



BIOGAS



UEMP Workshop

Waste to Energy Toolkit

20 May 2009

Greg Austin

Overview



BIOGAS



- Introduction
- Study focus & deliverables
- Rationale
- Waste types
- Planning a biogas project
- Case studies
- Toolkit
- Technical (feasibility) report
- Policy & policy recommendations
- Conclusions

Study focus & deliverables



BIOGAS



- Toolkit
 - Sustainability
 - Planning a biogas energy project
 - Legal framework
 - Policy recommendations
- Technical (feasibility) report
 - Technology and its applications
 - Municipal waste data
 - Description of feasibility model
- Case studies
 - 4 case studies
- Feasibility model
 - Spreadsheet, high user input

Rationale



BIOGAS



- Economic, environmental, social sustainability
- Moving from end-of-pipe approaches to upstream interventions
 - Sewage treated on-site
 - Organic waste treated on-site
 - Why not co-digestion?
- Opportunities abound for 'mid-stream' interventions e.g. OFMSW at waste transfer stations

Waste types



BIOGAS



RESOURCES

W/WATER /
OFMSW / WEEDS

ABATTOIRS

COSTING IS SCALE
DEPENDENT: <> 1
ML/DAY / <> 10 t/d

COSTING IS SCALE
DEPENDENT: <> 1
ML/DAY / <> 10 t/d

Municipal Biowaste Processing



BIOGAS



| Annual benefits, 1 million people | Sewage | Sewage & OFMSW |
|-----------------------------------|--------|----------------|
| LPG equivalent (t) | 2,000 | 6,600 |
| LPG savings (Rm) | 26 | 85.8 |
| OR elec savings (R) | 4.6 | 20.5 |
| OR petrol savings (R) | 21.1 | 84.5 |
| Algae biomass (tons) | 11,000 | 35,000 |
| Biodiesel value (Rm) | 16 | 63 |
| Fertiliser value (R) | 22 | 55 |
| CER value (R) (elec) | 3.7 | 11 |

Planning a biogas project



BIOGAS



- This section of the guidelines includes:
 - Project conceptualisation
 - Feasibility study
 - Project preparation
 - Planning and construction
 - Commissioning and start-up
 - Operation and maintenance

Case studies



BIOGAS



1. Cato Manor (RSA)

- Co-digestion – biogas & fertiliser (food production)



2. Petro SA (RSA)

- Petrochemical WW – electricity (4.2 MW, 34 GWh)



3. Raylong (Thailand)

- OFMSW – electricity (0.6 MW, 5 GWh) & fertiliser



4. Bran Sands WWTW (UK)

- WasteWater (AAD) – electricity (4.7 MW) & fertiliser (agriculture)



Feasibility model - options



In this section of the tool, you need to select either a "Yes" or "No" for the various options, using the drop-down list. If you answer "Yes" to a question, you may be further prompted for an input. Once you have familiarised yourself with some of the input data areas, you may wish to return to this sheet to select various options

1 Do you need to buy the land for the project?

If Yes, how much will the total cost for the land be?

If No, will you be leasing the land?

If Yes, what will the annual lease costs be?

2 Are all the resources comprising the feedstock for the energy plant available at the site where the plant is to be established?

If No, what is the average one-way distance per ton of feedstock?

3 Select Yes or No for the following biogas utilisation options:

Electricity only

Electricity and heat

Thermal only (e.g. In a boiler)

Thermal only (for direct consumption similar to LPG)

If Electricity only, will you connect to the power grid?

4 Do you plan to sell the fertiliser?

If Yes, will you sell it wet, or dried?

What price will you sell it for (ex energy plant)?

No

R -

No

R -

No

No

No

No

No

No

No

Dry

R -

By answering No to both the questions regarding land, it is assumed that the land is already owned and the cost of the land will not be included in the analysis

Insert average 1-way distance (km/ton)

Please only select Yes for 1 option!

R/ton

Model - input



BIOGAS



RESOURCE DATA

What types of wastes are available for digestion?

| | | |
|---------|-----|--|
| - WW | Yes | <i>any combination is OK</i> If Yes: GO TO WW INPUT SHEET |
| - OFMSW | Yes | If Yes: GO TO OFMSW INPUT SHEET |
| - weeds | Yes | If Yes: GO TO WEEDS INPUT SHEET |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| - abattoirs | 5 | If Yes: GO TO ABATTOIR INPUT SHEET |
| BLOOD, CONDEMNED MEATS, MANURE, WATER | | |

FINANCIAL DATA

| | | |
|---|-------|----------------|
| Electricity rate to users | 0.385 | R/kWh |
| Interest charged | 13.5% | % |
| Exchange rate | 11.0 | €1 : Rx |
| Maintenance & insurance on energy plant | 0.25 | R/kWh produced |
| Feed-in Tariff | 0.90 | R/kWh |
| Discount rate | 10.0% | % |

TECHNICAL DATA

| | | |
|--|----------|-------------------------------------|
| Electricity used for production | 6% | % of that generated, 6% is typical |
| Mass of Methane | 0.67 | kg/Nm ³ |
| Brut Energy Potential of Methane | 14879.21 | kWh / tCH ₄ |
| CHP Electrical Energy Potential ($\eta=36.8\%$) | 0.37 | kWh / tCH ₄ |
| CHP Heat Energy Potential of Methane ($\eta=46.5\%$) | 0.47 | kWh / tCH ₄ |
| Efficiency of use of CHP Electrical Generation Plant | 90% | |
| Fraction of heat available for sale from CHP | 40% | |
| Efficiency of CNG gas scrubbing and compression | 98% | |
| Overall Methane Fraction of Biogas | 60% | |
| Efficiency of electrical energy to heat | 60% | |
| Litres of Petrol Equivalent to 1kg Methane | 1.64 | l/kg.CH ₄ |
| Energy consumption for operation of pumps and pl | Nominal | Costs in Overheads, adjust CER req. |

CARBON DATA

| | | |
|----------------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Carbon cycle | 10 | years |
| Carbon credit price post 2010 | 7 | €/CER |
| SA emissions factor | 1.0 | kg CO ₂ /kWh |
| Carbon project development price | 1.2 | Rm |
| CDM Verification costs (annual) | 30000 | R |

Model – WW inputs



BIOGAS



Calculation methodology: **COD data** *select from drop-down list*

Insert daily waste water flow rate
 Insert the COD of the waste water stream
 Indicate the COD removal as a percentage

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 0 | ML/day (MegaLitres/day) | |
| 450 | mg/litre | 200 - 1000 |
| 80% | % | 80% is typical |
| Yes | | |
| Yes | | |
| Yes | | |
| Yes | | <i>Only 1 answer here to be Yes</i> |

Calculation methodology: COD destroyed

| | | |
|------|----------------------|----------------|
| 0 | tons COD removed/day | |
| 0.00 | t CH4/day | |
| 0 | MWh/day (total) | |
| 0 | MWh/day (elec) | 30% efficiency |
| 0 | MWh/day (thermal) | 50% |
| 0 | kWelec | |

[GO BACK TO INPUTS](#)

Model – outputs



BIOGAS



| | | | 2009 |
|-------------------------------|-------|---|--------------|
| Investment in biogas digester | R | R | -177,871,370 |
| Installation fees | R | R | -100,000 |
| Eskom grid connection fee | R | R | - |
| Power purchase | R | R | - |
| Management fee | | R | - |
| CDM charges | R | R | - |
| Electricity saving | R | R | - |
| Electricity saved p.a. | kWh | | 37,271,950 |
| Electricity cost | R/kWh | | 0.385 |
| CER revenue | R | R | - |
| Number of CER credits | tons | | - |
| Maintenance / insurance costs | R | R | - |
| REFIT | | | |
| Revenue | R | R | - |
| Cash flow | R | R | -177,971,370 |
| Interest charges | | R | - |
| Total cash flow | R | R | -177,971,370 |
| Discounted cash flow | R | R | -177,971,370 |

1.0

1.0

| Results | IRR | 16.75% |
|---------------------------|------------|---------------|
| NPV | R | R 63,479,530 |
| Simple payback period | Years | 8.22 |
| Discounted payback period | Years | 13.80 |
| Electricity saved | MWh p.a | 37,272 |
| | MW | |

Policy, recommendations



BIOGAS



- Overarching legislation
 - Municipal Systems Act
 - Municipal Finance Management Act
- Energy legislation
 - White Paper on RE
 - DME
 - NERSA
- Water
 - DWAF
 - National Water Act
 - Water Services Act
 - Aide Memoire
- Solid waste
 - Integrated Pollution & Waste Management Policy for SA
 - National Waste Management Strategy
 - General waste management legislation
 - Polokwane Declaration on Waste Management in SA
- Recommendations??

Thank you!



BIOGAS



Greg Austin

greg.austin@agama.co.za

021-7013364

Sharon Lewis

sharon@sacities.net

011-4076471