, p. 114780, 2020.
- [46] A. Zauner, K. Fazeni-Fraisl, P. Wolf-Zoellner, A. Veseli, M.-T. Holzleitner, M. Lehner, S. Bauer and M. Pichler, "Multidisciplinary Assessment of a Novel Carbon Capture and Utilization Concept including Underground Sun Conversion," *MDPI - Energies*, 2022.