



The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.



The Feasibility, Costs, and Environmental Implications of Large-scale Biomass Energy

Niven Winchester (with John Reilly)

Joint Program on the Science & Policy of Global Change

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Contributed presentation at the 60th AARES Annual Conference,
Canberra, ACT, 2-5 February 2016

Copyright 2016 by Author(s). All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

The Feasibility, Costs, and Environmental Implications of Large-scale Biomass Energy

February 4, 2016
AARES Conference

Niven Winchester (with John Reilly)

Joint Program on the Science & Policy of Global Change
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
niven@mit.edu



Motivation & Approach


Motivation

- Several governments have implemented policies to promote bioenergy
- Large-scale bioenergy and/or afforestation is required to prevent large temperature increases


Approach

- Develop a detailed representation of bioenergy in the MIT Economic Projection and Policy Analysis (EPPA) model
 - A global applied general equilibrium model that links greenhouse gas emissions to economic activity (16 regions, 14 sectors)
- Simulated conditions favorable for bioenergy (and other low-carbon energy) using a carbon price


Regions in the EPPA model



Bioenergy pathways considered in the EPPA model (for each region)



Production costs per gasoline-equivalent gallon, 2010 USD



- Costs for corn ethanol, soybean diesel and LC fuels in the US at constant input prices, and sugarcane ethanol in Brazil
 - Costs across regions vary depending on crop yields and land costs


Design of scenarios


- Goal is to investigate a large-scale contribution of biomass to global energy demand
- Biomass energy (and other low-carbon energy) production is induced with a global price on GHG emissions
 - Goal of ~150 exajoules (EJ) of modern primary bioenergy (→ ~75 EJ of final bioenergy) by 2050
 - Required carbon price was \$25/tCO₂e in 2015, rising by 4% per year to \$99/tCO₂e in 2050

Scenarios


Name	Description
Reference	'Business as usual' assumptions about economic, population and productivity growth and extension of renewable fuel mandates in the EU and the US
Base policy	Global carbon price on all GHG emissions except those from land-use change of \$25/tCO ₂ e in 2015 and rising by 4% per year to \$99/tCO ₂ e in 2050
Low ethanol blending	Global carbon price simulated in the Base policy with tighter ethanol blending constraints
Expensive LC ethanol	Global carbon price simulated in the Base policy with 50% more expensive LC ethanol costs
Low crop yield	Global carbon price simulated in the Base policy with exogenous crop yield improvements of 0.75% per year (compared to 1% per year in the base case)
Land carbon	Global carbon price simulated in the Base policy scenario extended to emissions from land-use change

Global primary energy






Global bioenergy in the Base policy scenario in 2050




Global bioenergy in the Expensive LC ethanol scenario in 2050

Global land use




Note: 'Other land' is not represented.

Global land-use change



Regional land-use change relative to the reference scenario, 2050



Other global results in 2050

	Reference	Base policy	Low blending	Expensive LC eth.	Low yield	Land carbon
Welfare change (%)	-	-3.5	-3.1	-2.9	-3.4	-4.2
CO ₂ e emissions (MMT)	74,131	43,180	44,466	45,828	43,124	35,627
Primary bioenergy (EJ)	28.2	142.6	99.5	72.7	136.5	150.9
N. Forest Land (Mha)	3,994	3,828	3,817	3,815	3,775	4,883
Food crop land (Mha)	1,765	1,634	1,674	1,681	1,726	1,609

Change in food use, % change relative to Reference

Total	-	-4.5	-3.5	-3.7	-4.3	-5.6
Due to bioenergy	-	-1.7	-0.7	-0.9	-1.3	-1.9

Change in food price % change relative to Reference

Total	-	4.3	3.5	3.2	4.1	5.2
Due to bioenergy	-	3.2	1.3	1.7	2.7	3.5

Conclusions

- The impact of bioenergy production on food prices is limited by:
 - Price-induced improvements in crop yields and conversion efficiency, reduced food wastage and incentives to collect more residues
- Penetration of LC biofuels rely on large reductions in costs for these technologies, otherwise first generation biofuels remain in the fuel mix, and bioelectricity and bioheat are the major forms of bioenergy
- Regardless of the location of bioenergy production, deforestation is largest in regions with the lowest barriers to conversion of natural areas
 - Policies that specify life-cycle emissions reduction factors based on the location of bioenergy production (or even the type of bioenergy) are unlikely to be successful

The Feasibility, Costs, and Environmental Implications of Large-scale Biomass Energy


Backup slides



The Economic Projection and Policy Analysis (EPPA5) model

- Global, recursive dynamic applied general equilibrium model
- Detailed representation of energy production and GHG emissions
- 16 regions and 14 broad sectors with multiple ways to produce some commodities (e.g., electricity)
- Advanced energy technologies and energy sources compete with conventional energy
- Represents six land types and land-use change: crop land, managed forest, natural forest, managed grassland, natural grassland, and other land

Land-use change



Note: x, y = crop land, managed forest land, natural forest land, managed grassland, natural grassland

The Economic Projection and Policy Analysis (EPPA) model

Factors/primary inputs and sectors in the EPPA for model

Factors/Primary inputs	Sectors
Capital	Crops
Labor	Livestock
Land	Forestry
Crop land, managed forest, natural forest, managed grassland, natural grassland, other land	Food
	Coal
	Crude Oil
	Conventional and tight oil, oil sands, oil shale
	Refined Oil
	From crude oil, first generation biofuels, cellulosic biofuels
Resources	Gas
For coal; crude oil; gas; shale oil; shale gas; hydro, nuclear, wind and solar electricity	Conventional gas, shale gas, tight gas, coal-bed methane, synthetic gas from coal
	Electricity
	Coal, gas, refined oil, hydro, nuclear, wind, solar, biomass, natural gas combined cycle, integrated gasification combined cycle, advanced coal and gas with CCS
	Energy Intensive Industry
	Other Industry
	Services
	Other Commercial Transportation
	Household Transportation
	ICE vehicles, hybrid vehicles, plug-in electric vehicles


Table 2. Bioenergy crop yields, wet metric tons per hectare per year (unless stated otherwise).


	USA	CAN	MEX	BRA	LAM	EUR	RUS	ROE	CHN	IND	JPN	ASI	REA	ANZ	MES	AFR
Corn	9.5	8.5	3.2	3.8	5.9	5.0	2.9	4.8	5.2	2.3	2.6	3.4	3.6	6.2	7.0	1.7
Rapeseed	1.4	1.5	1.3	1.3	2.2	2.5	1.2	1.3	1.9	1.1	1.2	1.2	0.9	1.0	2.1	1.2
Soybean	2.8	2.3	1.4	2.8	2.9	1.4	0.9	1.4	1.5	1.2	1.6	1.4	1.4	2.4	2.4	1.0
Sugar beet	63.2	55.2	0.0	0.0	76.6	47.0	29.2	35.1	41.3	0.0	64.5	0.0	41.7	0.0	36.8	51.3
Sugarcane	78.0	-	75.4	77.6	78.9	80.3	-	-	71.2	69.0	67.9	68.7	53.5	83.3	86.9	59.0
Wheat	2.7	2.3	5.1	2.2	2.9	3.4	2.1	2.3	4.6	2.7	4.3	3.5	2.5	1.1	2.5	2.0
Palm fruit	-	-	12.3	10.6	18.1	-	-	-	13.9	-	-	19.0	-	-	-	3.8
Energy grass*	16.8	12.7	14.0	42.5	42.5	14.7	11.3	14.8	9.4	8.8	14.8	41.5	13.2	16.0	6.8	15.5
Woody crop*	12.3	8.2	13.4	21.1	21.1	12.3	8.2	12.3	9.4	8.5	9.2	15.9	10.5	15.9	4.9	14.6

* Oven dry metric tons per year.


The Economic Projection and Policy Analysis (EPPA)

Maximum proportion of ethanol in blended fuel by volume in the Low ethanol blending (Low) and other scenarios (Base)






Biofuel crop production (j = corn, sugarcane, sugar beet, wheat, palm fruit, rapeseed, soybeans, energy grass, woody crop)




Biofuel production (*i* = corn ethanol, sugarcane ethanol, sugar beet ethanol, wheat ethanol, palm oil diesel, rapeseed diesel, soybeans diesel, LC ethanol, LC drop-in fuel)

Land-use change





Note: x, y = crop land, managed forest land, natural forest land, managed grassland, natural grassland


Conversion of natural forests to managed areas




Global bioenergy by final energy type





Global transportation fuel



Global electricity production




Global final bioenergy by feedstock




Global bioenergy by region in 2050


a) Reference




b) Base policy




c) Low ethanol blending




d) Expensive LC ethanol



e) Low crop yield




f) Land carbon



Heat Electricity 1st gen. ethanol Veg. oil-based LC ethanol

Regional land-use change relative to the reference scenario, 2050




Bioenergy land-use impacts

The impact of bioenergy on land-use change is influenced by at least three factors

1. The scope for deforestation in the model reflects current trends and political constraints
2. Some bioenergy feedstocks are sourced from forestry and agricultural residues (~30% of bioenergy is produced using residues)
3. Improved efficiency both in growing crops and turning biomass into biofuel results in improvements in energy yields
 - 60% increase in energy yield for energy grass in the US between 2015 and 2050 (1,166 → 1,873 gasoline-equivalent gallons per ha)

Interesting results


- Less bioenergy production can be associated with more deforestation
 1. Low crop yield scenario
 - More land is needed for food crops
 2. Low blending and Expensive LC ethanol scenarios
 - More (low yield) wood crops and less (high yield) energy grass in China → more land allocated to bioenergy and less to food crops
 - More food production in Africa for export to China
- Irrespective of the location of bioenergy production, natural forest loss is greatest in regions with the lowest political barriers to deforestation
- Pricing emissions from land-use change can increase bioenergy production (due to soil carbon credits) AND result in afforestation



Residue biomass potential by type and region in 2004 (EJ)

Source: Gregg, J.S. and S.J. Smith, 2010: Global and regional potential for bioenergy from agricultural and forestry residues, *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, 15, 241-262.

Biofuel values and physical quantities



Biofuel values and physical quantities

