

https://dspace.org/

# Assessing the undesired impacts on water sustainability from climate change mitigation technologies in fossilbased power generation

**Prebantha Moodley; Kevin Harding; T.A Adams**

https://hdl.handle.net/10539/42058
SCOPUS

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

Environmental Science
Water Research & Technology

ROYAL SOCIETY OF CHEMISTRY

PAPER

View Article Online
View Journal

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.

Check for updates

Cite this: DOI: 10.1039/d4ew00122b

# Assessing the undesired impacts on water sustainability from climate change mitigation technologies in fossil-based power generation†

Prebantha Moodley, [a] Kevin Harding [a] and Thomas A. Adams II *[b]

Received 15th February 2024,
Accepted 10th July 2024

DOI: 10.1039/d4ew00122b

rsc.li/es-water

This work investigates the water impact of carbon capture technologies employed in coal and natural gas power generation, *viz.* the integrated gasification combined cycle, oxy-fuel combustion, solid oxide fuel cells and solvent-based post-combustion. The water impact per $CO_2$ avoided (WICa) metric was developed to understand the tradeoff between water usage and global warming potential, and additionally as a decision-making tool. It relates the impact on available water resources to greenhouse gas reduction over the cradle-to-plant-exit lifecycle by leveraging existing metrics, including the water impact index (WII), water withdrawal, water consumption, water quality, and water scarcity index (WSI). The results show that some carbon capture technologies increase the overall water usage of power generation plants, thereby increasing the water impact per $CO_2$ avoided. Solid oxide fuel cells and oxy-fuel technology, though not mature in comparison with post-combustion capture, have the least water impact per $CO_2$ avoided. Furthermore, water withdrawal and consumption are shown to trend with the WII in specific scenarios, implying that, in the absence of water quality and WSI data, the metric's use as a stakeholder decision-making tool remains. The potential to reduce global warming *via* carbon capture technologies in the power generation industry can create additional water resource challenges for countries if not carefully considered.

**Water impact**

Our research in coal and natural gas-based power generation shows that the trade-offs between water impact (as water use, water quality and water scarcity) and carbon mitigation efforts have not been adequately addressed. The potential to reduce global warming *via* carbon capture technologies in the power generation industry can create additional water resource challenges for countries if not carefully considered.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Climate change mitigation & water sustainability

One unintended consequence of most carbon capture (CC) technologies for power generation is the requirement of additional water over the entire cradle-to-plant-exit lifecycle.[1–4] Additionally, despite the benefit in reducing greenhouse gas emissions, water data for some of these technologies are not available, and the data that are available cannot be used meaningfully.

Reviews over the last decade are seemingly comprehensive, focusing on differentiating between CC technologies and carbon separation technologies, relative technology readiness and sustainability based on environmental impact assessments.[5,6] The research highlighted and compared different technology requirements and configurations, included optimisation of parameters relative to reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and reported approximately 90% $CO_2$ removal for some technologies (data set of Adams *et al.*[7]). However, all fall short in terms of commentary on water usage which is essential and critical to the operation of these technologies.

To further emphasize the importance of water consideration in carbon capture technology, global water demands projected for 2050 show increases for manufacturing and thermal power generation of 400% and 140%, respectively.[8] This demand, together with increasing water scarcity and water degradation, further strains water resources globally and the impact is far greater in countries with an already depleted water supply. The access to clean

[a] *School of Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, 1 Jan Smuts Ave, Braamfontein, Johannesburg, 2050, South Africa*
[b] *Department of Energy & Process Engineering, Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Kolbjørn Hejes v 1B, Trondheim 7034, Norway.*
*E-mail: thomas.a.adams@ntnu.no*

† Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available: Supplied as an additional document. See DOI: https://doi.org/10.1039/d4ew00122b

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.

water for human activities, including power generation and agriculture, underpins economic and social progress,[9] and the adoption of CC technology would "commit humanity" to increased water use.[4]

Choosing between different CC technologies is simple from a greenhouse gas (GHG) emission perspective but complex from a water impact perspective. The extent of the impact on water resources is user determined by understanding their water usage requirements. Requirements include water body water quality and local water availability. With power generation and similar industries, the impact is expanded to the volume and quality of water that is returned. Fully understanding the impact of $CO_2$ emission reduction on water resources is crucial, not only from a volume perspective but also from a quality and location perspective.

The value is in knowing the trade-off between green initiatives and their impact on natural resources. Making responsible and accountable decisions on climate change mitigation technology requires a holistic view including its impact on water sustainability.

As an example, the cost of $CO_2$ avoided (CCA) metric is useful to illustrate the comparative value of different $CO_2$ mitigation processes, with the aim of finding the most cost-effective $CO_2$ reduction solution. Similarly, mapping the impact on water resources to carbon dioxide avoided will identify carbon capture technologies in power generation that might benefit a region's water resources and conversely will also identify technologies that could place a region's water resources under further stress. While no metrics exist to assess the trade-off between water sustainability and GHG emission reduction for CC technology in power generation, there are well known metrics available to construct such a model.

i. Volume of water (consumption and withdrawal): in power generation design, water provision is based on the requirements of the facility which are more closely related to withdrawal rather than consumption. Reporting on water withdrawn is critical during project feasibility as a process functions (the design capacity) on volume withdrawn and produces (the operating capacity) on volume consumed especially in the case of cooling technology requirements.

ii. The quality of water in terms of concentration of pollutants: the quality of water is considered as important in industry as the volume of water required, as it limits the use of the specific water resource to a narrower set of applications. Large amounts of water available at less-than-optimal quality can impact overall costs and determine whether certain technologies or operations are feasible. Anecdotally, higher water quality is in higher demand which can, and in most cases does, place further strain on stressed resources. Mikosch *et al.*[10] and Pradinaud *et al.*[11] both commented on the challenges and importance of considering water quality when assessing water impact.

iii. Water scarcity, in terms of the degree of water scarcity in the location that water is required: hydrological irregularities and high human use (catalysed by population growth and urbanisation) contribute to increasing water scarcity. Water scarcity is a global issue affecting all areas of protection and can impact the successful adoption of technology if not properly considered. At the same time, increasing water usage in industrial applications can directly increase water scarcity, as the demand for high quality water increases, and this is especially crucial in a country where water resources are threatened.

### 1.2 Water data (un)availability

Water data for CC technology are uncommon and often heterogeneous.[12–14] Notable work on water usage in power generation includes some information on CC technology but does not offer sufficient data to assess the trade-off between water usage from a volume perspective or water impact (because of that usage) and carbon dioxide avoided. Reviews on carbon capture technologies over the last decade concentrate on positioning the best technologies for addressing the global warming potential of power generation. This hierarchy between technologies is based largely on cost (Adams *et al.*[7] and Simpson *et al.*[15] investigated the levelized cost of electricity (LCOE) as well as the cost of $CO_2$ avoided (CCA)), carbon dioxide capture rates and heat efficiencies. Water usage data are seldom reported in carbon capture technology studies.[5–7]

Generally, natural gas technologies have low literature representation. Meldrum *et al.*[2] covered 18 natural gas plants *versus* 61 coal plants (utilising various cooling types). Macknick *et al.*[1] covered 20 natural gas plants *versus* 55 coal plants. Most research efforts are coal focused because of its higher $CO_2$ intensity than natural gas.[7]

Consumption and withdrawal data are readily available for cooling operations given the recognised contribution of cooling in power generation; however, data availability is also low for the fuel cycle and other operational activities required for electricity generation, leading to an overall incomplete water requirement understanding.[1] Investigations by Macknick *et al.*[1] and Meldrum *et al.*[2] estimate water usage data for coal and natural gas systems including different cooling technologies, based on the available literature. Macknick *et al.*[1] focussed on operational water usage only (excluding the fuel cycle) and Meldrum *et al.*[2] covered the full life cycle (fuel cycle and operations). Specifically, these studies consolidate water usage for selected power generation technologies and the impact of different cooling methods within them. While the studies do not focus on CC technology, they note that carbon capture has the potential to increase or decrease water consumption depending on the type of cooling.

For example, cooling towers consume twice as much water per unit of electricity generated *versus* once-through cooling. However, once-through cooling uses a withdrawal of 10–100× more water than cooling towers.[1] The type of cooling technology plays a significant role in water usage for power plant operations and having access to sufficient high-quality water is crucial to power generation plant operations.


This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2024

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.

Similar observations are noted in Feng *et al.*[16] who reported on water consumption alone in their work on the integration of post combustion CC in a coal-fired power plant in assessments of water use. In their work on water consumption of a retrofitted oxyfuel combustion facility, Zhu *et al.*[17] observed that once through cooling is superior to recirculating cooling purely based on the water consumption value. However, water consumption alone is only half the picture and relates the water used within the process and does not consider the general water requirements necessary to operate a process which is crucial to determining water impacts.

The lack of general water quality data is also a concern. Part of the problem is the complexity of water quality data and the extensive amount of parameters that need tracking.[18] Damania *et al.*[18] found that this is a global issue and regardless of economic status all countries experience the same challenges when it comes to water pollution. In fact, they highlighted that pollution does not decline with economic growth, instead the variety of pollutants increases with "prosperity". Water data is key to being able to assess impacts on water resources, to creating meaningful sustainability metrics and ultimately more sustainable processes.

### 1.3 Existing water sustainability and climate change impact assessment methods

Climate change impact assessment methodologies are well documented, robust, and accepted. Using ISO 14044 and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) global warming potential (GWP), the climate impacts of different chemical emissions are comparable.

Water impact assessment, however, is more challenging. Many variables contribute to the impacts with some being contested. We identify current noteworthy methods and present gaps preventing them from being suitable to assess environmental trade-offs related to water sustainability.

**1.3.1 Water footprinting methods.** The water footprinting method is presented by the Water Footprint Network (WFN)[19] and in ISO 14046[20] (the international standard on water footprinting), which approaches water footprinting as a water-targeted approach to life cycle assessment (LCA). LCA methodologies are the most common tool for assessing impacts of processes and products and have been standardised in ISO 14044. Bayart *et al.*[21] pointed out that the life cycle impact assessment (LCIA) methods on which they rely do not sufficiently address water, specifically "freshwater scarcity" and "availability". They summarized further limitations and efforts to capture the nuances presented by the quality and scarcity of water within these assessment methods. They pointed out this similar observation on LCI data. LCI data only offer details on the volume of freshwater used for systems. More often, limited information is provided on the type of resource (origin) and nothing about its discharge (fate) in terms of volume and quality. They concluded that these methods overlook the major environmental consequences of the reduction in quality and availability of freshwater. LCA characterises the impact on water from pollutant emissions, as is observed from the impact categories; however, impacts from water unavailability are not quantified.[22] The water use in LCA (WULCA) group developed a consensus based method known as AWARE (available water remaining) which is aimed at addressing the shortcomings of water scarcity, influenced by several parameters, for use in LCA[23,24] as well as water scarcity footprint assessments.

Water quality will impact access to water and intensify water scarcity; therefore, it must be considered to obtain a complete picture of the impact on water resources; however, the mechanics of including water quality concepts in water impact assessment is still uncertain.[11] This is also observed in the water footprinting where there is no consensus on how to address water quality deterioration.[10]

The WFN defines water footprinting as the volume of both direct and indirect freshwater use over the entire supply chain to produce a product.[19] It is generally reported as a single value. ISO 14046 defines water footprint as "metric(s) that quantify the potential environmental impacts related to water", reported as a single value or a set of impact indicators. For non-comprehensive assessments, the environmental impact categories per ISO 14046 are water availability footprint (impact due to high demand on water), water scarcity footprint (when water availability focuses on scarcity) and water footprint that addresses water degradation (environmental impacts due to water quality).

**1.3.2 The water impact index (WII).** The WII[25] is a single indicator, based on the water footprinting method, used to assess the reduction in available freshwater due to human activities. It integrates water volume, water quality, and water scarcity. Negative values suggest an increase in water availability, whereas positive values indicate a decrease in water availability. An index feature is the inclusion of quality in the withdrawal and return terms which creates a penalty for using high quality water and discharging poor quality water. The WII, as defined in Bayart *et al.*,[25] is:

$$\mathrm{WII} = \sum_i \left[W_i Q_{W_i} \mathrm{WSI}_i\right] - \sum_j \left[R_j Q_{R_j} \mathrm{WSI}_j\right] \quad (1)$$

where WII is the water impact index expressed as volume unit water impact index equivalent, and $W_i$ and $R_j$ are quantities of water withdrawn from water body $i$ and returned to body $j$. $Q_{W_i}$ and $Q_{R_j}$ are unitless quality indices of water withdrawn from water body $i$ and returned to body $j$, and range between 0 (worst quality) and 1 (best quality).[25] $\mathrm{WSI}_i$ and $\mathrm{WSI}_j$ are unitless water scarcity indices for water bodies $i$ and $j$, calculated by the water stress index equation outlined in Pfister *et al.*[13] (further details are provided in the ESI†).

The quality index is based on the chosen penalising pollutant $p$ and takes on the value of 1 when $c_p \leq c_{\mathrm{ref},p}$

$$Q = \min\left(1; \frac{c_{\mathrm{ref},p}}{c_p}\right) \forall p \quad (2)$$

where $Q$ is the quality index, $c_{\mathrm{ref},p}$ is the reference concentration of a specific pollutant, and $c_p$ is the actual concentration of that

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.

pollutant present in the water body (either withdrawal or discharge).

This is a modification from the original form of the equation in Bayart *et al.*,[25] where in that work $p$ is not a set of many different pollutants considered in the analysis, but rather a single "most penalizing pollutant". In their formulation, $p$ is chosen as the "worst case" pollutant $p$ which is the one with the minimum $C_{ref,p}/C_p$ in a set of all possible pollutants. Both approaches will find the same $Q$, but only if the "most penalizing pollutant" is known *a priori*. This was a known weakness in the formulation as indicated by the authors in their discussion. Therefore, we use a more generalized form that allows the user to consider a set of all pollutants of interest without needing to know the "most penalizing pollutant" *a priori.*

Water quality is central to determining water availability. For water withdrawal, a quality index of 1 means a lower overall water availability for other users because less high quality water is available to them. In the case of water returned – a quality index of 1 means a higher overall water availability (the full amount returned is available to other users at high quality).

The usefulness and meaning of relating water scarcity and water volume have been debated.[26] However, in the absence of a holistic method, the WII offers a simple way to quantitatively measure the degree of impact.

Additionally, we observe the following about the WII:

i. The WSI for water bodies in the same region does not change materially as the WSI is determined based on the ratio of water consumed by all users to total water available. The WSI was developed based on available watershed (feed to a water body) information which was available in aggregate regionally and not per watershed as suggested by the WII definitions. Independent watershed data would be ideal; however, its absence means that the WSI represents a country or region's position and not a single water body. Our approach uses the country WSI for the WSI of the withdrawal and returned water bodies. These are therefore identical in the WII equation.

ii. Once the value is calculated, freshwater availability is indicated without exposing the underlying water quality. A negative value (resulting from the withdrawal term being smaller than the returned term) is interpreted as an increase in water availability; however, this value cannot distinguish between pollutants. This overall scenario is useful when determining whether water is available for other users.

iii. The WII can aid comparisons of the same system (before and after water treatment or application of other technologies) as with the example presented in Bayart *et al.*[25] and seen later in this work.

**1.3.3 Available water–carbon metrics.** Rosa *et al.*[4] examined the water footprint of $CO_2$ captured (in $m^3$ water per tonne of $CO_2$ captured) of four CC technologies. Rosa *et al.*[4] acknowledged that high water footprints could exacerbate the water scarcity status in regions; however, their results indicate water that is solely consumed and not the possible impacts related to the use of that water, dependent on spatial and temporal factors.[27] While the work does confirm quantitatively the water consumption of some CC technology, it does not fully relate the benefit of the reduction in carbon dioxide emissions to water. Additionally, the work does not specify certain parameters that will allow fair comparison such as cooling requirements, heat rates or higher heating values.

The water–carbon-abated ratio (WCAR)[28] is a similar metric. Its water impact is based on LCA data, specifically water consumption only. This work does include water scarcity footprinting (calculated as the product of water consumption and a WSI factor); however, it is not used in the calculation of the WCAR. The calculation of the WCAR has its merits as an indicator of trade-offs between technologies in terms of water consumption and GHG emissions avoided but the lack of factoring of a quality value or a scarcity factor means that there is no understanding of the impact on water once the water is consumed.

Both efforts consider water impact as the availability to other users post consumption, but neither include quality or scarcity directly.

Other studies, such as that of Rosa *et al.*,[29] investigated the effects on water scarcity of retrofitting four different carbon capture technologies to existing coal fired based facilities, specifically: absorption with amine solvents, membrane separation, and adsorption into solid sorbents by either pressure swing adsorption (PSA) or temperature swing adsorption (TSA) processes. They show that while retrofitting does not significantly increase water scarcity, certain regions may lack the water resources to meet the additional water demands of carbon capture technologies. Additionally, they highlight that currently 43% of global coal fired plants experience water scarcity for one month a year while 32% can experience water scarcity for five months or more, suggesting that influences on water scarcity must be considered in water impact assessment. Therefore, this work is appropriately positioned and builds on this key finding of Rosa *et al.*[29]

### 1.4 Proposed metric and contribution of the work

In this work, we propose the water impact of $CO_2$ avoided (WICa) metric, an easy, usable, high-impact way to assess the trade-off between reduction of GWP, as $CO_2$ equivalent emissions avoided, and the impact on water resources for CC technologies in the power generation industry. Previous integrated metrics (Table 1) indicate water that is consumed but lack the impacts related to the use of that water, which also varies temporally and spatially.[27] By expanding the consideration beyond volumetric withdrawal, return and consumption to other key parameters such as water quality and water scarcity, we will be able to better understand the impacts of water use. This approach is further supported in literature.[30,31] Table 1 summarizes and compares the proposed metric to the previously available metrics in the literature and the characteristics they employ to assess water impact. The WICa metric is the first to incorporate all of the major water metric

 This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2024

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.

Table 1 Summary of characteristics in water sustainability captured by proposed metrics in the literature

| Characteristics | Water footprinting (water footprint network)[19] | Water footprinting ISO14046[20] | Water footprint of $CO_2$ captured Rosa *et al.*[4] | WCAR water–carbon-abated ratio Habib[28] | WII water impact index Bayart *et al.*[25] | WICa water impact of carbon avoided (this work) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Water consumption | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Water withdrawal | | | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| Water returned | | | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| Water quality | | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| Water scarcity | | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| GHG emissions/GHG emissions avoided | | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ |

characteristics (consumption, withdrawal, return, quality, and scarcity) as well as the GHG emissions avoided. WICa combines all of these factors into a single number especially useful for the cross comparison of green technologies.

The WICa metric is made up of two parts, the numerator is the change in water impact between a base case and a green case and the denominator is the change in global warming potential (GWP) between the same base case and green case. Water impact is assessed using the WII, which covers the key variables that are identified as important when understanding water impact. The change in GWP avoided is similar to the cost of carbon avoided metric and is calculated as the difference between the $CO_2$ equivalent emissions of the green case (with CC technology) and the base case (without CC technology).

$$\mathrm{WICa} = \frac{\mathrm{WII}_{\text{Green Case}} - \mathrm{WII}_{\text{Base Case}}}{\mathrm{GWP}_{\text{Base Case}} - \mathrm{GWP}_{\text{Green Case}}} \quad (3)$$

where the WII is calculated as $m^3$ water equivalents per MW h ($m^3e\ MW^{-1}\ h^{-1}$) which is based on water data available, and in some cases, estimated, for power generation plants, and GWP is the global warming potential reported as tonne (t = tonne = 1000 kg) $CO_2$ equivalents per MW h ($t_{CO_2}e\ MW^{-1}\ h^{-1}$). The resultant WICa metric units is therefore $m^3$ water equivalents per $t_{CO_2}$ equivalents.

The base case and green case subscripts are further described in the following sections. The WII is calculated for the base case at a specified withdrawn and returned water quality and WSI. It is then calculated for the green case at the same water quality (withdrawn, returned and WSI) as the base case, assuming that only a single water body, *i*, is used for withdrawal and return (discharge) and that the water bodies are in the same regions and share the same WSI value.

We explore the usefulness and value of WICa in a climate change mitigation case study. This will both demonstrate the value of the metric and provide new insights into the water sustainably and GHG emission trade-offs of several different climate change mitigation technologies for different countries. We assess several of these technologies in fossil-based power plant systems, together with varying water qualities and country water stress indices to put forward the holistic view of their impact on water resources.

## 2. Case study: comparing 65 different low-$CO_2$ fossil-based power plant systems

Power generation is responsible for over 40% of energy-related greenhouse gas emissions[32] and global water demands projected for 2050 show a 140% increase in thermal power production.[8] The incorporation of CC technology, as part of a strategy to reduce this GWP, impacts this global view. The adoption of certain CC technologies increases the energy requirements, reduces efficiency and thereby increases overall water usage requirements.

Water is required for two purposes: (i) for unit operations as a processing fluid and (ii) for cooling. Typical uses and unit operation interactions for process and cooling water, based on Adams *et al.*[7] and NETL reports referenced in this work, are illustrated in Fig. 1–4. For detailed water allocation breakdowns, see Gerdes and Nichols[33] and Zhai and Rubin.[34] The process water system "block" in Fig. 1–4 encompasses the water requirements for the boiler feed water system (makeup and blowdown), as well as flue gas desulphurisation (makeup and dewatering) and any other unit operations that require water. Within the CC process, this would include $CO_2$ capture recovery and $CO_2$ compression knockout.[33] The following subsections describe the five general categories of carbon capture in power plant design, with a focus on how water is used within the process.

### 2.1 Solvent-based post-combustion capture from coal

Post-combustion capture from coal (Fig. 1) is the most mature of the CC technologies. It is also the easiest to retrofit to an existing plant.[5] It can be retrofitted into current power plant systems without much modification to the original plant as it can be appended to the flue gas system following environmental controls such as $NO_x$ and $SO_2$ removal. $CO_2$ reduction is significant, but the overall plant efficiency is reduced due to the additional fossil-fuel consumption. More cooling is required to meet increased energy requirements than plants without carbon capture, thus increasing over all water usage.

Coal is combusted with air in a furnace at high temperature to produce steam at high pressure and high

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.





**Fig. 1** Post-combustion capture schematic for coal-fired power generation plants.





**Fig. 2** Post-combustion capture schematic for natural-gas fired power generation plants.

temperature, which produces power *via* a steam turbine and generator. The flue gas exhaust leaving the furnace generally goes through ash, $NO_x$ and sulphur removal. For solvent based CC technologies, gas is sent to an absorber where it

 This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2024

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.





**Fig. 3** Pre-combustion capture schematic for in coal-fired power generation plants (IGCC).





**Fig. 4** Oxy-fuel combustion schematic for coal- or natural gas-fired power generation plants.

comes into contact with the solvent and $CO_2$ is removed/captured from the gas. The captured $CO_2$ is then compressed, for transport and storage. The balance of the now low-carbon flue gases are vented to the atmosphere.

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.

### 2.2 Solvent-based post-combustion capture from natural gas

Based on the example in Adams *et al.*,[7] the natural gas combined cycle is an example of solvent-based post combustion capture from natural gas (Fig. 2). Both a gas combustion turbine and steam turbine are used to generate power.

A generator converts the mechanical power from the combustion turbine (in which natural gas is combusted with compressed air) to electric power. Additional electric power is created by the steam turbines using steam created by the heat exchange of the high temperature combustion exhaust. $CO_2$ removal occurs in an absorber column that utilises a solvent to scrub $CO_2$ from the cooled combustion gas. The rich solvent is regenerated in a stripper column where the lean solvent is recovered, and $CO_2$ distillate is then compressed for transport.

### 2.3 Solvent-based pre-combustion capture from coal

Pre-combustion (Fig. 3) is used in coal-gasification power plants and involves the pretreatment of the fuel prior to combustion. In the case of coal, coal is partially combusted in a gasifier in an oxygen-lean environment creating syngas. The syngas goes through the water gas shift reaction and series of absorbers to remove $H_2S$ and $CO_2$ separately. The $CO_2$ is then compressed, transported, and stored. The sequencing of gasification together with the water gas shift reaction (IGCC) results in a high-energy stream predominantly of $H_2$ and $CO_2$ where all the coal ends up as $CO_2$. Hydrogen is then combusted in a gas turbine to produce power. Despite the higher $CO_2$ capture efficiencies due to the higher pressures and concentrated $CO_2$ stream, the cost associated with gasification makes pre-combustion costly. From a water perspective, and as will be seen in this work, pre-combustion technology uses less water than solvent-based post-combustion for about the same $CO_2$ emissions, but more than all other technologies investigated in this work.

### 2.4 Oxy-fuel combustion with post-combustion capture from coal

In oxy-fuel combustion (Fig. 4), fuels, typically coal or natural gas, are combusted in a $N_2$ lean environment. An air separation unit is used to separate $O_2$ from air, in which the fuel is combusted resulting in flue gasses with high $CO_2$ and water content.[6] The exhaust of the heat recovery and steam generation unit typically contains $H_2O$ and $CO_2$, which goes through a series of condensers and flash drums that separate the $CO_2$ and $H_2O$. Oxy-fuel combustion systems are less mature than post- and pre-combustion options.

### 2.5 Solid oxide fuel cells with post-oxidation capture from coal and gas

Solid oxide fuel cell systems operate similarly to oxy-fuel post-combustion systems. Air is fed directly into the cathode of the SOFC, therefore an air separation unit is not needed. The oxygen in the air migrates to the anode and reacts directly with the fuel. This means that the fuel cell achieves both power generation and air separation. The separation strategy is also similar to that of post-combustion oxyfuels, where unspent fuel is catalytically oxidized, and then water is condensed out of the resulting gas stream, leaving a stream containing high purity $CO_2$. The $CO_2$ is compressed for transport and storage. This process means that water recovery is possible and a natural and necessary complementary outcome of the $CO_2$ capture process. Fuel cell technology in CC is expensive and commercially challenging due to the low cell lifetime and manufacturing; however, the low water usage and GHG emissions make it a technology worth exploring.

For detailed reviews on each technology see Adams *et al.*[7]

## 3. Research method

We compare different carbon mitigation technologies using the data set from Adams *et al.*[7] This data set contains a quantitative summary of over 100 proposed coal and natural gas power plants with CC technologies in the literature. The record for each power plant includes information such as efficiency, heat rates, fuel costs, non-fuel costs, and the cradle-to-plant-exit life cycle GHG emissions. The data set was normalized to have consistent supply chains, plant sizes, and boundaries of analyses, such that results taken from across the literature could be compared to each other on a consistent and fair basis. The data set was chosen due to its completeness, wide coverage of CC technologies and the effective consolidation of data by creating a consistent basis of metrics for comparison. However, the data set contained no information related to water consumption and therefore water information had to be determined in this work.

Not all technologies in that data set could be used in our work because relevant water data for the cited studies could not be determined from the published information available nor could they be estimated (through methods described later) due to insufficient data. Therefore, our final dataset used in this work includes a subset of 65 data points, covering coal and natural gas power generation plants, with the data being predominantly focussed on coal. The dataset for coal-based CC technologies used in this work includes supercritical pulverised coal (SCPC), the integrated gasification combined cycle (IGCC), coal-based oxy-fuel combustion (COXY) and integrated gasification solid oxide fuel cells (IGFC). For natural gas, the dataset consists of the natural gas combined cycle (NGCC) and natural gas solid oxide fuel cells (NGFC). These technologies are referred to as the green cases.

Four categories of data are necessary to compute the WICa metric: (i) $CO_2$ emissions (avoided) over the cradle-to-plant-exit life cycle for CC technologies; (ii) water data necessary to assess the WII which must include water withdrawal, water consumption and water returned (generally calculated by difference) for each stage of the cradle-to-plant-exit life cycle for the CC technologies; (iii) the water qualities; and (iv) regional WSI data.

The methodology used in this work is summarized in Fig. 5. First, base cases are selected, one for coal and one for natural gas. These are used as "business as usual" cases. For

 This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2024

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.





Fig. 5 Method for assumptions and calculation of the WICa metric.

each of the 65 "green" cases used in this study, the $CO_2$ emissions avoided are calculated by comparing the base case to the green case. When the information necessary to compute water metrics is not available for the green cases, estimates are computed where necessary. To help with these estimates, we have selected technology reference cases (with carbon capture) which are detailed studies of a single relevant power plant that contains sufficient information about water use in the process. We use that detailed water information to help generate estimates for other green cases where water information is missing, for example, by assuming that water consumption per unit cooling in the green case is the same as in the technology reference case. The details are explained in the following subsections.

### 3.1 Water stages

The overall water use for each technology case can be categorized into three contributing "water stages" which cover the cradle-to-plant-exit life cycle, as summarized in Fig. 6. The first stage is the fuel cycle. Meldrum *et al.*[2] defined the fuel cycle activities as fuel extraction, processing and transportation which aligns with the fuel cycle activities defined in Adams *et al.*[7] Cooling operations are cooling services typically provided by cooling towers, such that the water involved is isolated from the process and does not mix with other material streams in the process. Process operations consider any other water stream that is not involved in cooling. For example, this includes water that is a reagent for chemical reactions such as water gas shift or gasification, water recovered from a flue gas that is produced by combustion, and makeup water for losses in steam cycles and absorption cycles.

### 3.2 Base cases

Two base cases[35] (power generation plants without CC) are chosen based on water data availability and serve as the primary reference conditions when calculating WICa, one for coal and one for natural gas. The coal base case is a supercritical pulverized coal (SCPC) power plant without CC. The natural gas base case is a natural gas combined cycle (NGCC) power plant. It is important to choose a base case that is representative of the "*status quo*" or "business-as-usual" at the appropriate scale of the study (on the order of 600–750 MW net power output). There must also be sufficiently detailed information about each base case, including mass and energy flows of the process containing all water aspects. The base cases selected in this work are different than those chosen in Adams *et al.*[7] because we chose to use more recently published information, and because the chosen work had detailed water information. The choice of base cases will of course affect the WICa value, and choosing different cases would result in slightly different WICa values. However, since all 65 green cases are compared to the same base cases, very useful conclusions can be made by their direct comparison to each other. Relevant water and emissions data for the base cases are shown in Table 2.

**3.2.1 Estimating fuel cycle water withdrawal and consumption.** To estimate the water usage of the fuel cycle, we first use the heat rate of the base cases (Table 2) and the

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.





Fig. 6 Cradle-to-plant-exit life cycle water stages corresponding to GHG emissions.

literature fuel cycle water estimations from Meldrum *et al.*[2] (Table 3) to create a generalised base line. This value is in the form of $m^3$ water per $MJ_{HHV}$ also presented in Table 3. The fuel cycle water usage of each of the 65 green cases is then calculated by multiplying the heat rate of the green case to this generalised baseline (eqn (7)) and is reported in $m^3$ water per MW h. Meldrum *et al.*[2] based water estimations for coal underground mining on US mining data and associated activities as described above. For natural gas, we used their shale gas estimations which include drilling, fracturing, processing and transport. We used these conservative estimates opposed to their reported values for conventional natural gas and surface mining. We assumed that the water requirements for the fuel cycle are comparable within each fuel type for the green cases, due to similar activities within the cycle.

**3.2.2 Calculating carbon dioxide emissions avoided.** In this work, total cradle-to-plant-exit $CO_2$ process emissions are the sum of the direct (from the plant itself, including the cooling system) and indirect (from the production and delivery of fuel) emissions (Fig. 6). The GWP used to compute the $CO_2$ emissions avoided, and thus the WICa metric, is computed using IPCC's 100 year time horizon and is reported as $CO_2$ equivalents ($CO_2e$).

### 3.3 Technology reference cases

Technology reference cases are chosen to help estimate the water data for any of the 65 green cases where that information is lacking in the literature for that specific green case. This includes information for the cooling and process operation stages of the cradle-to-plant-exit lifecycle. One technology reference case is selected for each type of technology and used to fill in the gaps of missing information in the green cases where needed (Table 4). Details of these cases follow.

**3.3.1 Estimating water withdrawal and consumption for cooling and process operations.** The water usage estimations for cooling and process operations are calculated similarly to the fuel cycle water usage estimations (discussed in 3.2.1). We use the heat rate of the technology reference case (TRC) with the reported water data in the literature (Table 4) to create a generalised baseline for each withdrawal and consumption for cooling and process operations. The heat rate of the green case is then multiplied by this baseline to estimate the water usage (for each water use and operations). The technology reference cases are chosen based on the availability of water data in the literature. The water data must include withdrawal and consumption for both the cooling and process operations to be used. The resultant baseline values are shown in Table 4 for coal and natural gas in $m^3\ MJ_{HHV}^{-1}$.

$$\text{Fuel_Cycle_Water_Usage}_{\text{Green Case}} = \text{Heat Rate}_{\text{Green Case}} \times \left(\frac{\text{Fuel Cycle Water Estimations}_{\text{Literature}}}{\text{Heat Rate}_{\text{Base case}}}\right)_{\text{Generalised baseline}} \quad (4)$$

Table 2 Base cases for the coal and natural gas fuel type

| Property/units | Supercritical pulverised coal (SCPC) | Natural gas combined cycle (NGCC) |
|---|---|---|
| Fuel type | Bituminous coal | Conventional pipeline natural gas |
| Net plant power output (MWe) | 650 | 727 |
| Heat rate ($MJ_{HHV}\ MW^{-1}\ h^{-1}$) | 8957 | 6714 |
| **Water withdrawal** | | |
| Cooling operations ($m^3\ MW^{-1}\ h^{-1}$) | 1.938 | 0.905 |
| Process operations ($m^3\ MW^{-1}\ h^{-1}$) | 0.185 | 0.002 |
| **Water consumption** | | |
| Cooling operations ($m^3\ MW^{-1}\ h^{-1}$) | 1.477 | 0.701 |
| Process operations ($m^3\ MW^{-1}\ h^{-1}$) | 0.185 | 0.002 |
| Cradle-to-plant-exit $CO_2$ emissions ($t_{CO_2}e\ MW^{-1}\ h^{-1}$) | 0.950 | 0.406 |
| Type of cooling | Mechanical draft, evaporative cooling tower | Mechanical draft, evaporative cooling tower |
| Reference | Schmitt *et al.*[35] | |


This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2024

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.

Table 3 Literature fuel cycle water usage data (median values) from Meldrum *et al.*[2]

| Fuel | Subcategory | Water withdrawn | | Water consumed | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | [a] $m^3$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ | [b] $m^3$ $MJ_{HHV}^{-1}$ | [a] $m^3$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ | [b] $m^3$ $MJ_{HHV}^{-1}$ |
| Coal (SCPC) | Underground mining | 0.216 | $2.14 \times 10^{-5}$ | 0.212 | $2.37 \times 10^{-5}$ |
| Natural gas (NGCC) | Shale gas | 0.064 | $9.53 \times 10^{-6}$ | 0.061 | $9.09 \times 10^{-6}$ |

[a] This value is the water use per MW h. [b] This value is the water use per MW h divided by the heat rate ($MJ_{HHV}$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ from Table 2) which is used in the estimation of the fuel cycle water usage of the green cases described in section 3.2.1.

Table 4 Technology reference cases used to estimate the water use in the cooling operations and process operations where published data are unavailable

| | Coal cases | | | | Natural gas cases | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Property/units | Supercritical pulverised coal (SCPC) | Integrated gasification combined cycle (IGCC) | Coal based oxy-fuel combustion (COXY) | Integrated gasification solid oxide fuel cells (IGFC) | Natural gas combined cycle (NGCC) | Natural gas solid oxide fuel cells (NGFC) |
| Classification of process/primary $CO_2$ capture | Bituminous coal/solvent based – EconFG+ | Solvent based – Selexol | Oxy-fuel | Atmospheric pressure | Solvent based – Econamine FG+ | Atmospheric pressure |
| Net plant power output (MWe) | 550 | 497 | 550 | 550 | 559 | 650 |
| Heat rate ($MJ_{HHV}$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$) | 11 077 | 11 538 | 11 613 | 9105 | 7877 | 6220 |
| **Water withdrawal** | | | | | | |
| Cooling operations ($m^3$ $MJ_{HHV}^{-1}$) | $2.50 \times 10^{-4}$ | $1.74 \times 10^{-4}$ | $1.52 \times 10^{-4}$ | $7.43 \times 10^{-5}$ | $2.06 \times 10^{-4}$ | $1.13 \times 10^{-4}$ |
| Process operations ($m^3$ $MJ_{HHV}^{-1}$) | $4.36 \times 10^{-5}$ | $5.00 \times 10^{-5}$ | $1.24 \times 10^{-5}$ | $1.32 \times 10^{-5}$ | $1.64 \times 10^{-6}$ | $8.90 \times 10^{-6}$ |
| **Water consumption** | | | | | | |
| Cooling operations ($m^3$ $MJ_{HHV}^{-1}$) | $1.83 \times 10^{-4}$ | $1.34 \times 10^{-4}$ | $1.09 \times 10^{-4}$ | $4.55 \times 10^{-5}$ | $1.54 \times 10^{-4}$ | $7.72 \times 10^{-5}$ |
| Process operations ($m^3$ $MJ_{HHV}^{-1}$) | $4.28 \times 10^{-5}$ | $4.97 \times 10^{-5}$ | $1.24 \times 10^{-5}$ | $1.20 \times 10^{-5}$ | $1.64 \times 10^{-6}$ | $8.90 \times 10^{-6}$ |
| Total cradle-to-plant-exit GHG emissions ($t_{CO_2e}$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$) | 0.286 | 0.251 | 0.197 | 0.088 | 0.115 | 0.064 |
| Type of cooling | Mechanical draft, evaporative cooling tower | Mechanical draft, evaporative cooling tower | Mechanical draft, counter-flow cooling tower | Recirculating wet cooling tower | Mechanical draft, evaporative cooling tower | Mechanical draft, wet cooling tower |
| Reference | Fout *et al.*[36] – case B12B | Fout *et al.*[37] – Case B1B | Haslbeck *et al.*[38] – case: S12F | Iyengar *et al.*[39] – case 1–1 | Fout *et al.*[36] – case B31B | Iyengar *et al.*[40] – case ANGFC0B |

$$\text{Operations_Water_Usage}_{\text{Green Case}} = \text{Heat Rate}_{\text{Green Case}} \times \left(\frac{\text{Operations_Water_Usage}_{\text{TRC}}}{\text{Heat Rate}_{\text{TRC}}}\right) \quad (5)$$

**3.3.2 Variations in plant location.** The WICa metric considers both water quality and the WSI, which vary from location to location. Therefore, the specific location of each power plant and its context within the regional or national water supply affect the WICa on a case-by-case basis. We consider water quality and the WSI as variables subject to sensitivity analysis.

Water quality data are challenging to source in the literature and vary from location to location and implementation to implementation. Site-specific factors include the definitions of what constitutes a pollutant $p$, its corresponding safe limits $c_{ref,p}$, and the quality of the local water supply from which water is withdrawn. The purpose of this work is to compare the 65 different green cases generally. Therefore, we take water quality as a sensitivity parameter in the form of quality scenarios. The worst-case scenario would be to take high quality water and return poor quality water. The best-case scenario would be to take poor quality water and return high quality water – this is an unrealistic scenario. A likely, best-case scenario would be to return the same quality water as withdrawn. The quality scenarios used are shown in Table 6.

Table 5 shows the water stress data for selected representative countries used in this work. It is assumed that the water bodies for withdrawal and return are located in the same region and thus have the same WSI (calculated per

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.

**Table 5** Water scarcity indices for selected countries

| Rank[c] | Country | WTA[a] | WTA*[b] | WSI[b] (used in this work) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Unite Arab Emirates | 1 | 1.800 | 0.999 |
| 31 | India | 0.740 | 1.331 | 0.981 |
| 46 | China | 0.637 | 1.147 | 0.940 |
| 50 | South Africa | 0.595 | 1.072 | 0.906 |
| 58 | Philippines | 0.527 | 0.948 | 0.813 |
| 76 | Poland | 0.367 | 0.661 | 0.490 |
| 87 | Finland | 0.291 | 0.523 | 0.224 |
| 96 | Canada | 0.207 | 0.373 | 0.099 |
| 115 | Norway | 0.103 | 0.186 | 0.032 |

[a] WTA values are obtained from Luo *et al.*[41] and are used to calculate WTA*. [b] WTA* as defined in Pfister *et al.*,[13] is used to calculate WSI values used in this work. [c] Defined in Luo *et al.*,[41] this ranks countries according to their water stress.

country). The most recent WTA data are available from Luo *et al.*[41] as part of the WRI's aqueduct water stress projections and are described further in Luck *et al.*[42] These values were calculated based on contributions from 3 sectors: industry, domestic and agriculture. They presented three scenarios: business as usual, optimistic, and pessimistic. We have used the business-as-usual projections for 2020 in Table 5.

The variation factor of 1.8 was used to determine the WTA* for non-strongly regulated flows as described in Pfister *et al.*[13] This accounts for water stress that may be experienced due to precipitation variability. The resulting WSI values are computed using eqn (1) from the ESI† and presented in Table 5. We note that for studies that have location-specific information and considerations, a WSI specific to that location should be used instead of these general country-level statistics.

# 4. Results and discussion

## 4.1 Calculated water flows

The raw data used in this study (performance and emission data), including the results of the water withdrawal, consumption, and discharge calculations, are presented for coal and natural gas in Tables 7 and 8, respectively. These numbers apply to all 65 green cases generally, regardless of where the plant is located.[7]

Fig. 7 shows the overall water withdrawal, consumption and process water discharge for all the coal-based CC technologies. The first data bar is the coal base case (SCPC w/o CC). The consumption and process water discharge portions are normalized to withdrawal such that their sum is equivalent to the withdrawal.





**Fig. 7** Overall water usage data for carbon capture technologies in coal-fired plants.


This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2024

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.





**Fig. 8** Overall water usage data for carbon capture technologies in gas-fired plants.

SCPC and IGCC technologies with CC have worse water withdrawal than the high $CO_2$-emitting base case, illustrating the tradeoff between water impacts and $CO_2$ emission avoidance. However, the less mature oxyfuel combustion and SOFC technologies have lower water impacts than even the base case, because as a necessary part of the $CO_2$ capture process, they capture water that would be otherwise emitted in the flue gas. Since this water can be recycled or discharged, it is a positive synergistic benefit for the water cycle. The IGFC technology is superior in terms of water withdrawal for the cradle-to-plant-exit life cycle as compared to all other technologies presented.

Water data for the COXY-16 technology case is obtained from Haslbeck *et al.*[38] and not calculated as described above. All relevant water data are available in the report. We observed that the reported water consumed is the same as the reported water withdrawn, implying a zero process water discharge. Nothing about the process suggests the possibility of this outcome and we reason this to be an error in the text. We therefore recalculated the water consumption based on withdrawal and process water discharge data provided in the report and the values are aligned with other oxy-fuel technology cases.

Fig. 8 summarizes the results for natural gas. Like the coal case, the post-combustion capture processes had worse water impacts than the base case (without CC) but the SOFC based cases had reduced water impacts since water produced from natural gas oxidation could be captured and returned to the environment.

Fig. 9 illustrates the technologies investigated in this work with regard to their total water consumption and their total greenhouse gas emissions. Two key observations from this figure are noteworthy: (1) there are distinct clusters between the different technologies and fuel types; (2) water consumption and greenhouse gas emissions for CC technology for coal-based plants are higher than all natural gas technologies except for IGFC which has lower GHG emissions and water consumption than oxy-fuels, IGCC and solvent based post-combustion technologies (SCPC).

The base cases are also shown for coal and natural gas, creating ideal regions of water consumption and GHG emissions relative to the base cases. All technology cases have reduced total GHG emissions compared to both base cases as can be seen within the regions created by the vertical and horizontal lines drawn through the base case points. However, SCPC cases and IGCC cases have higher water consumption relative to the SCPC base case. Oxy-fuels and NGCC have lower water consumption than the SCPC base case but higher water consumption than the natural gas base case.

The natural gas based SOFC systems are the best in terms of water consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. The coal based SOFC systems are second in terms of water consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. This trend between NGFC and IGFC was observed in Adams *et al.*[7] with regard to levelized cost of electricity (LCOE) and greenhouse gas emissions.

This figure gives a good broad perspective on the water requirements of the different technologies, relative to their GHG emissions. However, some impacts of these technologies are unclear. What are the impacts on water quality and how does this compare to plants without CC? What are the impacts

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.





**Fig. 9** Water consumption *vs.* GHG emissions of coal and natural gas fired carbon capture technologies.

of consumption in locations with high and low water scarcity? These considerations enhance the decision-making process by creating holistic awareness around technology choices and are examined next.

### 4.2 Sensitivity analysis of the WII to water quality ($Q_{W_i}$ and $Q_{R_j}$)

To show the sensitivities to water quality in the withdrawn and returned water, we use WSI = 0.999 (reflecting the highest national water scarcity index in the world). The WII is then calculated for the different withdrawal and return qualities shown in Table 6 at this WSI and shown in Fig. 10. For a WSI of approximately 1, the water withdrawal maps the worst-case scenario accurately. This means that water withdrawal can be used to approximate the WII when the water quality is very low. Water withdrawal is also the worst-case upper bound to the WII. When the water quality is high (water withdrawn and returned are both equal to 1), the WII correlates to the total water consumption exactly. Thus, water consumption can be used to approximate the WII in very high-quality situations, or to form a lower bound on the WII. This creates a range of potential water impacts of technologies when data are unknown.

As the quality improves, the WII increases (*i.e.* withdrawing higher quality water means less high quality water is available for other users). In the case of water quality = 0.02, the lower impact is misleading. Withdrawing poor quality water might reflect low impact; however, this water requires pre-treatment to either cooling or process water quality. Our work assumes that all the cited processes work the same regardless of water quality. Therefore, the impact of that pre-treatment will not be reflected in the results and would ultimately increase the LCOE of the plant.

**Table 6** Water quality scenarios used in the sensitivity analysis

| Scenario | Water quality of withdrawn water | Water quality of returned water | Scenario commentary |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1 | 0.01 | This scenario describes high quality withdrawal and poor-quality return. It is unlikely that water return would be this low; however, we use this as the worst case scenario in this work. |
| 2 | 0.02 | 0.02 | In these scenarios, water qualities are the same and range from low to high values. This means that the concentration of the major pollutant ($C_p$) ranges from 50 to 0 times more than the reference concentration of the major pollutant in both the withdrawn and returned water. |
| 3 | 0.5 | 0.5 | |
| 4 | 0.6 | 0.6 | |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | |
| 6 | 0.01 | 1 | This scenario presents the "best case", creating an overall benefit for the water for the next user—withdraw poor quality water and return high-quality water. It is however unrealistic in the case of power generation. It is an unlikely scenario and is therefore not investigated. |

 This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2024

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.





**Fig. 10** WII and water usage *vs.* GHG emissions for a high WSI (0.999) and varying water qualities for SCPC technology cases.

This raises an important point: the consideration of water quality and pre-treatment in the calculation of LCOE. In the previous study, no standardisation was performed on water quality and how that might affect pre-treatment costs. The water impact in an absolute sense differs greatly depending on the quality of water (see the next section) and the relative





**Fig. 11** Relationship between normalised WII and normalised withdrawal and consumption values for coal fired carbon capture technologies at a high WSI.

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.

water scarcity. Treatment costs may also vary based on these factors. Although out of scope of this study, this should be considered in future work.

The WII results are presented in Fig. 11 for different water quality values. The green case is normalised against the base case for the different metrics.

From eqn (3), substituting an equivalent and, for this purpose, arbitrary value of 0.5 for $Q_{Wi}$ and $Q_{Rj}$, with a WSI = 0.999 for the green case, the equation is now:

$$\mathrm{WII}_{\text{Green Case}} = [(0.5)(0.990)(W_i - R_i)]_{\text{Green Case}} \quad (6)$$

To normalise this, we divide the WII of the green case (eqn (6)), by the WII of the base case with the same water quality and WSI values. The normalised equation is:

$$\mathrm{WII}_{\text{Normalised, same quality}} = \frac{[(0.5)(0.999)(W_i - R_j)]_{\text{Green Case}}}{[(0.5)(0.999)(W_i - R_j)]_{\text{Base Case}}} \quad (7)$$

Reducing further:

$$\mathrm{WII}_{\text{Normalised, same quality}} = \frac{(W_i - R_j)_{\text{Green Case}}}{(W_i - R_j)_{\text{Base Case}}} \approx \frac{C_{\text{Green Case}}}{C_{\text{Base Case}}} \quad (8)$$

The difference between withdrawal and return is consumption ($C_i$). The normalised WII values for all values of WSI with equal withdrawal and return water qualities are the same, and, are also equal to the normalised consumption values. In the normalised sense, only when the qualities are equal, the qualities and WSI are irrelevant. A similar effect can be seen for the worst-case scenario where $Q_{W_i}$ = 1 (high water quality) and $Q_{R_j}$ = 0.01 (low water quality).

We replace these values in eqn (9) maintaining the WSI of 0.999:

$$\mathrm{WII}_{\text{Normalised, worse case}} = \frac{(W_i - 0.01R_j)_{\text{Green Case}}}{(W_i - 0.01R_j)_{\text{Base Case}}} \quad (9)$$

We can approximate for returned water of very low quality that:

$$W_i - 0.01R_j \approx W_i \quad (10)$$

Then the normalised WII for the worst case is approximately the normalised total withdrawal:

$$\mathrm{WII}_{\text{Normalised, worse case}} \approx \frac{W_{i\text{Green Case}}}{W_{i\text{Base Case}}} \quad (11)$$

The normalised Fig. 11 shows these relationships.

For IGCC values, the normalised consumption value is greater than the normalised withdrawal value which is not observed in other technologies. It is important to remember that this bar graph must be read relative to the base case only and not the other parameters. However, this anomaly is not unusual for IGCC technology. The water data for IGCC reflect that there is a higher percentage of the withdrawn water that is consumed as compared to the base case and compared to all technologies investigated for both coal and natural gas. In the work of Macknick *et al.*[1] and Meldrum *et al.*,[2] the percentage of water withdrawn for consumption in IGCC





**Fig. 12** Change in WII relative to carbon dioxide avoided using the worst-case scenario for water qualities and a high water scarcity index (WSI = 0.999). Blue shading reflects the impact of decreasing water scarcity; the data range moves in the direction of the arrows as the WSI decreases. See Fig. 13 for the magnified version of the darker blue shading at low water scarcity = 0.032.

 This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2024

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.





**Fig. 13** Change in WII relative to carbon dioxide avoided using the worst-case scenario for water qualities and a low water scarcity index (WSI = 0.032). The expanded graph at high water scarcity (WSI = 0.999) is shown in Fig. 12.

technology with CC is greater than SCPC cases. The additional water consumption can be attributed to the additional absorption steps and the gasifier.

In summary, when water quality and scarcity data are unknown, the data should be normalised to make comparative decisions between the categories. The most reasonable values to use are water qualities from the worst-case scenario. When geographical data are available, absolute values can be used to obtain a more rigorous meaningful result.

It is worth mentioning that the water quality equation presented in ref. 25 does create some boundaries around the water quality, specifically the returned water quality. The equation considers only one penalising pollutant (the worst case one) which has been raised as a challenge by the authors. If we are to consider any local or national regulations on the concentrations of compounds that are considered to be pollutants, these regulations prohibit industries from discharging/returning water with concentrations higher than the concentration of the reference pollutant. Eqn (4) is then always 1 in any normal situation in which a plant is operating legally. It is unclear if this is a feasible or realistic approach especially when one pollutant is considered. The idea of improving water quality is not new. Consider desalinisation or inter-basin transfer.[43] Within the power generation context, however, high volumes of high-quality water are necessary and planning and securing these resources are key to meeting power demands. The "basin" is unlikely to be shared with other users. We put forward these various scenarios to emphasize the equal importance of water volume and water quality.

### 4.3 Sensitivity analysis of the WII to the WSI

Fig. 12 and 13, and Table 9 demonstrate, using SCPC technology as an illustrative example, the effect of water scarcity on the overall water impact for different countries. We calculate the WII based on the worst-case quality scenario. In Table 9, the technologies have been ordered to show the range of WSI values. This range is shown by the larger blue shading in Fig. 12 (WSI = 0.999 (UAE)). As the WSI decreases (WSI = 0.032 (Norway)) the impact is lessened as seen by the values in Table 9 and the narrower range, shown by the smaller blue shaded region in Fig. 12. Fig. 13 is a zoomed in version of this smaller darker blue shaded region. The SCPC values in Table 9 present varying data with a significant difference between SCPC-11 and SCPC-10 for all values of WSI. As noted earlier, the WII maps the water withdrawal data at the worst-case water quality scenario and a high WSI. This means that the change in WII is in fact the difference in withdrawal rates between the base case and the green case; for SCPC-10, the change is less compared to the change for SCPC-11. For these specific SCPC cases, these values are attributed to, and are proportional to, the differing heat rates of these technology cases (Table 7), SCPC-10 has a heat rate of 9836 $MJ_{HHV}$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ and SCPC-11 has a heat rate of 14 063 $MJ_{HHV}$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$. Another difference between these two cases is the type of solvent used; SCPC-10 uses chilled ammonia whereas SCPC-11 is amine based. Depending on the actual mechanism of solvent use (washing steps and heat exchange), water usage can be affected. Matin *et al.*[44] investigated varying concentrations of monoethanolamine (MEA) as an amine solvent in their LCA work. It was found that these concentrations do not impact the

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.

**Table 7** Water and GHG emission data for carbon-capture technologies in coal-fired plants

| Tag | Green technology/process | [a]Net plant output | [a]Electrical efficiency | [a]Heat rate | [a]$CO_2$ removed | [a]Cradle-to-plant-exit GWP | $CO_2$ avoided | Water withdrawal | Water consumption | Net water discharge |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (Units) | | MWe | % HHV | $MJ_{HHV}$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ | % | $t_{CO_2}e$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ | $t_{CO_2}e$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ | $m^3$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ | $m^3$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ | $m^3$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ |
| SCPC-2 | Solvent based | 525 | 27.4 | 13 139 | 90 | 0.327 | 0.623 | 4.18 | 3.29 | 0.89 |
| SCPC-3 | Solvent based – adv. amine | 837 | 36.1 | 9972 | 90 | 0.275 | 0.675 | 3.17 | 2.5 | 0.68 |
| SCPC-4 | Solvent based – Cansolv | 822 | 33.8 | 10 651 | 90 | 0.279 | 0.672 | 3.39 | 2.66 | 0.73 |
| SCPC-5 | Solvent based – amine | 546 | 27.2 | 13 235 | 90 | 0.323 | 0.627 | 4.21 | 3.31 | 0.9 |
| SCPC-6 | Solvent based – adv. amine | 616 | 36.5 | 9863 | 90 | 0.271 | 0.679 | 3.14 | 2.47 | 0.67 |
| SCPC-7 | Solvent based – chilled ammonia | 548.7 | 28.4 | 12 676 | 90 | 0.314 | 0.637 | 4.03 | 3.17 | 0.86 |
| SCPC-8 | Solvent based – chilled ammonia | 549.3 | 31.5 | 11 429 | 90 | 0.292 | 0.658 | 3.64 | 2.86 | 0.78 |
| SCPC-9 | Solvent based – chilled ammonia | 558.7 | 27.9 | 12 903 | 90 | 0.325 | 0.625 | 4.11 | 3.23 | 0.88 |
| SCPC-10 | Solvent based – chilled ammonia | 614 | 36.6 | 9836 | 88.4 | 0.276 | 0.674 | 3.13 | 2.46 | 0.67 |
| SCPC-11 | Solvent based – amine | 519 | 25.6 | 14 063 | 94 | 0.291 | 0.659 | 4.48 | 3.52 | 0.96 |
| IGCC-1 | Solvent based – Selexol | 543 | 32.6 | 11 043 | 90 | 0.241 | 0.709 | 2.74 | 2.29 | 0.45 |
| IGCC-2 | Solvent based – Selexol | 513 | 31 | 11 613 | 90 | 0.251 | 0.699 | 2.88 | 2.41 | 0.48 |
| IGCC-4 | Data not available | 500 | 29.9 | 12 040 | 86 | 0.307 | 0.644 | 2.99 | 2.5 | 0.49 |
| IGCC-5 | Solvent based – Selexol NS | 694 | 32 | 11 250 | 90 | 0.241 | 0.71 | 2.79 | 2.33 | 0.46 |
| IGCC-6 | Solvent based – shift + Selexol | 455 | 35.1 | 10 256 | 94 | 0.197 | 0.753 | 2.55 | 2.13 | 0.42 |
| COXY-1 | Oxy-fuel | 376.1 | 34.3 | 10 493 | 91 | 0.16 | 0.79 | 1.98 | 1.52 | 0.46 |
| COXY-2 | Oxy-fuel | 352.9 | 32.2 | 11 180 | 90 | 0.178 | 0.772 | 2.11 | 1.62 | 0.49 |
| COXY-3 | Oxy-fuel | 670.3 | 34.7 | 10 369 | 94 | 0.136 | 0.814 | 1.96 | 1.5 | 0.45 |
| COXY-4 | Oxy-fuel with 10% air added | 669.3 | 34.7 | 10 384 | 94 | 0.137 | 0.814 | 1.96 | 1.51 | 0.45 |
| COXY-5 | Oxy-fuel with 20% air added | 666.2 | 34.5 | 10 432 | 94 | 0.137 | 0.813 | 1.97 | 1.51 | 0.46 |
| COXY-6 | Oxy-fuel with 30% air added | 661.2 | 34.3 | 10 511 | 94 | 0.138 | 0.812 | 1.98 | 1.52 | 0.46 |
| COXY-7 | Oxy-fuel with 40% air added | 654.1 | 33.9 | 10 626 | 94 | 0.14 | 0.811 | 2.01 | 1.54 | 0.46 |
| COXY-8 | Oxy-fuel with 50% air added | 645.1 | 33.4 | 10 775 | 94 | 0.142 | 0.809 | 2.03 | 1.56 | 0.47 |
| COXY-9 | Oxy-fuel | 238.5 | 32.3 | 11 149 | 90 | 0.231 | 0.719 | 2.11 | 1.62 | 0.49 |
| COXY-10 | Oxy-fuel | 533.2 | 32.7 | 10 996 | 93 | 0.147 | 0.804 | 2.08 | 1.6 | 0.48 |
| COXY-11 | Oxy-fuel w/compression, dehydration | 310 | 33.8 | 10 648 | 100 | 0.091 | 0.859 | 2.01 | 1.54 | 0.47 |
| COXY-12 | Oxy-fuel w/double flash purification | 270.6 | 29.5 | 12 199 | 92 | 0.189 | 0.762 | 2.3 | 1.77 | 0.53 |
| COXY-13 | Oxy-fuel w/distillation purification | 265.8 | 29 | 12 418 | 90 | 0.214 | 0.737 | 2.34 | 1.8 | 0.54 |
| COXY-14 | Oxy-fuel | 574 | 36.6 | 9836 | 90 | 0.203 | 0.747 | 1.86 | 1.43 | 0.43 |
| COXY-16 | Oxy-fuel (Case: S22F) | 549 | 30.1 | 11 960 | 90.9 | 0.201 | 0.749 | 1.81 | 1.29 | 0.52 |
| COXY-17 | Oxy-fuel (USC-subbituminous) | 509 | 31.5 | 11 429 | 90 | 0.203 | 0.748 | 2.16 | 1.66 | 0.5 |
| COXY-18 | Oxy-fuel (SCPC-bituminous) | 501 | 31 | 11 613 | 98 | 0.12 | 0.83 | 2.19 | 1.68 | 0.51 |
| COXY-19 | Oxy-fuel (SCPC-bituminous) | 510 | 31.5 | 11 429 | 90 | 0.203 | 0.748 | 2.16 | 1.66 | 0.5 |
| COXY-20 | Oxy-fuel (USC-subbituminous) | 833 | 34.1 | 10 557 | 90 | 0.182 | 0.768 | 1.99 | 1.53 | 0.46 |
| COXY-21 | Oxy-combustion supercrit | 550 | 29.3 | 12 287 | 99.5 | 0.105 | 0.845 | 2.32 | 1.78 | 0.54 |
| COXY-22 | Oxy-combustion supercrit | 555.1 | 29.5 | 12 203 | 99.4 | 0.104 | 0.846 | 2.3 | 1.77 | 0.53 |
| COXY-23 | Oxy-combustion supercrit | 549 | 29.3 | 12 287 | 96.9 | 0.132 | 0.819 | 2.32 | 1.78 | 0.54 |
| COXY-24 | Oxy-combustion supercrit | 548.7 | 29.2 | 12 329 | 85.5 | 0.182 | 0.769 | 2.33 | 1.79 | 0.54 |


This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2024

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.

Table 7 *(continued)*

| Tag | Green technology/process | [a]Net plant output | [a]Electrical efficiency | [a]Heat rate | [a]$CO_2$ removed | [a]Cradle-to-plant-exit GWP | $CO_2$ avoided | Water withdrawal | Water consumption | Net water discharge |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (Units) | | MWe | % HHV | $MJ_{HHV}$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ | % | $t_{CO_2e}$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ | $t_{CO_2e}$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ | $m^3$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ | $m^3$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ | $m^3$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ |
| COXY-25 | Oxy-combustion ultra-supercrit | 550 | 33 | 10 909 | 99.4 | 0.093 | 0.857 | 2.06 | 1.58 | 0.48 |
| COXY-26 | Oxy-combustion ultra-supercrit | 545.3 | 32.7 | 11 009 | 93.2 | 0.154 | 0.796 | 2.08 | 1.6 | 0.48 |
| IGFC-1 | Minimized CO content in SOFC feed | 719 | 42 | 8571 | 100 | 0.073 | 0.877 | 0.96 | 0.7 | 0.26 |
| IGFC-2 | IGFC-1 w/seasonal shutdowns | 719 | 42 | 8571 | 100 | 0.073 | 0.877 | 0.96 | 0.7 | 0.26 |
| IGFC-3 | IGFC-1 w/integrated energy storage | 719 | 41.5 | 8675 | 100 | 0.074 | 0.876 | 0.97 | 0.71 | 0.26 |
| IGFC-4 | IGFC-2 w/integrated energy storage | 719 | 40.6 | 8867 | 100 | 0.076 | 0.875 | 0.99 | 0.72 | 0.27 |
| IGFC-5 | Syngas directly in SOFC | 719 | 38.4 | 9375 | 100 | 0.08 | 0.87 | 1.05 | 0.76 | 0.29 |
| IGFC-6 | IGFC-5 w/seasonal shutdowns | 719 | 38.4 | 9373 | 100 | 0.08 | 0.87 | 1.05 | 0.76 | 0.28 |
| IGFC-7 | IGFC-5 w/integrated energy storage | 719 | 38 | 9474 | 100 | 0.081 | 0.869 | 1.06 | 0.77 | 0.29 |
| IGFC-8 | IGFC-5 w/integrated energy storage | 719 | 37.4 | 9626 | 100 | 0.082 | 0.868 | 1.08 | 0.78 | 0.29 |
| IGFC-9 | Atm-pressure IGFC plant | 253 | 49.4 | 7287 | 99 | 0.064 | 0.887 | 0.82 | 0.59 | 0.22 |
| IGFC-10 | Pressurized IGFC | 253 | 56.2 | 6406 | 99 | 0.056 | 0.894 | 0.72 | 0.52 | 0.19 |
| IGFC-11 | Part. methane syngas IGFC (TREMP) | 846.6 | 44.4 | 8115 | 99 | 0.072 | 0.878 | 0.91 | 0.66 | 0.25 |
| IGFC-12 | Part. methane syngas IGFC (HICOM) | 925 | 48.5 | 7425 | 99 | 0.07 | 0.881 | 0.83 | 0.61 | 0.23 |
| IGFC-13 | IGFC-DIRECT | 865 | 45.3 | 7943 | 99 | 0.075 | 0.876 | 0.89 | 0.65 | 0.24 |
| IGFC-14 | Liquid-tin anode SOFC | 93.9 | 57.2 | 6294 | 100 | 0.054 | 0.897 | 0.7 | 0.51 | 0.19 |

[a] From Adams *et al.*[7]

water consumption impact category as much as the $CO_2$ emissions.

Table 9 also highlights that higher water impacts are experienced in regions of high-water scarcity (WSI = 0.999, UAE) as seen in the range of values across the countries for each SCPC technology case. The same trend is observed: when high-quality water is consumed, the impact increases. However, the impact of using high-quality water is far greater in a region with a higher water scarcity index because it is in greater demand.[43]

In the normalised sense, as shown in Fig. 11, the value of WSI doesn't not change the normalised impact; however, comparative conclusions can still be drawn. In a region with high water stress, withdrawing good quality water will mean less water available to other users. There is a challenge in choosing the most realistic scenario without having a full picture of the process. These graphs show that by varying the water quality of withdrawn and returned water, eventually the water impact maps the water withdrawn in the worst-case scenario and then maps the water consumed in the case of the same water quality. In the case of the same water quality, we see that the normalised value for the technology is the same and the real difference comes from the worst case scenario (scenario 1). Additionally, Fig. 13 shows that two distinct categories of technologies can be identified. NGFC, IGFC and COXY have a net benefit for the environment in terms of water sustainability, whereas the other technologies illustrate the negative trade-off between water impact and GWP.

### 4.4 Discussion

Fig. 12 is the metric presented as the numerator (change in water impact between the green case and base case) against the denominator of the metric ($CO_2$ emissions avoided) for all technologies investigated. A negative change in WII implies that the WII of the green case is less than that of the base case.

Firstly, we observe the distinct trends between the natural gas-based technologies and the coal-based technologies. It is important to remember that the natural gas based case studies reflect a lower amount of GHG emissions avoided as compared to the coal based case studies purely because the total cradle-to-plant-exit GHG emissions for the natural gas base case are lower than those for the coal base case.

Both coal and natural gas SOFC technologies have a negative change in WII but IGFC has higher GHG emissions avoided, due to the high emissions of the coal base case. The average GHG emission of IGFC is 0.07 $t_{CO_2e}$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ and

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.

**Table 8** Water and GHG emission data for carbon-capture technologies in gas-fired plants

| Tag | Green technology/process | [a]Net plant output | [a]Electrical efficiency | [a]Heat rate | [a]$CO_2$ removed | [a]Cradle-to-plant exit GWP | $CO_2$ avoided | Water withdrawal | Water consumption | Net water discharge |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (Units) | | MWe | % HHV | $MJ_{HHV}$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ | % | $t_{CO_2e}$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ | $t_{CO_2e}$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ | $m^3$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ | $m^3$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ | $m^3$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ |
| NGCC-2 | Solvent based – MEA | 789.0 | 46 | 7809 | 90% | 0.115 | 0.291 | 1.69 | 1.29 | 0.41 |
| NGCC-3 | Solvent based – advanced amine | 804.0 | 47 | 7660 | 90% | 0.113 | 0.293 | 1.66 | 1.26 | 0.40 |
| NGCC-4 | Solvent based – Econamine FG+ | 448.9 | 43 | 8451 | 90% | 0.123 | 0.283 | 1.83 | 1.39 | 0.44 |
| NGCC-5 | Solvent based – amine | 485.0 | 42 | 8491 | 90% | 0.122 | 0.284 | 1.84 | 1.40 | 0.44 |
| NGCC-6 | Solvent based – amine | 389.0 | 41 | 8824 | 94% | 0.110 | 0.296 | 1.91 | 1.45 | 0.46 |
| NGFC-1 | SOFC base case | 693.0 | 74 | 4865 | 100 | 0.044 | 0.362 | 0.59 | 0.42 | 0.18 |
| NGFC-6 | Low pressure ATR, 6 parallel SOFC sections. (BASELINE CASE1-1) | 550.0 | 56 | 6394 | | 0.059 | 0.347 | 0.67 | 0.4485 | 0.22 |
| NGFC-7 | Low pressure ATR, 8 parallel SOFC sections. Smaller ASU (CASE 1–7) | 550.0 | 62 | 5825 | | 0.053 | 0.353 | 0.61 | 0.41 | 0.20 |
| NGFC-8 | High pressure ATR (CASE 2-1) | 550.0 | 65 | 5556 | | 0.055 | 0.351 | 0.70 | 0.55 | 0.15 |
| NGFC-9 | High pressure ATR. Smaller ASU (CASE 2–3) | 550.0 | 65 | 5556 | | 0.055 | 0.351 | 0.48 | 0.31 | 0.16 |
| NGFC-10 | No ATR (CASE 3-1) | 550.0 | 66 | 5463 | | 0.050 | 0.356 | 0.52 | 0.35 | 0.17 |

[a] From Adams *et al.*[7]

that of NGFC is 0.05 $t_{CO_2e}$ $MW^{-1}$ $h^{-1}$ (Table 7, reported as cradle-to-plant-exit GWP) making NGFC the better choice in terms of average emissions. However, in a feasibility study natural gas might be the only viable option for various reasons. If the base case of a coal plant was used, the numbers for all the natural gas cases would look very different. There would be a greater change in water impact and a higher amount of GHG emissions avoided.

The next best technology is coal based oxy-fuels (COXY) both in terms of change in WII and GHG emissions avoided, however, they consume more water than NGCC, NGFC and IGFC (Fig. 9). In this situation, with three closely competing technologies (excluding NGCC due to its positive change in WII), considerations on the location (access to natural gas/coal, water and other raw materials), emission regulations and the land footprint required to construct this kind of facility must be considered. Further to this, feasibility studies are necessary and imperative to understand the impacts (economic, environmental, and social) over the entire supply chain to arrive at a suitable technology, this includes the water impact and GHG emissions.

Table 10 lists the final median WICa metric values, based on a worst-case scenario and a high WSI, for all the technologies investigated in this work, which are presented in Fig. 14 relative to key water and energy metrics. Negative WICa values mean that there is a net benefit to water resources and GHG emission reduction since the WII for the green case is lower than that of the base case. It is interesting to compare the fuel efficiency to the water metrics. Fig. 14 shows the anticipated link between electrical efficiency and

**Table 9** Change in WII (numerator of WICa) for different WSI values of countries for SCPC technology, presented in descending order to illustrate the boundary of the impact. These values are based on scenario 1 (worst-case) quality values

| World ranking | 1 | 31 | 46 | 50 | 58 | 76 | 87 | 96 | 115 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Country | United Arab Emirates | India | China | South Africa | Philippines | Poland | Finland | Canada | Norway |
| WSI | 0.999 | 0.981 | 0.940 | 0.906 | 0.813 | 0.409 | 0.224 | 0.099 | 0.032 |
| SCPC-11 | 2.126 | 2.087 | 2.000 | 1.928 | 1.731 | 0.870 | 0.477 | 0.211 | 0.068 |
| SCPC-5 | 1.863 | 1.830 | 1.753 | 1.690 | 1.517 | 0.763 | 0.418 | 0.185 | 0.060 |
| SCPC-2 | 1.833 | 1.800 | 1.725 | 1.662 | 1.492 | 0.750 | 0.411 | 0.182 | 0.059 |
| SCPC-9 | 1.758 | 1.727 | 1.654 | 1.594 | 1.431 | 0.720 | 0.394 | 0.174 | 0.057 |
| SCPC-7 | 1.686 | 1.656 | 1.587 | 1.529 | 1.373 | 0.690 | 0.378 | 0.167 | 0.054 |
| SCPC-8 | 1.291 | 1.267 | 1.214 | 1.170 | 1.051 | 0.528 | 0.289 | 0.128 | 0.042 |
| SCPC-4 | 1.044 | 1.025 | 0.983 | 0.947 | 0.850 | 0.428 | 0.234 | 0.103 | 0.034 |
| SCPC-3 | 0.829 | 0.814 | 0.780 | 0.752 | 0.675 | 0.339 | 0.186 | 0.082 | 0.027 |
| SCPC-6 | 0.794 | 0.780 | 0.748 | 0.720 | 0.647 | 0.325 | 0.178 | 0.079 | 0.026 |
| SCPC-10 | 0.786 | 0.772 | 0.739 | 0.713 | 0.640 | 0.322 | 0.176 | 0.078 | 0.025 |


This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2024

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.

**Table 10** Median WICa values for the technologies investigated presented in ascending order for both coal and natural gas CC technologies

| Fuel type | Technology | WICa value |
|---|---|---|
| Coal | IGFC | −1.57 |
| | COXY | −0.33 |
| | IGCC | 0.64 |
| | SCPC | 2.30 |
| Natural gas | NGFC | −1.03 |
| | NGCC | 3.04 |

water usage – higher efficiency technologies have lower water usage – and the overall benefits of less mature but more efficient technologies. Even though the efficiencies for COXY, IGCC and SCPC technologies are similar, the median water usage is significantly lower for COXY technologies. A closer look at Table ESI 2 (in the ESI†) shows that the percentage of process operation water withdrawal to total operation water withdrawal (cooling + process) for COXY case studies is 8%, whereas for IGCC and SCPC technologies, this percentage is between 15% and 22%. This could suggest two things. Firstly, the water requirements of the individual unit operations are far less than those of SCPC and IGCC. This is a high possibility as solvent based post-combustion and pre-combustion systems have high water requirements. Additionally, due to the complete separation of $H_2O$ and $CO_2$, COXY systems have the potential of water recovery. This water can be treated and reused within the system thereby reducing raw water withdrawal[17,45] and is enough, in some instances, to satisfy the full water consumption requirement.[45] In the cases investigated in this study, it is unclear if this was done. A similar benefit was noted in van der Spek *et al.*[46] where the comparison of an oxyfuel configuration to a post-combustion configuration resulted in lower cooling water intensity due to the integration of the steam cycle with downstream processes.

Secondly, and conversely, the percentage of the cooling operation water withdrawal to total operation water withdrawal for COXY systems in this work is more than that for SCPC and IGCC. The actual withdrawal values are, however, significantly lower. Zhu *et al.*[17] investigated the life cycle water consumption of oxyfuel combustion systems, and found that "operations and maintenance", which include cooling, consume the most water over the life cycle. However, within "operations and maintenance" they do not distinguish between cooling and other operations making it impossible to determine if cooling or other unit operations contribute the most to water consumption. Again, further validating earlier observations, the technologies with high efficiencies, low water impact and low water consumption are the fuel cell technologies.

## 5. Conclusions

The objective of this work was to create an easy, usable, high impact way to assess the trade-off between global warming mitigation, as $CO_2$ equivalents avoided, and the impact on water resources for CC technologies in the power generation industry.





**Fig. 14** Summary of the relationship between technology efficiencies, water usage and the WII.

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.

The analysis shows that, overall, CC technology increases water usage except for IGFC and NGFC technologies. This suggests that capturing carbon can be done in a water efficient way by selecting an appropriate technology. The usefulness of the metric is demonstrated in the absence of specific water quality and water scarcity data – a common situation as often noted in the literature.[14,47] Our results show that the worst-case scenario (described as scenario 1 in this work) can be used to estimate the WII of different technologies and, in a normalized sense, not knowing the WSI does not impair the comparative conclusions that can be drawn.

Our case study of 65 different low-$CO_2$ fossil-based power plant systems provided a substantial basis from which to estimate water usage data and draw qualitative and quantitative conclusions. Additionally, the exercise drew attention to the water data availability in the literature *versus* the availability of other data, such as GHG emissions and economic data. The discrepancy between *needing water* in the power generation CC process and the *reporting of water usage* data in power generation CC research was emphasised. Additionally, we also recognise that changes in the cooling employed in the technology reference cases would alter the overall water usage image presented here but potentially not impact overall observations.

By varying the quality variable for both water withdrawn and water returned, for a WSI close to 1 the impact maps the water withdrawal and consumption data points accurately for scenario 1 and the scenarios when the qualities are equivalent. This is especially useful when data are unknown; however, it is important to note that the specific impact relies heavily on the water quality. In varying the WSI, we observe greater impact for areas with low WSI *versus* areas with high WSI. For low impact cases due to poor quality water, considerations related to pretreatment cost must be factored in. These could affect other parameters not included in the scope of this work.

We established that NGFC, IGFC and COXY technologies have the most promising WICa values. However, IGFC and COXY have the highest GHG emissions avoided due to the high GHG emissions of the base case. SOFC based CC has the lowest water usage and GHG emissions on an absolute basis compared to all other technologies investigated further supported by their low WICa values.

Enabling the CC technology decision making for fossil-based power plants with a water resource impact dimension was a further goal of this work. The method presented here translates to other contexts and industries with different water metrics and green initiatives (reducing particulate matter, reducing sulfur, *etc.*). The WICa metric reflects the key characteristics that are necessary in understanding the potential water impacts of reducing GWP, as described in Table 1. It is useful in making general assessments of technologies for specific regions and for specific water qualities. It does not yet include the additional emission impact for the treatment of water to improve water quality before use and after disposal.

## Data availability

The data supporting this article have been included as part of the ESI.†

## Author contributions

P. M. – formal analysis and writing – original draft; P. M. and T. A. A. – conceptualisation and methodology; T. A. A. and K. H. – writing – review and editing and supervision.

## Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts to declare.

## Acknowledgements

No external funding was used to support this research.

## Notes and references

1 J. Macknick, R. Newmark, G. Heath and K. C. Hallett, Operational water consumption and withdrawal factors for electricity generating technologies: A review of existing literature, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 2012, **7**, 045802.
2 J. Meldrum, S. Nettles-Anderson, G. Heath and J. Macknick, Life cycle water use for electricity generation: A review and harmonization of literature estimates, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 2013, **8**, 015031.
3 H. Zhai and E. S. Rubin, Water Use at Pulverized Coal Power Plants with Postcombustion Carbon Capture and Storage, *Energy Procedia*, 2011, **4**, 2238–2244.
4 L. Rosa, D. L. Sanchez, G. Realmonte, D. Baldocchi and P. D'Odorico, The water footprint of carbon capture and storage technologies, *Renewable Sustainable Energy Rev.*, 2021, **138**, 1–11.
5 D. Y. C. Leung, G. Caramanna and M. M. Maroto-Valer, An overview of current status of carbon dioxide capture and storage technologies, *Renewable Sustainable Energy Rev.*, 2014, **39**, 426–443.
6 A. Yagmur Goren, D. Erdemir and I. Dincer, Comprehensive review and assessment of carbon capturing methods and technologies: An environmental research, *Environ. Res.*, 2024, **240**(P1), 117503.
7 T. A. Adams II, L. Hoseinzade, P. B. Madabhushi and I. J. Okeke, Comparison of $CO_2$ capture approaches for fossil-based power generation: Review and meta-study, *Processes*, 2017, **5**(3), 44.
8 *OECD Environmental Outlook to 2050 : The Consequences of Inaction Key Facts and Figures*, Outlook, 2012.
9 United Nations, *Sustainable Development Goal 6* [Internet], United Nations, 2023 [cited 2024 Mar 22], Available from: **https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal6#targets_and_indicators**.
10 N. Mikosch, M. Berger and M. Finkbeiner, Addressing water quality in water footprinting: current status, methods and limitations, *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.*, 2021, **26**(1), 157–174.
11 C. Pradinaud, M. Núñez, P. Roux, G. Junqua and R. K. Rosenbaum, The issue of considering water quality in life

 This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2024

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.

cycle assessment of water use, *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.*, 2019, **24**(3), 590–603.
12 V. Fthenakis and H. C. Kim, Life-cycle uses of water in U.S. electricity generation, *Renewable Sustainable Energy Rev.*, 2010, **14**(7), 2039–2048.
13 S. Pfister, A. Koehler and S. Hellweg, Assessing the environmental impacts of freshwater consumption in LCA, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2009, **43**(11), 4098–4104.
14 M. A. D. Larsen, S. Petrovic, R. E. Engström, M. Drews, S. Liersch and K. B. Karlsson, *et al.*, Challenges of data availability: Analysing the water-energy nexus in electricity generation, *Energy Strategy Rev.*, 2019, **26**, 100426.
15 J. Simpson, C. McConnell and Y. Matsuda, *Economic Assessment of Carbon Capture and Storage Technologies*, 2011.
16 L. Feng, R. Zhai and Y. Guo, Water consumption of the integration of coal-fired power plant with $CO_2$ post combustion system with different cooling methods, *Int. J. Greenhouse Gas Control*, 2022, **121**, 103776.
17 Y. Zhu, M. Chen, Q. Yang, M. J. M. Alshwaikh, H. Zhou and J. Li, *et al.*, Life cycle water consumption for oxyfuel combustion power generation with carbon capture and storage, *J. Cleaner Prod.*, 2021, **281**, 124419.
18 R. Damania, S. Desbureaux, A.-S. Rodella, J. Russ and E. Zaveri, *Quality Unknown The invisible Water Crisis*, World Bank Publications, The World Bank Group, Washington, DC, 2019.
19 A. Y. Hoekstra, A. K. Chapagain, M. M. Aldaya and M. M. Mekonnen, *The Water Footprint Assessment Manual, Setting the Global Standard*, Social and Environmental Accountability Journal, 2011, vol. 31.
20 *ISO 14046, ISO 14046: 2014 Environmental management — Water footprint — Principles , requirements and guidelines*, International Organization for Standardization, 2014.
21 J.-B. Bayart, C. Bulle, L. Deschênes, M. Margni, S. Pfister and F. Vince, *et al.*, A framework for assessing off-stream freshwater use in LCA, *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.*, 2010, **15**, 439–453.
22 A. Boulay, C. Bulle and L. Deschênes, LCA Characterisation of Freshwater Use on Human Health and through Compensation, *Towar Life Cycle Sustain Manag.*, 2011.
23 A. M. Boulay, J. Bare, L. Benini, M. Berger, M. J. Lathuillière and A. Manzardo, *et al.*, The WULCA consensus characterization model for water scarcity footprints: assessing impacts of water consumption based on available water remaining (AWARE), *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.*, 2018, **23**(2), 368–378.
24 *ISO 14046, A Practical Guide for SMEs ISO 14046 Environmental Management Water footprint*, Switzerland, 2017.
25 J. B. Bayart, S. Worbe, J. Grimaud and E. Aoustin, The Water Impact Index: A simplified single-indicator approach for water footprinting, *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.*, 2014, **19**(6), 1336–1344.
26 A. Y. Hoekstra, A critique on the water-scarcity weighted water footprint in LCA, *Ecol. Indic.*, 2016, **66**, 564–573.
27 J. Chenoweth, M. Hadjikakou and C. Zoumides, Quantifying the human impact on water resources: a critical review of the water footprint concept, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 2014, **18**, 2325–2342.
28 R. Habib, *Life Cycle GHG Emissions and Water Consumption for a Hypothetical 400 MW Coal-Fired Power Plant in Western Australia : Impacts of Carbon Capture and a Comparison of Two Prevailing Carbon Capture Technologies*, 2017.
29 L. Rosa, J. A. Reimer, M. S. Went and P. D'Odorico, Hydrological limits to carbon capture and storage, *Nat. Sustain.*, 2020, **3**(8), 658–666.
30 M. Berger and M. Finkbeiner, Methodological Challenges in Volumetric and Impact-Oriented Water Footprints, *J. Ind. Ecol.*, 2013, **17**(1), 79–89.
31 É. Pierrat, A. Laurent, M. Dorber, M. Rygaard, F. Verones and M. Hauschild, Advancing water footprint assessments: Combining the impacts of water pollution and scarcity, *Sci. Total Environ.*, 2023, **870**, 161910.
32 *Carbon Dioxide Emissions From Electricity [Internet]*, 2022, Available from: **https://world-nuclear.org/information-library/energy-and-the-environment/carbon-dioxide-emissions-from-electricity.aspx**.
33 K. Gerdes and C. Nichols, *Water Requirements for Existing and Emerging Thermoelectric Plant Technologies*, National Energy Technology Laboratory DOE/NETL 402/080108, 2009, vol. 2008.
34 H. Zhai and E. S. Rubin, Performance and cost of wet and dry cooling systems for pulverized coal power plants with and without carbon capture and storage, *Energy Policy*, 2010, **38**, 5653–5660.
35 T. Schmitt, S. Leptinksy, M. Turner, A. Zoelle, M. Woods and T. Shultz, *et al.*, *Cost And Performance Baseline For Fossil Energy Plants Volume 1: Bituminous Coal And Natural Gas To Electricity*, revision 4a, Pittsburgh, 2022, vol. 1.
36 T. Fout, A. Zoelle, D. Keairns, M. Turner, M. Woods and N. Kuehn, *et al.*, *Cost and Performance Baseline for Fossil Energy Plants Volume 1a: Bituminous Coal (PC) and Natural Gas to Electricity*, National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL), revision 3, 2015, vol. 1a.
37 T. Fout, A. Zoelle, D. Keairns, M. Turner, M. Woods and N. Kuehn, *et al.*, *Cost and Performance Baseline for Fossil Energy Plants Volume 1b: Bituminous Coal (IGCC) to Electricity Revision 2b – Year Dollar Update*, National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL), 2015, vol. 1b.
38 J. L. Haslbeck, C. Zhang, R. D. Brasington, M. C. Woods, E. G. Lewis and J. Black, *et al.*, Cost and Performance for Low-Rank Pulverized Coal Oxycombustion Energy Plants, *Technical Report*, 2010.
39 A. K. S. Iyengar, R. A. Newby and D. L. Keairns, *Techno-Economic Analysis of integrated gasification fuel cell Systems*, National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL), 2014, vol. DOE/NETL-341/112613.
40 A. K. S. Iyengar, A. A. Noring, J. K. Mackay and D. L. Keairns, *Techno-economic analysis of natural gas fuel cell plant configurations*, National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL), 2022, vol. DOE/NETL-2022-3259.
41 T. Luo, R. Young and P. Reig, *Aqueduct Projected Water Stress Country Rankings*, World Resources Institute, Washington, DC, 2015.

Published on 12 July 2024. Downloaded by University of the Witwatersrand on 8/14/2024 1:36:51 PM.

42 M. Luck, M. Landis and F. Gassert, *Aqueduct Water Stress Projections: Decadal Projections of Water Supply and Demand Using CMIP5 GCMs*, Technical Note, World Resources Institue, Washington, DC, 2015.
43 C. Pradinaud, M. Núñez, P. Roux, G. Junqua and R. K. Rosenbaum, The issue of considering water quality in life cycle assessment of water use, *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.*, 2019, **24**(3), 590–603.
44 N. S. Matin and W. P. Flanagan, Life cycle assessment of amine-based versus ammonia-based post combustion $CO_2$ capture in coal-fired power plants, *Int. J. Greenhouse Gas Control*, 2022, **113**, 103535.
45 IEAGHG, *Water Usage and Loss Analysis of Bituminous Coal Fired Power Plants*, 2010/05, IEAGHG, 2011.
46 M. Van Der Spek, N. H. Eldrup, R. Skagestad and A. Ramirez, Techno-economic Performance of State-of-the-Art Oxyfuel Technology for Low-$CO_2$ Coal-fired Electricity Production, *Energy Procedia*, 2017, **114**, 6432–6439.
47 A. Lohrmann, C. Lohrmann and P. Luukka, Global and regional models for identification of cooling technology in thermal power generation for water demand estimations in water-energy nexus studies, *J. Cleaner Prod.*, 2022, **380**, 134842.

 This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2024