



A techno-economic and life cycle assessment for the production of green methanol from CO₂: catalyst and process bottlenecks

Tomas Cordero-Lanzac^{a,1,2}, Adrian Ramirez^{b,1}, Alberto Navajas^{c,d}, Lieven Gevers^b, Sirio Brunialti^e, Luis M. Gandía^{c,d}, Andrés T. Aguayo^a, S. Mani Sarathy^e, Jorge Gascon^{b,*}

^a Department of Chemical Engineering, University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU), PO Box 644, 48080 Bilbao, Spain

^b King Abdullah University of Science and Technology, KAUST Catalysis Center (KCC), Advanced Catalytic Materials, Thuwal 23955, Saudi Arabia

^c Department of Science, Public University of Navarre (UPNA), Arrosadía Campus s/n, 31006 Pamplona, Spain

^d Institute for Advanced Materials and Mathematics (InaMat²), Universidad Pública de Navarra (UPNA), Edificio Jerónimo de Ayanz, Campus de Arrosadía, Pamplona-Iruña 31006, Spain

^e King Abdullah University of Science and Technology, Clean Combustion Research Center (CCRC), Thuwal 23955, Saudi Arabia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 22 August 2021

Revised 19 September 2021

Accepted 25 September 2021

Available online 26 October 2021

Keywords:

CO₂

Methanol

Kinetic modeling

Process simulation

Life cycle assessment

ABSTRACT

The success of catalytic schemes for the large-scale valorization of CO₂ does not only depend on the development of active, selective and stable catalytic materials but also on the overall process design. Here we present a multidisciplinary study (from catalyst to plant and techno-economic/lifecycle analysis) for the production of green methanol from renewable H₂ and CO₂. We combine an in-depth kinetic analysis of one of the most promising recently reported methanol-synthesis catalysts (InCo) with a thorough process simulation and techno-economic assessment. We then perform a life cycle assessment of the simulated process to gauge the real environmental impact of green methanol production from CO₂. Our results indicate that up to 1.75 ton of CO₂ can be abated per ton of produced methanol only if renewable energy is used to run the process, while the sensitivity analysis suggest that either rock-bottom H₂ prices (1.5 \$ kg⁻¹) or severe CO₂ taxation (300 \$ per ton) are needed for a profitable methanol plant. Besides, we herein highlight and analyze some critical bottlenecks of the process. Especial attention has been paid to the contribution of H₂ to the overall plant costs, CH₄ trace formation, and purity and costs of raw gases. In addition to providing important information for policy makers and industrialists, directions for catalyst (and therefore process) improvements are outlined.

© 2021 Science Press and Dalian Institute of Chemical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences. Published by ELSEVIER B.V. and Science Press. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The high environmental impact of greenhouse gas emissions requires the development of technologies for the capture, storage and valorization of CO₂. In this scenario, the catalytic conversion of captured CO₂ has attracted a great deal of attention over the last few decades. Production of methanol, dimethyl ether and other hydrocarbons is amidst the most studied CO₂ hydrogenation processes [1,2]. Among these possibilities, methanol stands out [3,4], thanks to its versatility as commodity chemical, potential as a marine fuel, and as feedstock for the manufacture of intermediate chemicals and even more complex road transport fuels [5]. Not

surprisingly, the large-scale production of green methanol is being sought after by both industry and academia.

Within the strategies for CO₂ valorization through catalytic technologies, insightful results have been reported for its electrochemical [6] and photochemical transformation [7]. In that sense, recent publications have reported the potential of electrofuels from CO₂. Brynolf et al. [8] reviewed the production cost estimates of this technology, which could potentially be competitive by 2030 according to the developments of technology. Regarding life cycle assessments (LCAs) of electrofuels, there is no doubt that greenhouse gas emissions can be clearly decreased by circa 90%, values that change depending on the considered boundary conditions [9]. Nevertheless, the uncertainty of calculations was also highlighted, as well as the high costs associated with these new technologies, mainly caused by electrolyzer capital costs and stack life [8].

For these reasons, when considering the current technology readiness level (TRL) of these technologies, thermocatalytic pro-

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: jorge.gascon@kaust.edu.sa (J. Gascon).

¹ These authors contributed equally to this work.

² Present address: Centre for Materials Science and Nanotechnology (SMN), Department of Chemistry, University of Oslo, N-0315 Oslo, Norway.

cesses seem to be far ahead in terms of industrial implementation. In the field of thermocatalytic CO₂ hydrogenation to methanol, in addition to a large number of studies focusing on the classical syngas methanol synthesis catalyst, Cu-ZnO-Al₂O₃, several new systems have been recently reported, with ZnO-ZrO₂ [10], Pt-based [11] and In₂O₃/ZrO₂ catalysts being among the most promising solids in terms of methanol selectivity under mild reaction conditions [12,13]. Indium oxide has been reported as a highly active catalyst to produce methanol. The activation of CO₂ takes place over the active sites generated by In₂O₃ and an oxygen vacancy derived from the ZrO₂, and the stability of the catalyst depends on the In reducibility [13]. In a previous work, an In₂O₃/Co catalyst was presented as a promising alternative to the Zr-based catalyst [14]. Computational catalysis proved that the reaction is driven by the same mechanism, with oxygen vacancies being derived from Co. The obtained results in terms of methanol selectivity (>80%) and productivity (0.86 g_{CH₃OH} g_{catalyst}⁻¹ h⁻¹) at near thermodynamic equilibrium conversion place this new catalyst among the state of the art [14].

Catalyst development is, however, only one (although very important) hurdle to overcome when improving green methanol production; equally important is the overall process that determines the economic feasibility of the manufacture route. In order to gain insight into process performance, understanding (and modelling) reaction kinetics is a must. Vanden Bussche and Froment [15] proposed a steady-state kinetic model for the CO₂ hydrogenation to methanol considering all the individual steps involved in the process, including thermodynamic considerations. After simplifications, the system was described by apparent kinetic and adsorption constants. More recently, Seidel et al. [16] reported a comparison of a complex model with a Langmuir-Hinshelwood model, resulting in a very accurate estimation of experimental results in both cases. Indeed, Langmuir-Hinshelwood models have shown reliable overall fitting of experimental data for CO₂ hydrogenation using different catalysts and conditions [17–20].

Using similar kinetic models, albeit based on outdated data for the commercial Cu-ZnO-Al₂O₃ catalyst, several groups have carried out steady-state simulations of a methanol plant using Aspen Plus [21–24]. Most of these studies propose a similar plant outline, incorporating compression and separation stages and reactant recirculation along with the catalytic reactor. These simulations can be used to predict the amount of CO₂ abated by the production plant [21], estimate the viability of the process as a function of reactant price fluctuation [23], and calculate the carbon tax that would make the process economically viable [24]. However, as recently highlighted by Nestler et al. [19], in most cases these simulations have relied either on outdated Cu-ZnO-Al₂O₃ kinetic models or on models derived under conditions far from those of the actual plant operation. Moreover, these studies provide limited insights into the process bottlenecks. Indeed, CH₄ trace formation, the raw gas source (and therefore purity and cost), the influence of the energy source in the final CO₂ abatement, the impact of the different process costs (i.e., CAPEX, raw materials, utilities) on the breakeven MeOH price, or the maximum O₂ content in the system (which can alter the catalyst performance, especially for the Cu-ZnO-Al₂O₃ commercial system) have been largely overlooked in the open literature.

Hence, in order to address the issues highlighted above, we present a full multidisciplinary approach that should give the most updated economic analysis on green methanol synthesis. We first describe the catalyst material and perform the corresponding kinetic fitting. This is followed by detailed process modeling using the developed realistic kinetics. We then study how process variables impact the techno-economics of green methanol production. Lastly, we perform a life cycle assessment of the process to assess the real environmental impact and determine the main process bottlenecks.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Chemicals

Cobalt acetate (Co(CH₃COO)₂·6H₂O, Aldrich), indium acetate (In(CH₃COO)₃·xH₂O, Aldrich), hydrogen peroxide (H₂O₂, 23% solution in water, Aldrich) and ammonia hydroxide (NH₄OH, Aldrich) were used as received. The commercial Cu-ZnO-Al₂O₃ catalyst was purchased from Alfa-Aesar.

2.2. Catalyst preparation

The catalyst was prepared via co-precipitation method following the procedure detailed elsewhere [14]. Briefly, 3.49 g of Co(CH₃COO)₂·6H₂O and 1.02 g of In(CH₃COO)₃ were dissolved in 35 mL of H₂O. Separately, 1.39 mg of H₂O₂ and 35 mL of 28% ammonia hydroxide solution were diluted with H₂O to 315 mL. Then, the salts-containing solution was added dropwise to the stirred ammonia hydroxide solution with a flow rate of 2 mL min⁻¹. The formed powder, denoted as InCo, was recovered and washed via centrifuging and subsequently dried at 60 °C. The washing protocol was repeated for three times.

2.3. Catalytic tests

Catalytic tests were carried out in a 16 channel Flowrence[®] from Avantium. Samples of the InCo catalyst were loaded in 15 of the channels, using the remaining one as a blank without catalyst. Prior to the reactions, the tubes were pressurized to 50 bar using a membrane-based pressure controller and the temperature was set to 300 °C. After 24 h of pretreatment under the reaction flows, experimental runs were carried out in the pressure range of 30–50 bar at 250–350 °C, using space time values up to 11 g h mol⁻¹CO₂, a total flow of 13 cm³ (STD) min⁻¹ per channel, and H₂/CO₂ molar ratios of 3–4. A small constant concentration of He was mixed with the feed as internal standard.

The reaction products were analyzed online using an Agilent 7890B GC with two sample loops. One sample loop goes to a TCD channel with 2 Haysep pre-column and MS5A, where He, H₂, CH₄ and CO are separated. Gases that have longer retention times than CO₂ on the Haysep column (Column 4 Haysep Q 0.5m G3591-80023) are back-flushed. Further separation of permanent gases is done on another Haysep column (Column 5 Haysep Q 6 Ft G3591-80013) to separate CO₂ before going to MS5A. The second sample loop goes to a FID with an Innovax pre-column (5 m, 0.20 mm OD, 0.4 μm film), a Gaspro column (Gaspro 30 M, 0.32 mm OD) and another Innovax column (45 m, 0.2 mm OD, 0.4 μm). Gaspro column separates C₁–C₈, paraffins and olefins. Innovax separates oxygenates and aromatics.

The CO₂ conversion (X_{CO₂}, %) and selectivity of each *i* product (S_{*i*}, %) in terms of contained C units are defined as follows:

$$X_{\text{CO}_2} = \left(1 - \frac{C_{\text{He,blk}} C_{\text{CO}_2,\text{R}}}{C_{\text{He,R}} C_{\text{CO}_2,\text{blk}}} \right) 100, \quad (1)$$

$$S_i = \frac{\frac{n_i C_{i,\text{R}}}{C_{\text{He,R}}}}{\frac{C_{\text{CO}_2,\text{blk}}}{C_{\text{He,blk}}} - \frac{C_{\text{CO}_2,\text{R}}}{C_{\text{He,R}}}} 100, \quad (2)$$

where C_{He,blk}, C_{He,R}, C_{CO₂,blk}, C_{CO₂,R} are the concentrations of He in the blank, He in the reactor effluent, CO₂ in the blank, and CO₂ in the reactor effluent, respectively, and C_{*i*,R} is the concentration of each *i* product in the reactor effluent with *n_i* carbon atoms. The carbon balance closure was higher than 97.5% in all cases. Each experiment was repeated four times, and the composition was computed by

average values of the results. Please note that negligible conversion of CO₂ to MeOH, CO or CH₄ was observed in all blank tests.


2.4. Kinetic modeling methodology

The kinetic model for the conversion of CO₂ into methanol was developed using the convection–dispersion–reaction equation, accounting for the mass conservation equation of each component of the reaction medium. Several simplifications can be assumed due to the characteristics of the system. The catalytic tests were performed during 180 h in a sequence that includes repeated control experiments. Deactivation was not observed, and the catalyst activity remained constant during the duration of the experiments. This avoids the need for a time-dependent expression of the equation and the intrinsic kinetic model can be extracted from these steady-state experiments. Moreover, the reactor inner diameter is 2 mm, which completely avoids radial dispersion and permits modeling the flow as purely convective transport. Axial dispersion is assumed negligible due to the high enough gas flows in the small-diameter reactor, with Re up to 10⁵. At these values, dispersion coefficient can be assumed as low as 0.2 m² s⁻¹ [25], with Pe reactor number values of 10². The pressure in all channels was accurately controlled by a membrane system and temperature was maintained constant in each set of channels (temperature controllers for each group of 4 reactors). Therefore, isothermal and isobaric conditions can also be assumed. In summary, experimental runs were carried out at suitable conditions that allow the intrinsic kinetic parameters to be calculated using the steady-state design equation for a packed bed reactor. Then, for the molar fraction of each *i* component of the reaction medium,

$$\frac{F}{S} \frac{dy_i}{dl} = \rho r_i \quad (3)$$

is defined for a catalytic bed length within 0 < *l* < *L*, where *F* is the molar flow rate, *S* is the reactor section, ρ is the catalytic bed density and *r_i* is the formation rate of each *i* compound. Although the contribution of axial dispersion is low, a negligible diffusion term was also used aiming at the stabilization of the mathematical method, as we explained elsewhere [26]. For that reason, the above mentioned Pe number was considered.

These formation rates are calculated from the reaction rate of each *j* step of the reaction network, described by the reverse water gas-shift reaction, the production of methanol from CO₂ and CO and the undesirable formation of methane (heavier hydrocarbons are not observed in the product stream),



The kinetic equations follow Langmuir–Hinshelwood expressions, defined as

$$r_1 = \frac{k_1 \left(P_{\text{CO}_2} P_{\text{H}_2} - \frac{P_{\text{CO}} P_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}}{K_1} \right)}{1 + K_{\text{CO}_2} P_{\text{CO}_2} + K_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} P_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}}, \quad (8)$$

$$r_2 = \frac{k_2 \left(P_{\text{CO}_2} P_{\text{H}_2}^3 - \frac{P_{\text{CH}_3\text{OH}} P_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}}{K_2} \right)}{1 + K_{\text{CO}_2} P_{\text{CO}_2} + K_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} P_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}}, \quad (9)$$

$$r_3 = \frac{k_3 \left(P_{\text{CO}} P_{\text{H}_2}^2 - \frac{P_{\text{CH}_3\text{OH}}}{K_3} \right)}{1 + K_{\text{CO}_2} P_{\text{CO}_2} + K_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} P_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}}, \quad (10)$$

$$r_4 = \frac{k_4 P_{\text{CO}} P_{\text{H}_2}^3}{1 + K_{\text{CO}_2} P_{\text{CO}_2} + K_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} P_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}} \quad (11)$$

with kinetic constants (*k_j*) being defined by a reparametrized form of the Arrhenius equation:

$$k_j = k_j^* \exp \left[-\frac{E_j}{R} \left(\frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{T^*} \right) \right], \quad (12)$$

where *k_j*^{*} is the kinetic constant at the reference temperature *T*^{*}, *E_j* is the activation energy and *R* is the universal gas constant. The equilibrium constants (*K_j*) are estimated as a function of the temperature using the empirical correlations reported elsewhere [27]. The adsorption constants for the CO₂ and water (*K_{CO2}* and *K_{H2O}*, respectively) follow the van't Hoff equation:

$$K = K^* \exp \left[\frac{\Delta H}{R} \left(\frac{1}{T^*} - \frac{1}{T} \right) \right], \quad (13)$$

where *K*^{*} is the adsorption constant at the reference temperature *T*^{*} and ΔH is the enthalpy of adsorption. Note that, despite methanol adsorption could also limit reaction rates, it was not considered in the model because a significant improvement of experimental data was not observed probably due to its lower partial pressure in the reaction medium.

The system is solved using a Runge–Kutta method of orders 1–5, with *k_j*^{*}, *E_j*, *K*^{*} and ΔH being the parameters to be optimized. With this aim, an objective function based on the sum of square errors (SSE) between the calculated and experimental values of molar fractions (*y_i* and *y_i*^{*e*}, respectively) is defined as

$$\text{SSE} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \omega_i \sum_{n=1}^{n_e} (y_i - y_i^e)_n^2, \quad (14)$$

where ω_i is the weight factor of each *i* compound and *n_c* and *n_e* are the number of compounds and experiments, respectively

2.5. Process simulation

Process simulations were carried out with steady-state simulation models developed in Aspen Plus® V8.8 software. The selected property method was SR-POLAR, based on an equation-of-state model by Schwarzentruber and Renon, which is an extension of the Redlich–Kwong–Soave equation of state. The Wegstein method was used for flowsheet convergence with a mass balance closure of the system was better than 99.99%. In line with the standard conventional plants, the annual productivity target of the system is 275 kton year⁻¹ of 99.5% purity MeOH. Economic analysis was carried out with the Economics Solver extension of Aspen Plus. The electricity price was set to 0.0775 k\$ kWh⁻¹. For the CO₂ emissions associated with the electricity and steam utilities, natural gas was selected as fuel source with a CO₂ emission data source from US-EPA-RULE-E9-5711 (5.59 10⁻⁵ kg CO₂ per kJ). CO₂ emissions using these estimates were only considered for the conventional energy sources scenario. The CO₂ abated was then calculated as the total CO₂ reacted in the plant minus the CO₂ emitted by the process utilities following the above CO₂ emission data source.

The techno-economic assessment of a plant using the conventional Cu–ZnO–Al₂O₃ methanol catalyst was also carried out as a comparison scenario. In particular, the plant proposed by Szima et al. [28] was scaled in order to match the target output of 275 kton year⁻¹ of 99.5% purity MeOH. It should be noted that the com-

parison scenario was performed without accounting for detailed kinetics of the Cu-ZnO-Al₂O₃ catalyst.

2.6. Life cycle assessment

The LCA simulation of the methanol plant was carried out using the software GaBi[®] Pro. 9.5 together with the databases associated to this program. Processes located in the European Union were considered. Two study cases were evaluated: the first study case considers all energy supplies for the reaction and electrolysis to be provided by a mix of renewable sources (47% photovoltaic, 30% wind energy, and 27% hydraulic [29,30]) and thermal energy supplied by the combustion of hydrogen from water electrolysis (hydrogen combustion has been selected as the best way in terms of environmental impact for thermal energy production [31]); the second study case considers thermal energy to be supplied by the combustion of natural gas, electricity from a current standard mix and hydrogen from natural gas steam cracking. A cement plant was considered the source of CO₂ with amine based capture located next to the MeOH plant. In case 1, the H₂ electrolyzer was also considered to be close to the MeOH plant. Both cases were evaluated using the environmental indicators recommended by The European Platform on Life Cycle Assessment [32]. Detailed information on these indicators and the assumptions of each study cases can be found in the [Supplementary Material](#).

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Experimental data fitting and kinetic modeling

Experimental runs were carried out across a wide range of reaction conditions to gather information on the effect of the main variables for the development of the kinetic model. [Fig. 1](#) shows the evolution with temperature of the selectivity to products (methanol, CO, methane and hydrocarbons) and CO₂ conversion at 50 bar, H₂/CO₂ molar ratio of 4 and using different space time values of 3.7, 7.3 and 11.0 g h mol⁻¹CO₂ ([Fig. 1a–c](#), respectively). Each run was repeated at least three times, with the corresponding error bars being displayed in the conversion symbols; the reproducibility of the results is shown to be high. From the experimental points depicted in [Fig. 1](#), we can observe that CO₂ conversion increases with temperature and space time and reaches a maximum value of ca. 25% at the extreme study case (350 °C and 11.0 g h mol⁻¹CO₂). Nevertheless, the product distribution is drastically modified as the reaction conditions are varied. Without considering the reaction at 250 °C and 3.7 g h mol⁻¹CO₂, which shows negligible conversion values, methanol selectivity significantly declines as temperature increases. This presumably occurs due to the disfavored equilibrium reaction of CO₂ conversion at higher temperatures [18]. Consequently, the selectivity to CO is increased with temperature. The concentration of CH₄ is also higher at 325 and 350 °C, which could be related to the promoted methanation reaction over the Co catalyst. A similar trend is observed with space time. The increase in the amount of catalyst leads to a higher extent of reaction, which decreases the selectivity to methanol and increases that of CO.

Aiming for maximum production of methanol in the simulated process, a compromise between conversion and selectivity must be reached. The evolution of methanol productivity in each of these experimental runs is depicted in [Fig. S1](#). In all cases, a maximum of productivity is observed, which is displaced towards lower temperatures upon increasing the space time value. The overall maximum methanol production exhibited by the InCo catalyst (0.42 g g⁻¹h⁻¹) is located at the central experimental data point, at 50 bar, H₂/CO₂ molar ratio of 4, 300 °C and 7.3 g h molCO₂⁻¹. Note that runs at different pressures and H₂/CO₂ molar ratios were also

used for the kinetic model computation, but methanol productivity was lower in all cases.

The kinetic modeling methodology (see Methods and [Supplementary Material](#)) and the collected experimental data were used in order to calculate the kinetic parameters that describe the catalytic system. The best fitting of the experimental data is obtained with the parameters listed in [Table 1](#). The 95% confidence intervals, also shown in [Table 1](#), were calculated from the discrepancies between experimental and calculated data. The value of the SSE obtained is ca. 0.04 and the standard deviation is ca. 0.02, which gives a very narrow normality plot for the kinetic parameter computation.

With the computed kinetic parameters, the initial reaction rates for CO and MeOH formation are estimated to be 5.1 10⁻³ and 1.7 10⁻² mol g⁻¹h⁻¹, respectively. This is in agreement with most of the reported mechanistic studies, which suggest the prevalence of the direct mechanism of CO₂ to MeOH via formate and methoxy intermediates [33]. The order of magnitude of the computed constants is similar to that reported for a similar catalytic system with CO₂ conversions higher than 15% [34]. In terms of energy requirements, the values of apparent activation energy calculated for all the steps of the reaction network are within the 47–65 kJ mol⁻¹ range, characteristic values of the kinetic regime. Especially, the value of the activation energy for the direct hydrogenation of CO₂ to methanol is within the range of those previously proposed by other authors with similar catalytic systems [18]. At our experimental conditions, the apparent activation energy for the rWGS reaction is slightly lower than that of methanol formation, which can also be explained by equilibrium-limited reaction at the integral regime used in this work. The adsorption heats for CO₂ and water are, as expected for an exothermic process, negative in value. The suitable fitting of the experimental data is more easily observed in [Fig. 1\(d–g\)](#), where the evolution with space time of the molar fractions of C-containing products is illustrated. The model predicts well the CO₂ conversion into CO and methanol. Moreover, the maximum concentrations of methanol previously observed at 300 and 325 °C are also estimated by the model. Experimental data fitting for reactions with lower H₂/CO₂ ratio and lower pressure is also shown in [Fig. S2](#).

Although [Fig. 1\(d–g\)](#) show the evolution of C-containing products, the model also accounts for the consumption of H₂ and formation of water. Indeed, the partial pressures of both components play a key role in the reaction network (see Equations (8)–(11) and experimental data fitting in [Figs. S3–S6](#)). As expected, the concentration of H₂ decreases along with that of CO₂ and water is produced as a function of the conversion. Then, the higher the extent of the reaction, the more water is produced through the reverse water-gas shift reaction (Equation (4)) and the direct formation of methanol (Equation (5)). Management of these two carbon-free compounds is of a paramount importance for the process, as H₂ should be recirculated and H₂O should be condensed in order to maximize methanol production. Likewise, although its concentration is the lowest one at most conditions, the production of methane increases with space time, temperature, total pressure and H₂/CO₂ ratio. At this point, this experimental observation (well predicted by the model) should be considered for the simulation of the plant since recirculation and scaling-up will lead to an accumulation of this undesirable byproduct in the system, ultimately causing a pronounced decrease in methanol productivity. At the optimal conditions that will be simulated in the plant, the net formation rates of CO, methanol and methane are compared in [Fig. S7](#). Despite the rates of methanol and CO formation being considerably higher (0.75 times lower than that of CO at this temperature), methane is present in the product stream, with its formation rate being 0.14 times lower than that of methanol.




Fig. 1. Evolution with temperature of the CO_2 conversion and products selectivity at 50 bar, $\text{H}_2/\text{CO}_2 = 4$ and using space time values of (a) 3.7, (b) 7.3 and (c) 11.0 $\text{g h mol}_{\text{CO}_2}^{-1}$; comparison of the experimental data (symbols) with those estimated by the model (line) for the evolution with space time of the molar fractions at (d) 275, (e) 300, (f) 325 and (g) 350 °C. $P = 50$ bar, $\text{H}_2/\text{CO}_2 = 4$; (h) parity plot of the calculated and experimental molar fractions.

Table 1

Kinetic and adsorption constants at the reference temperature (300 °C), apparent activation energies and adsorption heats for the InCo intrinsic kinetic model.

	k^*, K^*	$E, \Delta H$ (kJ mol^{-1})
k_1 ($\text{mol g}^{-1}\text{h}^{-1} \text{bar}^{-2}$)	$(1.38 \pm 0.29) 10^{-4}$	48.3 ± 2.7
k_2 ($\text{mol g}^{-1}\text{h}^{-1} \text{bar}^{-4}$)	$(2.98 \pm 0.53) 10^{-7}$	52.9 ± 3.7
k_3 ($\text{mol g}^{-1}\text{h}^{-1} \text{bar}^{-3}$)	$(5.70 \pm 0.62) 10^{-6}$	64.4 ± 2.7
k_4 ($\text{mol g}^{-1}\text{h}^{-1} \text{bar}^{-4}$)	$(5.40 \pm 0.59) 10^{-7}$	47.7 ± 3.0
K_{CO_2} (bar^{-1})	$(9.79 \pm 0.32) 10^{-1}$	-6.3 ± 1.5
$K_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$ (bar^{-1})	$(1.36 \pm 0.30) 10^0$	-5.9 ± 1.0

As an overall fitting result, the parity plot in Fig. 1(h) shows the comparison of the experimental and calculated data for the 90 non-repeated runs fitted for the kinetic computation (from which the 95% confidence interval was estimated). Most of the dots are

located at the diagonal and only few outliers are identified, validating the model.

3.2. Aspen Plus® process simulation

In our process simulation we targeted an annual productivity of 275 kton year^{-1} of 99.5% purity MeOH, in line with standard conventional plants [35]. A simplification of the plant is illustrated in Fig. 2(a), whereas the detailed process model flowsheet is summarized in Fig. 2(b) and contains three main parts: the feeding stage, the reaction stage and the separation stage.

3.2.1. The feeding stage

To meet the desired product capacity, the process has a CO_2 feed of 1750 kmol h^{-1} and a H_2 feed of 5500 kmol , close to the 1:3 sto-




Fig. 2. (a) Simplified scheme of the methanol plant (blue: reaction, green: separation, gray: heat integration) and (b) process flow diagram of the MeOH plant. Temperature and pressure values are presented for each stream.

ichiometric ratio. Both the CO_2 and H_2 feed are considered to be produced in external facilities. Taking the reactants recirculation into account, the CO_2 -to- H_2 molar ratio in the reactor section is 1:4, as was previously observed to be the optimal one. The inlet conditions for both gases were assumed to be 1 bar and 25 °C. Both streams were compressed by 4 isentropic compressors (C1 to C4 for CO_2 and C5 to C8 for H_2) with intercooling heat exchangers (HX1 to HX6) to cool down the pressurized streams. The isentropic efficiency was set to 0.8 and the mechanical efficiencies to 0.95. Once pressurized at 50 bar, the streams were mixed (M1) together with the recycle stream.

3.2.2. The reaction stage

The pressurized mixed feed is first sent to a heat exchanger (HX7) to preheat the stream to 275 °C by using the heat of the product stream. The reactor is a Lurgi type tubular fixed bed reactor that operates at 300 °C and 50 bar. The number of tubes was 7500 with a length of 7.5 m and an internal diameter of 40 mm. The reactor is packed with 105 ton of InCo catalyst with a density of 2500 kg m^{-3} and a bed voidance of 0.5. The resulting space time and residence time of the gases are ca. 7.3 $\text{g h mol}_{\text{CO}_2}^{-1}$ (GHSV, 14,400 $\text{cm}_{\text{STP}}^3 \text{h}^{-1} \text{g}^{-1}$) and 1.5 s, respectively. The kinetic model extracted from our experimental results was incorporated into the reactor simulation. The software required a specific input of the equation consisting in a kinetic factor, a driving force expression and an adsorption term along with SI units. The rearrangement of the kinetic parameters to the suitable form is detailed in the [Supplementary Material](#). The reactor was tested isolated in order to validate the experimental results. The comparison of the experimental values, the satisfactory predictions of the intrinsic kinetic model for the InCo catalyst and those simulated for the reaction stage of our process are depicted in [Fig. S8](#).

3.2.3. The separation stage

The reactor outlet at 300 °C and 50 bar is first cooled down to 30 °C in a heat exchanger (HX8). The cooled stream is then sent to a flash drum unit (Flash1) operating at 30 °C and 50 bar to remove the light gases (CO , CH_4 , and H_2). This gas stream is recycled back and mixed to the reactor feed with a 2.5% purge (Purge1). Based on our experimental observations and model predictions ([Fig. 1](#)), avoiding the production of methane is not completely possible at all conditions, which motivates the necessity of including this purge stream. The liquid stream is sent through a pressure relief valve to reduce the pressure to 1 bar and then to another flash drum (Flash2), operating at 25 °C and 1 bar to remove traces of CO_2 dissolved in water (Purge2). The liquid stream, rich in water and methanol, is sent to a RadFrac rigorous distillation column operating at 1 bar with 30 equilibrium stages final product purification. The condenser type is total condenser and the reboiler type is kettle. The reflux ratio is set to 2 and the final purity of the methanol stream is 99.5%.

3.3. Techno-economic evaluation (TEA)

The mass balance and composition of each stream of the process depicted in [Fig. 2\(b\)](#) can be found in Table S2. In total, 32.1 ton h^{-1} of methanol with a purity of 99.5% is produced in the plant. Assuming 8500 h year^{-1} of operation, the plant will generate a total of 272,850 ton year^{-1} of liquid methanol, close to the design value of the plant. The total thermal duty was –74 MW (34 MW of heating duty and 108 MW of cooling duty, mostly for cooling water) and total electrical power was 31.5 MW. The recycle of the light gases stream would allow an overall CO_2 conversion of 72.5% to be obtained in the process, almost 5 times higher than the experimental conversion per pass. Nevertheless, attempts to increase this conversion by reducing the purge ratio below 2.5%

were fruitless as CH₄ accumulated in the system to concentrations above 15%. Moreover, since the heating/cooling/compression steps are also an indirect source of CO₂ (see experimental section), the real CO₂ conversion (i.e., total CO₂ abated) decreases to 28.9% (purge ratio of 2.5%), with abated CO₂ quantities of 0.77 tons per ton of methanol produced (see Table 2). Hence, these numbers highlight the importance of using renewable energy to power up the plant as 55% of the CO₂ converted in the reactor will be offset if traditional fossil energy sources are used. In contrast, if only renewable energy sources are used and all these indirect sources of CO₂ are obviated, the CO₂ abated will jump to 1.75 tons per ton of methanol, a 225% increase.

To provide further insight, we estimated the size of the renewable energy source depending on its type and the associated CAPEX needed. As discussed above, the total electrical power is estimated in 32.5 MW. For solar photovoltaic cells (PV), on a capacity basis, the total-area capacity-weighted average is ca. 28 MW km⁻² [36,37]. For typical average wind installation, this requirement is 5 MW km⁻² [38]. Therefore, only considering the electricity, the methanol plant will require 1.16 km² of land if PV is used or 6.5 km² of land if wind is used. This later value can be further reduced by circa 40% if offshore wind farms are used due to their higher capacity density. Assuming now that CAPEX costs of PV and wind farms can be estimated in 500 and 1500 \$ kW⁻¹, respectively [39], the solar PV farm will cost ca. 16 M\$ and the wind farm will cost ca. 48 M\$. Both values are less than the methanol plant CAPEX. However, only approx. 40% of the CO₂ emissions of the plant come from the electricity used for the compressors (31.5 MW). The remaining 60% is due to the heating thermal duty (34.5 MW), meaning that virtually two times bigger PV or wind plants will be required, with a resulting CAPEX rivaling the one of the methanol plant alone. Hence, here we need to ponder that the integration of renewable energy comes with a huge associated cost that can double the initial CAPEX investing. Additionally, we also need to consider the intermittency of the renewable energy [40]. While the intermittency can be partially offset by combining different sources that complement each other (i.e., continental wind that tends to peak at night and solar that peaks with daylight), it might require external storage systems that can impact the initial investing. This could even lead to prohibitive MeOH costs above 1500 \$ ton⁻¹ if intermittency is addressed solely by energy storage [41]. A much more reasonable approach is the flexible process with a variable load able to meet the annual target [41]. Hence, integration of renewable energy is not straightforward and individual studies for each particular plant capacity and/or location are necessary.

Following, the estimated equipment costs required for the operation are shown in Fig. 3(a). In addition, the values of individual costs can also be found in Table S3. As observed, two compressors account for more than 65% of the total equipment costs. Specifically, C5 and C6 compressors deal with H₂ compression from 1 bar to only 10 bar (please see the effect of final pressure on energy requirement for compression on Fig. S9). Hence, if green electrochemically generated hydrogen could be produced at least at 10 bar, the CAPEX would be reduced from 94 to 34 M\$. At this point, it is worth mentioning that most of the previous process simulation studies in the state of the art do not consider the H₂ compression [21–24], despite its obvious influence on CAPEX. Most of them only consider the simulation of the Cu-ZnO-Al₂O₃ commercial catalyst with the feed stream directly at 30 bars, thereby painting an unrealistic picture of the overall process. Only the work of Szima et al. [28] included the compression of reactants from atmospheric to 80 bar, which was also predicted as one of the most expensive operations of the process.

Next, we evaluated the economic viability of the proposed MeOH plant. For the initial analysis, the following material costs

Table 2
CO₂ mass balance for the MeOH process.

Variable	Value
Total CO ₂ in (ton h ⁻¹)	77.0
Total CO ₂ out (ton h ⁻¹)	22.2
Total CO ₂ utilities (ton h ⁻¹)	30.2
Total CO ₂ abated (ton h ⁻¹)	24.6
CO ₂ abated (ton ton _{MeOH} ⁻¹)	0.77
Max CO ₂ abated (ton ton _{MeOH} ⁻¹) ^a	1.75

^a If only renewable energy sources are used, impact of the CO₂ source emissions is not included.

were used: 550 \$ ton_{MeOH}⁻¹, 50 \$ ton_{CO₂}⁻¹ and 3.5 \$ kg_{H₂}⁻¹. The MeOH price was set based on the guidance provided by the Methanol Institute in their 2019 report on green methanol [42] and on the work of Bergins et al. from Mitsubishi Hitachi Power Systems [43]. A 20 year timeframe was considered for CAPEX amortization with a linear depreciation method. The results of overall costs are listed in Table 3 and depicted in Fig. 3(b). H₂ and CO₂ costs (325 M\$ year⁻¹) are two times the product sales (154 M\$ year⁻¹), making this process unfeasible. This high influence of the raw materials can be easily observed in Fig. 3(c), where the contribution of the different annualized process costs on the final MeOH price is evaluated. Up to 67.5% of the final MeOH price comes only from H₂, while CO₂ contributes to 16.5%. Similarly, the utilities account for 12.4% of the MeOH price of which almost 85% comes from the compression steps (see Fig. S10). Last, the CAPEX contribution to final MeOH price is only 2.2%. These numbers highlight the importance of including gas compression in the TEA and gives fair warning to the optimistic MeOH prices provided by current simulations in the state of the art. However, it could be reasonable to consider that grey and blue hydrogen can be produced and delivered at high pressure. This assumption should be avoided for green hydrogen produced in current electrolyzers, which work close to near atmospheric pressures, and therefore, this extra expense needs to be taken into consideration. In summary, the overall process can be considered low capital intensive, highly dependent on the raw material cost, and hindered by the energy costs required for H₂ compression.

To better evaluate the raw materials effect on the net revenue (i.e., product sales-operating costs), a sensitivity analysis was performed focusing on H₂ and CO₂ (see Fig. 3d and e, respectively). As expected, the feasibility of the MeOH plant largely depends on H₂ and CO₂ prices. In particular, with the current MeOH plant design, the process would be economically viable with H₂ prices lower than 1.5 \$ kg⁻¹ with a CO₂ price of 50 \$ ton⁻¹. Similarly, with the current H₂ price fixed at 3.5 \$ kg⁻¹, a taxation of CO₂ of at least 300 \$ ton⁻¹ would be needed to obtain a positive revenue. The low price range of 1.5 \$ kg⁻¹ is currently only feasible for blue/gray hydrogen from fossil fuels [44], while according to the recent Monte Carlo study of Yates et al. [45], the high range of 3.5 \$ kg⁻¹ might not even be feasible for current PV electrolysis depending on the electrolyzer technology or location. To validate our simulations, TEA on the commercial Cu-ZnO-Al₂O₃ catalyst was also performed, scaling the model developed by Szima et al. [28] to match our system productivity target. Similar CAPEX, H₂ prices and CO₂ taxations are required to reach a MeOH breakeven of 550 \$ ton⁻¹ (see section S7 in Supplementary Material), corroborating therefore our simulations and the high influence of the raw material costs.

3.4. Other process bottlenecks

An important factor that strongly affects the process that has not been considered up to now and is usually neglected in the lit-




Fig. 3. (a) Equipment cost distribution for the MeOH process; (b) overview of the main costs for the MeOH process. H₂ price fixed to 3.5 \$ kg⁻¹ and CO₂ price to 50 \$ ton⁻¹; (c) contribution of the different annualized process costs on the final MeOH price (pattern in the utility pie represents the compression contribution); sensitivity analysis of the main raw materials cost: (d) H₂ price (CO₂ price fixed to 50 \$ ton⁻¹), (e) CO₂ cost (H₂ price fixed to 3.5 \$ kg⁻¹). MeOH price set to 550 \$ ton⁻¹.

Table 3
Summary of the cost evaluation for the MeOH process.

Variable	Value
Total capital cost (\$ ton _{MeOH} ⁻¹)	347.6
Equipment installed cost (\$ ton _{MeOH} ⁻¹)	209.6
Total operating cost (\$ ton _{MeOH} ⁻¹ year ⁻¹)	1408.7
Raw materials cost (\$ ton _{MeOH} ⁻¹ year ⁻¹)	1192.0
Utilities cost (\$ ton _{MeOH} ⁻¹ year ⁻¹)	96.5
Total product sales (\$ ton _{MeOH} ⁻¹ year ⁻¹)	567.9

erature is the inevitable formation of CH₄ during the process. Surprisingly, most of the reported kinetic models and process simulations for any of the MeOH catalysts on the state of the art do not take this constraint into account, modeling close to 100% recycle streams. Nonetheless, up to now, there is no reported catalyst able to totally suppress the formation of CH₄. By way of example, additional CO₂ hydrogenation reaction tests with the commercial Cu-ZnO-Al₂O₃ catalyst were conducted in a wide variety of conditions (see Table S4). Although low concentrations are achieved, the benchmark Cu-ZnO-Al₂O₃ catalyst produces CH₄ even under the most favorable reaction conditions. The InCo catalyst studied herein, which demonstrated a significant improvement of the process selectivity [14], also produces CH₄ (Fig. 1a–c). As a product whose separation is not considered in the plant, it must be taken into account in order to obtain realistic results of the operation.

First, the formation of CH₄ must be included as an individual step of the reaction network, which is commonly avoided aiming for computational simplifications. In this case, we performed experiments in a very wide range of temperatures, even higher than the optimal one. The goal was to obtain CH₄ concentrations in the effluent high enough to calculate kinetic parameters with mathematical significance. Then, when CH₄ is included in the catalytic system, it directly affects the design of the plant, because its accumulation limits the maximum recycle stream.

In order to illustrate this effect, additional simulations were performed for our InCo catalyst considering the real CH₄ production, half of the CH₄ production and no CH₄ production. For this, the kinetic constant of reaction (4) (Equation (11)) was adapted in each case. The resulting MeOH prices for the 3 cases as a function of the CO₂ and H₂ prices are depicted in Fig. S11. Indeed, the lower the CH₄ formation, the lower the MeOH final price can be, independently of the H₂ or CO₂ prices. For instance, with no CH₄ formation, MeOH prices close to the target of 550 \$ ton⁻¹ can be achieved with a H₂ price of 2 \$ kg⁻¹ (a very realistic approach) and without any CO₂ taxation. The reason behind this is the ability to increase the recycle stream by reducing the CH₄ formation, as its accumulation in the plant will be greatly suppressed. In our particular case, by reducing the CH₄ formation by half, we can increase the recycle from 97.5 to 99% without having a CH₄ accumulation above 15%. Consequently, the MeOH productivity of the process increases by 15%. In case of no CH₄ formation, the recycle stream can be further increased to 99.5%, thereby boosting MeOH productivity up to 30%.

Apart from CH₄, other undesired compounds can also affect the process in multiple ways rarely evaluated in most studies. For instance, the source of both CO₂ and H₂ will determine its purity and its price, the highest purity means the highest production cost (see Table 4 [46]). This is especially important due to the already demonstrated high influence of the raw materials in the final MeOH cost (see Fig. 3c). Moreover, these traces can also affect the performance of the catalyst. As it has been reported, the commercial Cu-ZnO-Al₂O₃ cannot tolerate high concentrations of O₂ (300 ppm) or Cl (10 ppm) due to metal reoxidation and Cu metal poisoning (CuCl is formed), respectively [47]. To shed light on this hurdle, additional simulations were performed to investigate the accumulation of O₂ in the system when ppm of O₂ is fed with the reactants (see Fig. S12). Again, recirculation of gases (assumed at 99% for the simulations) leads to a magnification of the O₂ concentration in the system, especially when O₂ traces are con-

Table 4
Source, price and purity of the CO₂ feed [46].

Source	Price (\$ ton ⁻¹)	CO ₂ (%vol)	SO _x (ppm)	NO _x (ppm)	O ₂ (ppm)	HCl (ppm)	H ₂ S (ppm)
Oxyfuel	82.68	77.69	127.31	446.3	76100	–	–
Oxyfuel	120.6	96.61	137.63	81	14000	–	–
Oxyfuel	135.26	99.99	138.69	20	5500	–	–
Post-combustion	118.95	99.99	102	10	–	349	–
Pre-combustion	25.32	97.64	–	–	–	–	3249

sidered in the H₂ feed stream. The 300 ppm limit established for the commercial Cu-ZnO-Al₂O₃ catalyst is obtained feeding only 145 ppm of O₂ in the H₂ stream. As the recycle stream increases, the process requires even lower O₂ concentrations in the feed stream, thereby increasing drastically the H₂ and CO₂ purity needed and hindering the positive recycle productivity. One possible solution could be to include a deoxygenation (deoxo) catalytic reactor [48] in the system after the first compression steps (see Fig. S13). The rationale of this location is to take advantage of the high temperature of the feed after compression (ca. 200 °C), enough to avoid any additional heat supply to the reactor, while still being below the 10 bar limit operation pressure of the deoxo process. However, these reactors cannot eliminate completely the O₂ in the system (ca. 10 ppm [49]), do not tolerate inlet O₂ concentrations higher than 0.8%, and are based on expensive Pt or Pd catalysts that need to be replaced every ca. 5 years [50], which will drastically increase the OPEX costs.

Summing up, although outstanding efforts have been made in recent years for the development of selective catalyst for methanol production from CO₂, the main process bottlenecks still need further investigation. Based on our results, a successful scale-up of the process will depend on non-catalytic variables as the reactant prices and their compression to the reaction pressure. Moreover, developing a catalyst that does not produce CH₄ or can withstand large oxygen impurities could have the greatest impact in the process. In particular, the absence of CH₄ could boost the productivity by minimizing the purges, whereas the increase in oxygen tolerance would allow low-cost feed gases to be used in the process, whose huge positive effects in the final MeOH breakeven price have been already discussed. For instance, in the particular case of green H₂ produced via water electrolysis, a great fraction of the costs comes from the oxygen removal after the electrolyzer [51,52]. Consequently, catalyst development, if done in the right direction, could avoid purification costs and greatly increase the viability of the plant.

3.5. Life cycle assessment

Due to the above discussed key contribution of reactants and the renewable energetic requirements to the process, a LCA of the MeOH plant was also carried out (see Methods and Supplementary Material). Diagrams for the two study cases are provided in Fig. 4(a) (renewable energy sources, case 1) and Fig. 4(b) (non-renewable sources, case 2). The functional unit of both cases studied is the production of 2.75 10⁸ kg of methanol, which is the production of the plant along one year with 8500 h working per year. A summary of the TEA estimation for the two study cases is summarized in Table S5. Fig. 5(a) shows the comparison of both study cases, with the values of each indicator being summarized in Tables S7 and S8. As observed, 10 of the 16 evaluated indicators are lower in the study case 1, highlighting the global warming potential (GWP) indicator that is reduced from 1.7 to – 4.2 kg 10⁸ CO₂ eq. when renewable energies are used to run the plant. Hence, in line with the above TEA discussion, we can resolve that it does not make sense to produce MeOH from CO₂ if all the energy requirements are also not renewable. Nevertheless, we also need to

highlight that some indicators, specially the ozone depletion potential (ODP), land use (LU) and water use (WU) are higher in case 1.

The relative contribution of the process variables to each indicator in both study cases is detailed in Fig. 5(b and c), respectively. As expected, a significantly higher contribution of electricity production (yellow bars) from the non-renewable sources can be easily observed for the study case 2. We can also observe that the contribution of CO₂ capture is negative on the GWP due to its consumption in the process and that, in the second case, the emission related with the energy supply and hydrogen production via steam cracking can actually overcome the CO₂ consumption. Those indicators with higher values in the study case 1 are mainly associated with the renewable source requirements. H₂ is the main contributor to ODP, LU and WU indicators, which is explained by photovoltaic and hydraulic energy production. Some indicators as HTC (human toxicity potential, cancer effects) and RDM (resource use of minerals and metals) are mainly related to the catalyst production and are unavoidable. The CO₂ capture process via amines (green bars) also negatively impacts most of the indicators except the GWP. Nevertheless, although the different distribution on each indicator, we can consider that, overall, H₂ production (red bars) is the most environmentally impactful variable of the process for both cases, as well as the most expensive resource as predicted by the TEA (Fig. 3).

Following, we have compared the MeOH price and the normalized GWP per ton of MeOH produced of our process with the ones obtained in the production of MeOH via conventional sources, i.e., natural gas and coal [53,54] (see Fig. 6). As expected, the MeOH prices that can be obtained from coal or natural gas are lower than the 550 \$ ton⁻¹ MeOH target of the CO₂ valorization process (which is even hard to reach as the above TEA revealed). Nevertheless, when looking at the GWP, the picture changes and now the lowest value can be observed for case 1. The normalized GWP of case 1 is – 1.5 kg CO₂/kg MeOH, very close to the 1.75 maximum value predicted by the TEA. However, for case 2 the GWP is still slightly higher than in the particular case of MeOH from natural gas, making this process no sense from both an environmental and economic point of view. These results are in line with recent TEA/LCA work that report similar CO₂ abatement numbers and the importance of the energy mixt to the overall process [55–57].

Lastly, we have also evaluated a third scenario where the impact of the cement plant normal operation is considered, being the energy of the MeOH plant still provided by renewable energy sources. While the selection of the source of CO₂ will largely impact the results (i.e., from a cement plant to direct air capture), it is also paramount to assess the total impact of the overall process. The results of this new scenario can be found in Table S9 of the Supplementary Material. A direct comparison between the 2 scenarios is also depicted in Fig. S14. We can observe that, by including the cement plant in the analysis and as expected, most of the indicators deteriorate. The deterioration of the respiratory inorganics (RI), photochemical ozone formation (POF) and acidification potential (AC) indicators is especially severe. Similarly, the normalized GWP increases from the – 1.5 kg CO₂/kg MeOH of case 1 to 1.2 kg CO₂/kg MeOH (Case 3 in Fig. 6), implying that the MeOH




Fig 4. Flow chart for the study cases (a) 1 and (b) 2. The impact of the operation of cement production plant is not considered on the LCA boundaries for these 2 cases.

plant cannot fully offset the emissions of the highly contaminating cement plant.

4. Conclusions

A multidisciplinary study of a methanol production plant from CO₂ has been carried out, assessing from the possibilities of a novel catalyst to the economic viability and the main operational issues coupled with a life cycle assessment. Using a catalyst and a kinetic model made in-house, we have analyzed some relevant parameters for the implementation of the plant from the process and economic point of views, such as CH₄ trace formation, purity, and costs of raw gases, O₂ tolerance in the system, or influence of energy sources.

From experimental results at laboratory scale, an intrinsic kinetic model for the valorization of CO₂ into methanol has been developed using packed bed reactors and an InCo catalyst, which has been demonstrated to be highly active and selective. A comparison of the experimental and calculated data indicated an accurate prediction of the catalytic system by the intrinsic kinetic model and demonstrated that considering the CH₄ formation rate is essential for a truly accurate model.

The implementation of the above kinetic model in the process simulation allowed us to develop a realistic methanol production plant using Aspen Plus[®] software, taking not only the catalyst CH₄ formation into account but also the important H₂ and CO₂ compression steps.

Based on our results, a successful scale-up of the process will depend on non-catalytic variables, mainly the reactant prices with




Fig 5. (a) Comparison of the total environmental impact between study cases 1 and 2; comparison of the environmental impacts, distributed by each operation variable, caused by using (b) renewable (case 1) vs. (c) non-renewable sources (case 2).




Fig 6. Normalized GWP (kgCO₂/kgMeOH) vs. MeOH price (\$ ton⁻¹) for different technologies. Case 1 corresponds to MeOH from CO₂ using only renewable energy sources. Case 2 uses traditional energy sources. Case 3 corresponds to case 1 plus the impact of the cement plant. MeOH from coal and natural gas was obtained using data from [53,54].

H₂ itself accounting for most of the final MeOH costs. Our sensitivity analysis confirms that the viability of the plant will largely depend on the fluctuation of H₂ and CO₂ prices, requiring H₂ prices lower than 1.5 \$ kg⁻¹ or a taxation of CO₂ of at least 300 \$ ton⁻¹ to reach breakeven.

Nevertheless, our TEA suggests that developing a catalyst that does not produce CH₄ or can withstand large oxygen impurities could have the greatest impact in the process. In particular, the absence of CH₄ could boost the productivity by minimizing the purges, whereas the increase in oxygen tolerance would allow

low-cost feed gases to be used in the process, boosting the profitability of the system. Consequently, catalyst development in this particular direction, paying special attention to the CH₄ formation rate and the oxygen tolerance, could affect the viability of the plant more than the current trend of developing more and more active catalyst.

The evaluation of the plant energy sources indicates that, if only renewable energy sources are used and all the indirect sources of CO₂ are obviated, the maximum CO₂ abated in the plant will jump to 1.75 tons per ton of methanol, a 225% increase versus using traditional energy sources. The LCA supports this conclusion with 10 of the 16 indicators studied being lower for the case where only renewable energy is used to run the plant, with especial emphasis to the GWP indicator.

Hence, from an environmental point of view, our results suggest that it does not make sense to produce MeOH from CO₂ if all the energy requirements are also not renewable. Finally, when taking into account the impact of the CO₂ source (a cement plant in our case), most of the LCA indicators are deteriorated and the MeOH plant cannot fully offset the vast emissions of the cement plant. These results highlight the importance of looking at the overall picture when developing a catalyst/process for CO₂ conversion to methanol and, we hope that they help to pave the route for a truly carbon neutral economy.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge financial support from the King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST). T.

Cordero-Lanzac and A.T. Aguayo acknowledge the financial support received from the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation with some ERDF funds (CTQ2016-77812-R) and the Basque Government (IT1218-19). T. Cordero-Lanzac also acknowledges the Spanish Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport for the award of his FPU grant (FPU15-01666). A. Navajas and L.M. Gandía gratefully acknowledge the financial support from Spanish Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades, and the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF/FEDER) (grant RTI2018-096294-B-C31). L.M. Gandía also thanks Banco de Santander and Universidad Pública de Navarra for their financial support under “Programa de Intensificación de la Investigación 2018” initiative.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jechem.2021.09.045>.

References

- [1] G. Leonzio, J. CO₂ Util. 27 (2018) 326–354.
- [2] A. Rafiee, K. Rajab Khalilpour, D. Milani, M. Panahi, J. Environ. Chem. Eng. 6 (2018) 5771–5794.
- [3] A. Álvarez, A. Bansode, A. Urakawa, A.V. Bavykina, T.A. Wezendonk, M. Makkee, J. Gascon, F. Kapteijn, Chem. Rev. 117 (2017) 9804–9838.
- [4] N. Mac Dowell, P.S. Fennell, N. Shah, G.C. Maitland, Nat. Clim. Chang. 7 (2017) 243–249.
- [5] P. Tian, Y. Wei, M. Ye, Z. Liu, ACS Catal. 5 (2015) 1922–1938.
- [6] S. Zhong, X. Yang, Z. Cao, X. Dong, S.M. Kozlov, L. Falivene, J.K. Huang, X. Zhou, M.N. Hedhili, Z. Lai, K.W. Huang, Y. Han, L. Cavallo, L.J. Li, Chem. Commun. 54 (2018) 11324–11327.
- [7] L. Wang, M. Ghoussoub, H. Wang, Y. Shao, W. Sun, A.A. Tountas, T.E. Wood, H. Li, J.Y.Y. Loh, Y. Dong, M. Xia, Y. Li, S. Wang, J. Jia, C. Qiu, C. Qian, N.P. Kherani, L. He, X. Zhang, G.A. Ozin, Joule 2 (2018) 1369–1381.
- [8] S. Brynolf, M. Taljegard, M. Grahn, J. Hansson, Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev. 81 (2018) 1887–1905.
- [9] G. Zang, P. Sun, A. Elgowainy, A. Bafana, M. Wang, Environ. Sci. Technol. 55 (2021) 3888–3897.
- [10] J. Wang, G. Li, Z. Li, C. Tang, Z. Feng, H. An, H. Liu, T. Liu, C. Li, Sci. Adv. 3 (2017) 1701290.
- [11] E.S. Gutterød, A. Lazzarini, T. Fjermestad, G. Kaur, M. Manzoli, S. Bordiga, S. Svelle, K.P. Lillerud, E. Skúlason, S. Øien-Ødegaard, A. Nova, U. Olsbye, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 142 (2020) 999–1009.
- [12] M.S. Frei, C. Mondelli, A. Cesarini, F. Krumeich, R. Hauert, J.A. Stewart, D. Curulla Ferré, J. Pérez-Ramírez, ACS Catal. 10 (2020) 1133–1145.
- [13] A. Tsoukalou, P.M. Abdala, A. Armutlulu, E. Willinger, A. Fedorov, C.R. Müller, ACS Catal. 10 (2020) 10060–10067.
- [14] A. Bavykina, I. Yarulina, A.J. Al Abdulghani, L. Gevers, M.N. Hedhili, X. Miao, A.R. Galilea, A. Pustovarenko, A. Dikhtiarenko, A. Cadiau, A. Aguilar-Tapia, J.L. Hazemann, S.M. Kozlov, S. Oud-Chikh, L. Cavallo, J. Gascon, ACS Catal. 9 (2019) 6910–6918.
- [15] K.M. Vanden Bussche, G.F. Froment, J. Catal. 161 (1996) 1–10.
- [16] C. Seidel, A. Jörke, B. Vollbrecht, A. Seidel-Morgenstern, A. Kienle, Chem. Eng. Sci. 175 (2018) 130–138.
- [17] R. Peláez, P. Marín, S. Ordóñez, Fuel Process. Technol. 168 (2017) 40–49.
- [18] K. Ahmad, S. Upadhyayula, Int. J. Hydrogen Energy 45 (2020) 1140–1150.
- [19] F. Nestler, A.R. Schütze, M. Ouda, M.J. Hadrich, A. Schaadt, S. Bajohr, T. Kolb, Chem. Eng. J. 394 (2020) 124881.
- [20] A. Ateka, M. Sánchez-Contador, A. Portillo, J. Bilbao, A.T. Aguayo, Fuel Process. Technol. 206 (2020) 106434.
- [21] É.S. Van-Dal, C. Bouallou, J. Clean. Prod. 57 (2013) 38–45.
- [22] D. Milani, R. Khalilpour, G. Zahedi, A. Abbas, J. CO₂ Util. 10 (2015) 12–22.
- [23] M. Pérez-Fortes, J.C. Schöneberger, A. Boulamanti, E. Tzimas, Appl. Energy 161 (2016) 718–732.
- [24] C. Zhang, K.W. Jun, R. Gao, G. Kwak, H.G. Park, Top. Catal. 61 (2018) 1794–1809.
- [25] H.S. Fogler, Elements of Chemical Reaction Engineering, 3rd ed., Prentice-Hall, London, 1999.
- [26] T. Cordero-Lanzac, A.T. Aguayo, A.G. Gayubo, P. Castaño, J. Bilbao, Chem. Eng. J. 331 (2018) 818–830.
- [27] A.T. Aguayo, J. Ereña, D. Mier, J.M.J.M. Arandes, M. Olazar, J. Bilbao, Ind. Eng. Chem. Res. 46 (2007) 5522–5530.
- [28] S. Szima, C.C. Cormos, J. CO₂ Util. 24 (2018) 555–563.
- [29] Commission of Experts. Spanish Government, Analisis y Propuestas Para La, Descarbonización, Madrid, 2018, pp. 1–546.
- [30] REData - Generación Red Eléctrica de España, 2021. <https://www.ree.es/en/datos/generacion>.
- [31] J. Li, H. Huang, N. Kobayashi, Energy Procedia 142 (2017) 1083–1088.
- [32] S. Fazio, F. Biganzoli, V. De Laurentiis, L. Zampori, S. Sala, E. Diaconu, Supporting Information to the Characterisation Factors of Recommended EF Life Cycle Impact Assessment Methods (Version 2, from ILCD to EF 3.0), Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2018, pp. 1–42.
- [33] A. Ramirez, P. Ticali, D. Salusso, T. Cordero-Lanzac, S. Ould-Chikh, C. Ahobasam, A.L. Bugaev, E. Borfecchia, S. Morandi, M. Signorile, S. Bordiga, J. Gascon, U. Olsbye, JACS Au (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1021/jacsau.1c00302>.
- [34] J. Ereña, I. Sierra, A.T. Aguayo, A. Ateka, M. Olazar, J. Bilbao, Chem. Eng. J. 174 (2011) 660–667.
- [35] J. Ott, V. Gronemann, F. Pontzen, E. Fielder, G. Grossmann, D.B. Kersebohm, G. Weiss, C. Witte, Methanol, Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim, 2012.
- [36] S. Ong, C. Campbell, P. Denholm, R. Margolis, G. Heath, Land-Use Requirements for Solar Power Plants in the United States, National Renewable Energy Laboratory (U.S. Golden, 2013, pp. 1–47.
- [37] P. Ruiz, W. Nijs, D. Tarvydas, A. Sgobbi, A. Zucker, R. Pilli, R. Jonsson, A. Camia, C. Thiel, C. Hoyer-Klick, F. Dalla Longa, T. Kober, J. Badger, P. Volker, B.S. Elbersen, A. Brosowski, D. Thrän, Energy Strateg. Rev. 26 (2019) 100379.
- [38] K. Eurek, P. Sullivan, M. Gleason, D. Hettinger, D. Heimiller, A. Lopez, Energy Econ. 64 (2017) 552–567.
- [39] BloombergNEF, New Energy Outlook 2019, n.d. <https://about.bnef.com/new-energy-outlook/>
- [40] M. Yekini Suberu, M. Wazir Mustafa, N. Bashir, Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev. 35 (2014) 499–514.
- [41] C. Chen, A. Yang, Energy Convers. Manag. 228 (2021) 113673.
- [42] G. Dolan, Methanol: Renewable Hydrogen Carrier Fuel, Methanol Institute CaFCP Working Group Meeting, Washington D.C. 2019, pp. 1–45.
- [43] C. Bergins, E.L. Fox, K.C. Tran, P. Wuebben, ATZextra Worldw. 21 (2016) 22–25.
- [44] H. Dagdougui, R. Sacile, C. Bersani, A. Ouammi, Hydrogen Infrastructure for Energy Applications, Elsevier Inc., Netherlands, 2018, pp. 7–21.
- [45] J. Yates, R. Daiyan, R. Patterson, R. Egan, R. Amal, A. Ho-Baille, N.L. Chang, Cell Reports Phys. Sci. 1 (2020) 100209.
- [46] R.T.J. Porter, M. Fairweather, C. Kolster, N. Mac Dowell, N. Shah, R.M. Woolley, Int. J. Greenh. Gas Control 57 (2017) 185–195.
- [47] CLARIANT Catalysts for Methanol Synthesis, Product Data Sheet, 2017. <https://www.clariant.com/en/Solutions/Products/2019/02/14/13/39/MegaMax-800>.
- [48] Z. Abbas, T. Mezher, M.R.M. Abu-Zahr, Energy Procedia 37 (2013) 2389–2396.
- [49] T. Wiesmann, C. Hamel, S. Kaluza, Chemie-Ingenieur-Technik 90 (2018) 1446–1452.
- [50] BASF, 0.1% Pd/AS R5279, Product Data Sheet, 2015. <https://catalysts.basf.com/products/0-1-pd-as-r-5279>
- [51] Y. Ligen, H. Vrubel, H. Girault, Int. J. Hydrogen Energy 45 (2020) 10639–10647.
- [52] G. Saur, Wind-To-Hydrogen Project: Electrolyzer Capital Cost Study, National Renewable Energy Laboratory (U.S.), (2008) 1–48.
- [53] R. Kajaste, M. Hurme, P. Oinas, AIMS Energy 6 (2018) 1074–1102.
- [54] G. Harp, K.C. Tran, C. Bergins, T. Buddenberg, I. Drach, O. Sigurbjornsson, Application of Power to Methanol Technology to Integrated Steelworks for Profitability, Conversion Efficiency, and CO₂ Reduction, 2nd European Steel Technology and Application, Duesseldorf, 2015.
- [55] J. Nyári, M. Magdeldin, M. Larmi, M. Järvinen, A. Santasalo-Aarnio, J. CO₂ Util. 39 (2020) 101166.
- [56] C. Chen, Y. Lu, R. Banares-Alcantara, Appl. Energy 243 (2019) 71–90.
- [57] A. González-Garay, M.S. Frei, A. Al-Qahtani, C. Mondelli, G. Guillén-Gosálbez, J. Pérez-Ramírez, Energy Environ. Sci. 12 (2019) 3425–3436.