

# ROBUST DESIGN OF A FUTURE 100% RENEWABLE EUROPEAN ENERGY SUPPLY SYSTEM WITH HYDROGEN INFRASTRUCTURE

<sup>1, 2\*</sup> *Dilara Gulcin Caglayan*, <sup>1</sup>*Heidi U. Heinrichs*, <sup>1</sup>*Martin Robinius*, <sup>1, 2</sup>*Detlef Stolten*

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Energy and Climate Research – Techno-economic Systems Analysis (IEK-3)  
Forschungszentrum Juelich GmbH, 52425 Juelich, Germany

<sup>2</sup> RWTH Aachen University, Chair for Fuel Cells, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering,  
Eilfschornsteinstraße 18, D-52062 Aachen, Germany

\*Corresponding author e-mail: [d.caglayan@fz-juelich.de](mailto:d.caglayan@fz-juelich.de)

## ABSTRACT

Variable renewable energy sources (VRES) will be the cornerstones of future energy supply systems. Nevertheless, their inherent intermittency remains an obstacle to their widespread deployment. Renewably-produced or ‘green’ hydrogen has been suggested as an energy carrier that could account for this in a sustainable manner. In this study, a fully VRES-based European energy system in the year 2050 is designed using an iterative minimal cost-optimization approach that ensures robust supply security across 38 weather-year scenarios (1980-2017). The impact of different power generation locations is factored in by defining exclusive VRES groups within each optimization region. From this, it can be seen that higher numbers of groups in each region offer cheaper electricity generation locations to the optimizer and thus decrease the system’s total annual costs. Furthermore, the robust system design and impact of inter-annual variability is identified by iteratively combining the installed capacities of different system designs derived through the application of the 38 historical weather years. The system design outlined here has significantly lower capacities in comparison to the maximum regional capacities obtained in the first round of optimization.

**Keywords:** Renewable energy systems; energy supply systems; hydrogen pipelines; power-to-hydrogen.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The shift towards variable renewable energy sources (VRES) such as wind and solar has been building momentum [1,2]. However, the inherent intermittency of these technologies remains an issue that could be solved by employing chemical energy carriers [3]. Such chemical energy carriers could be produced during peak power generation periods and then used in other sectors such as transport (as a fuel) [4], electricity (for grid balancing) or industry (as feedstocks), thus enabling so-called ‘sector coupling’ [5–8]. Hydrogen is considered the most promising chemical energy carrier owing to its carbon-free nature and wide variety of applications [9,10]. Nevertheless, some issues relating to its use remain unresolved [10,11].

Up until now, various studies have modeled hypothetical hydrogen infrastructures on a national level, such as for the United Kingdom [12], France [13], Italy [14], and Germany [6,15,16], or the propensity for energy trading between countries [17]. When one turns to larger regional scopes such as the European continent, the number of analyses that assume large shares of renewables decreases compared to those with a national focus. In this vein, some European-focused studies do not consider alternative energy carriers at all, whereas others consider them to some extent. A greenfield approach to a future European energy system was employed by Reichenberg et al. [18], in which different shares of renewables were assessed. A large-scale future renewable energy system was considered by Aboumahboub et al. [19] and was global in scope, but focused on the European context as well. Additionally, Brown et al. [20] highlighted

the role of electricity transmission and concluded that flexibility and transmission will play a significant role in the system. Beyond the power sector, the importance of sector-coupling in a future European energy system has been emphasized by a number of studies [21,22]. How best to define regions in future European energy system designs and the impacts of this was assessed by Siala and Mahfouz [23]; a similar methodology was then applied to a hypothetical future European energy system that was then coupled to a multi-regional input-output model by Siala et al. [24]. A fully renewable European energy system was reported as being feasible by Zappa et al. [25]. Meanwhile, a comparison of storage technologies (grid, hydrogen or hydropower) was conducted by Steinke et al. [26] in a theoretical European energy system, and yet a combination of all of these technologies was lacking in this analysis. Moser et al. [27] focused on storage technologies by conducting sensitivity analyses of a European energy system model. Including hydrogen storage and conversion in their analysis, Bussar et al. [28–30] designed a potential future European energy system; nevertheless, the transmission of hydrogen between regions was not addressed.

In addition to the aforementioned analyses conducted directly in the context of future energy systems, transitional paths for energy system design have been addressed in a number of studies. For instance, Löffler et al. [31] modeled the transition of the European energy system so that the target of climate change-induced temperature increase of no more than 2 °C could be achieved. Similarly, Schlott et al. [32] assessed the European energy system's transformation and potential further evolution between 1970 and 2100. In turn, Child et al. [33] analyzed European energy system design, whereas Bogdanov et al. [34] conducted a similar analysis at a global level on the basis of the transformations taking place.

High spatial and temporal resolution, the future characteristics of technologies incorporated into the energy system's design and consideration of low-cost hydrogen technologies were addressed by Caglayan et al. [35]. In their assessment, Europe was divided into 96 regions and optimized with hourly-resolved renewable and demand profiles. Although the unpredictable nature of hourly generation profiles of renewables in the context of 2050 were evaluated by comparing energy system designs based on different weather years [36,37], a systematic approach to overcome these variations in the design was not proposed. Therefore, the various potential system designs taking different weather years into account must be scrutinized in order to determine an optimal and robust design that ensures security of supply. To the authors' knowledge, no existing studies have covered all of these aspects together in the context of a fully renewable European energy supply system. In other words, this work uniquely combines three key aspects, each of which are often underrepresented in the existing literature. Firstly, the model-runs include not only 96 regions across Europe but also up to 360 VRES generation groups within each region (Approximately 35000 artificial VRES hubs across Europe). In addition to this, the highly resolved spatio-temporal model encompasses 38 weather years to include the effects of inter-annual VRES variability. Finally, the model also includes the development of a pan-European hydrogen pipeline network and the distribution of large-scale hydrogen storage sites

In this study, an iterative approach is employed to design a robust 2050 European energy supply system based on 100% renewable energy and which incorporates a hydrogen infrastructure. For this purpose, an optimization model that minimizes the total annual cost (TAC) is developed and features an hourly temporal resolution [35]. Furthermore, Europe is divided into 96 regions with subgroups of VRES technologies within each of these in order to achieve higher spatial resolutions. The results integrate the optimal capacities for the technologies considered in the

system design, as well as the optimal operation patterns for these. The potentials and simulations for wind and solar energy in these regions are estimated by using future-oriented VRES technologies. Significant variations are observed in the system designs for different weather years, ranging from 1980 to 2017. On the basis of these, a robust design is attained by using an iterative approach over individual system designs for different years. These results can then be used as an indicator to understand the roles of individual countries in a fully renewable energy supply system.

The novelty of this paper stems from the consideration of multiple weather years in the context of a fully renewable European energy system within a highly resolved optimization model. To accomplish this, this work was originally formulated to address the issue of inconsistent single-year-optimal system designs inherent to cost-minimal optimization models when different weather years are employed. In order to overcome this, this work proposes and executes an iterative approach to attain a robust system design for all years while still maintaining a minimal overall cost. As a result, outcomes from this work can help readers identify several key characteristics of a future fully renewable European Energy system including: the most promising regions for VRES installation and the overall cost of the electricity they produce, the magnitude and localization of energy storage sites and other dispatchable back-up generators needed to maintain security of supply, and also the routing and sizing of a pan-European hydrogen pipeline network.

## **2. METHODOLOGY**

The analysis was performed using the open source optimization framework, the Framework for Integrated Energy System Assessment (FINE) [15]. The objective function of the problem was minimizing the system's TAC. From the purposes of this study, Europe<sup>1</sup> was separated into 96 regions. Although hourly temporal resolution was used, time series aggregation [38] was also employed in some model runs to simplify the optimization problem (see Figure 4). In these simplified model runs, 30 typical days are assumed to be sufficient to represent the entire year. The impact of the temporal complexity reduction by time series aggregation and of modeling the European energy system by using a single weather year has been previously investigated in detail by Caglayan et al. [35].

---

<sup>1</sup> A regional definition of Europe with corresponding region names is provided in the supplementary material.




Figure 1. Regional definition employed in this work.

The technologies and their interactions with corresponding commodities within a region are shown in Figure 2. The techno-economic parameters for demand, generation, conversion, storage, and transmission technologies are defined exogenously as input parameters in the optimization problem, and are provided in the supplementary material. Despite the greenfield approach for 2050 employed in this study, the capacities of run-of-river and hydropower (pumped-hydro storage and reservoirs) plants were assumed to have the same values as reported in 2015. Electricity demand was derived using the same approach as that taken in the E-Highway study [39]. However, electricity demand for battery-electric vehicles and plug-in hybrid vehicles was excluded, as fuel cell-electric vehicles are integrated into the system, with 75% market penetration. Existing driving behavior, annual driving distance and the total number of passenger vehicles are used to derive annual hydrogen demand, which is then projected onto the hourly profile of the fueling stations. The technical storage capacity of salt caverns for each region were obtained from the study of Caglayan et al. [40].

With respect to electricity generation, onshore wind, offshore wind, open-field photovoltaics (PV), run-of-river, and biomass combined heat and power (CHP) plants were included. The simulation of wind and PV technologies was performed using historical weather data from the reanalysis dataset, Modern-Era Retrospective analysis for Research and Applications

(MERRA) [41] by using the open-source Python package, “RESKit - Renewable Energy Simulation toolkit for Python” [42–45]. In order to determine the maximum capacity that can be installed in each region, land eligibility analyses were performed individually for onshore and offshore wind following the eligibility constraints reported by Ryberg et al. [43] and Caglayan et al. [45], Additionally, the conversion of hydrogen to electricity and vice-versa is undertaken by several conversion technologies, such as open-cycle gas turbines (OCGT), combined-cycle gas turbines (CCGT), and water electrolysis. Hydrogen transmission is taken into account by estimating the shortest path between regions from a candidate grid derived from the combination of roads, railways, and existing natural gas infrastructure. Finally, electricity transmission is taken into account when considering high voltage alternative current (HVAC) and high voltage direct current (HVDC) cables, the capacities of which are derived by using the same method as employed in the E-Highway study [39].




Figure 2. Representation of technologies and their interactions within a region in the energy system.

## 2.1. Detailed Modeling of Wind and PV Energy by Grouping

The number of regions and technologies considered in the energy system design is limited due to the tractability issues presented by optimization problems. Simplification of the system while maintaining a high level of modeling detail is possible by grouping the VRES placements by criterion. In doing so, spatial resolution can be increased while keeping the number of regions constant. The definition of several groups of technologies instead of averaging enhances their accuracy. In other words, utilizing different groups provides higher spatial resolution with slightly increased model complexity for a larger number of regions. A VRES generation technology is defined in the energy system model by a generation time series and the maximum capacity to be installed within a region, where each VRES group is defined as an independent technology.

As an example, Figure 3 shows turbine locations in North Rhine-Westphalia, Germany, and their corresponding generation time series in 2015, in order to emphasize the impact of grouping on the generation time series. It can be seen in the upper figure that peak power is not attained most of the time, as the average time series is affected by turbines with low generation. As a result, the utilization of high-generation locations is not possible when a single time series is used in the model. The lower figure shows the same time period in the same region when only four turbine groups are defined by their average LCOE. As can be seen from the generation time series, the time series shown in purple covers the peak power generation time periods better than single generation time series, whereas the time series shown in blue represents the low-generation locations. Although the overall behavior has still not been fully captured, the technology can be modeled in a more realistic way, with a larger number of groups (the ideal level of modeling occurs when the number of groups is equal to the number of turbines in that region). In this analysis, 60 groups per renewable technology grouped by average LCOE are employed as a compromise between model accuracy and computational effort.




Figure 3. Distribution of onshore turbine locations in North Rhine-Westphalia, Germany, with corresponding generation time series (weather year: 2015) and different groups that are

classified by an equal division of percentiles of the turbine's LCOE. The upper section indicates single groupings and the lower represents four-turbine groups.

## **2.2. Iterative Approach for Robust Energy System Design**

The design of the energy supply system differs with respect to the generation time series of VRES technologies (i.e., historical weather year). Thus, an iterative method is developed to achieve a robust system design while keeping the costs as low as possible. This approach consists of three main steps, as depicted in Figure 4, which are as follows: optimization of the overall system, adjusting the biomass CHP plant capacities to capture extreme weather periods and, finally, optimizing the operation of these technologies. Each iterative step consists of 38 model runs conducted over all weather years between 1980 and 2017. In the optimization of the overall system, 38 optimal capacities of each technology for each weather year are averaged and defined as the minimum capacity; afterwards, the system was optimized with these new constraints. The individual iterations in this work can be explained in simple terms as follows:

**Iteration 0:** Results of the impact of different weather years obtained with the technical potential of renewables defined as the maximum installable capacities in the optimization problem of each weather year. The system is independently optimized for different weather years.

**Iteration 1-3:** At each iterative step, the maximum capacities for each technology from the previous iteration results are defined as the technical limit in each region. Moreover, the average capacities are set as the minimum capacity that must be installed. In the case of a hydrogen pipeline, minimum capacities are only set for the pipeline connections repeating 50% of the time. For the optimizations, 30 typical days were used. As the total annual cost did not change by more than 1% compared to the previous iteration, Step 1 consists of four iterations (Iterations 0-3).

**Iteration 4:** All of the capacities except biomass CHP plants were fixed at "Iteration 4." The assumed capacities are the average optimal capacities of technologies amongst all of the weather years estimated at "Iteration 3." The optimizations were conducted without time series aggregation, as the fixed capacities decreased the complexity and memory requirements. The purpose of this step was to scale the biomass CHP plant capacities in order to capture extreme periods (days) that could not be captured with the use of a mere 30 typical days. The main objective of this step was to scale the biomass plant's capacity to ensure the security of supply in extreme periods.

**Iteration 5:** The design results obtained in "Iteration 4" were analyzed to identify the maximum biomass CHP plant capacity in each region across all of the weather years. Afterwards, as with all of the other technologies, the biomass CHP plant capacities were set to these maximum values obtained in "Iteration 4." In this iterative step, the main purpose was to find the optimal operation of technologies with the design capacities proposed for the robust system design. Therefore, the average results over all weather years for curtailment, losses, and transported commodities were estimated by using all of the results indicated in "Iteration 5."






Figure 4. Algorithm used to derive the robust energy system design to ensure security of supply.

### 3. RESULTS & DISCUSSION

This section can be classified into two main parts, the first of which shows the importance of the detailed modeling of VRES technologies. The impact of the detailed VRES technology modeling on a given system design, the underlying weather year of which was assumed to be 2015, is shown by creating groups for each technology, as is outlined in Section 2.1. After investigating the number of groups to be used in the analysis, a robust design was attained by applying the iterative approach explained in Section 2.2, with the system design assessed as the second main part of the results section. The presented results were then compared against the existing European energy scenarios available in the literature and are presented in the supplementary material.

#### 3.1. The Impact of Grouping VRES Sources

For each model run, the number of groups in each region and each VRES technology is assumed to be the same. For instance, having 60 groups indicates that there are 60 onshore wind technology units, 60 offshore wind technologies and 60 open-field PV technologies with and without tracking, corresponding to a total of 240 VRES technologies considered across all regions. The number of groups for each VRES technology is kept constant in order to avoid bias towards a particular technology. For example, keeping all technologies within a single group except onshore wind energy influences the optimizer in favor of onshore wind energy technologies, as high potential locations would be preferred over more competitive technologies due to the latter's lower fidelity.

The maximum number of groups is defined as 90 for two reasons: less significant variations beyond 90 groups and a drastic increase in the solution time. Although the solution times in the VRES grouping analysis are not comparable to each other because of the calculations performed in the same computational nodes, they are mentioned in order to offer insight into the increase. The solution times of the problems with 60, 72 and 90 VRES groups are 28.6 hours, 85.6 hours and 163.4 hours (nearly 7 days), respectively.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> The computations are distributed across the IEK-3 cluster. The cluster has 10 compute nodes with 72 Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 6154 CPU @ 3.00GHz cpus, and 15 compute nodes with Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 6144 CPU @ 3.50GHz cpus.



Figure 5 shows the optimal European capacities of VRES technologies and the total annual cost with respect to the different number of groups defined in each independent calculation. Focusing on the optimal capacities, a decreasing trend in the installed capacities of VRES technologies is evident, especially between 1 and 10 groups, which could be explained by the averaging of the time series. Nevertheless, the same behavior is also observed in offshore wind turbines and PV panels. The optimal capacity increases with a lower number of groups in order to supply the demand through the smoother generation time series. The smoother time series are not capable of covering the peak generation periods and exhibit lower levels of generation due to averaging. This is avoided by introducing as many groups as possible so that peak generation time periods are not compensated for by locations with low generation. Therefore, the optimizer chooses to install VRES technologies starting from these groups with high-generation locations, and in cases where the capacity in that group is insufficient, the following groups with relatively lower generation locations were chosen. Overall, the optimal capacity remains more or less the same after a certain number of groups, which is nearly 10 in this case.

When the total annual cost is analyzed for a different number of groups, it can be seen that biomass in particular is chosen in the case of single and double groups. As the number of groups increases, the share of biomass in the total annual cost decreases because the locations generating electricity more cheaply than biomass emerged owing to the higher fidelity of the grouping. Therefore, these cost-competitive locations were utilized in the optimization instead of biomass; this issue will be discussed in further detail in the discussion of Figure 6, below, as this behavior can be better observed on a national scale rather than within the cumulative variations. Similarly to the optimal European capacities, variation in the total annual cost decreases with a higher number of groups. Nevertheless, slight changes in the shares of on-/offshore wind turbines and open-field PV systems without tracking can still be observed. Hence, the optimal capacity distribution should be investigated in order to understand these slight variations and ensure that the system design does not drastically change.




Figure 5. Optimal European capacities and corresponding total annual cost with respect to a different number of groups.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Single group represents the state-of-art in the literature, which includes the average generation time series of all the locations within the region.

In order to determine the number of groups, regional capacities and whether or not these change should be investigated. Although the results do not significantly vary on the European scale, as discussed earlier, the regional capacities may alter with respect to different numbers of groups. Therefore, the optimal national capacities of VRES technologies are shown in Figure 6 in order to display the results summarized for all regions and determine if the capacities vary with respect to the number of groups. It must be noted that although open-field PV with tracking is introduced in the plot, it was not selected by the optimizer, primarily because of its higher cost compared to the non-tracking variant.

As is discussed briefly with respect to the optimal European capacities, an increase in the number of groups results in a decrease in the overall installed capacity. For example, the use of three VRES groups instead of a single one decreases the optimal capacity in Ireland from 98 GW to 22 GW, which is due to the competitiveness of the technologies grouped in the surrounding regions. Introducing more groups reveals the high-generation locations in these neighboring regions, which become cost-competitive with the cheap onshore locations observed in Ireland. In this example, Denmark experiences a decrease in optimal capacity by 15 GW between single and 3 VRES groups. Similar behavior but with an opposite trend can be observed in Hungary and Slovenia for open-field PV without tracking and Norway, the Netherlands and Lithuania for onshore wind energy. By unveiling these high-generation locations, the capacity distribution changes, as with the relationship between northern and southern Greece. With more VRES groups, the optimal capacity of onshore wind energy increases in northern Greece, which then affects the optimal capacity of open-field PV without tracking in the southern part of the country. In other words, high-potential onshore wind locations in northern Greece, which were established by using higher numbers of groups, are more favorable to the energy system than some of the PV locations in southern Greece. This is mainly due to the use of an optimization model to design the energy system, as it seeks to reduce the total annual cost.

In the United Kingdom and Netherlands, offshore wind energy has become cost-competitive due to the effects of grouping. This cost-competitiveness results from variation in the investment cost of wind turbines within the region rather than a significant increase in the generation of offshore wind turbines. As the maritime boundaries of these two countries have large areas extending long distances from the shore, expensive wind turbines increase the average investment cost of offshore wind energy in these regions. Especially in countries with a large area extending far from the shore, the investment cost can reach 4000 € kW<sup>-1</sup> as a result of the electrical infrastructure cost of the turbines driving up the overall cost. For example, the average specific investment cost of offshore wind turbines in the Netherlands is 2800 € kW<sup>-1</sup> for the overall capacity of 149.7 GW, 42.3 GW of which has an average cost of 2060 € kW<sup>-1</sup> because of closer proximity to the shore. Therefore, with the introduction of three groups, the specific investment cost was decreased by nearly 30%, along with the maximum allowable capacity. In the case of Belgium, the maritime area is small and the maximum available capacity of offshore wind energy in the country is utilized in different group scenarios due to the low average specific investment costs (nearly 2000 € kW<sup>-1</sup>). In some regions, such as Poland and Estonia, a switch between onshore and offshore wind energy is apparent. This is due to the effect of grouping and changes in the specific investment costs of onshore and offshore wind energy solutions. In such regions, these two technologies might become cost-competitive and slight changes in their cost or generation could induce switching in the optimal capacity of the individual technologies.




Figure 6. National optimal capacities broken down into onshore wind energy, offshore wind energy, open-field PV with tracking, and open-field PV without it for different numbers of technology groups.

### 3.2. Variation in the Total Annual Cost by Iterations

Figure 7 shows the distribution of total annual costs found in each weather year within the corresponding iterative step. Furthermore, the analysis indicates that only a few iterations **were** required in order to identify a robust system design. As can be seen from the figure, the range between the minimum and maximum total annual cost in each iteration decreases until the

capacities of biomass are scaled (Iteration 4). The increase in the median system cost (shown as red lines in the figure) in each iteration is also evident due to the method employed in this iterative approach to obtain a robust system design. Furthermore, the comparably more pronounced increase between “Iteration 3” and “Iteration 4” can be explained through the use of time series aggregation. When time series aggregation is omitted in the system design, the impact of extreme days on the total annual cost can be clearly seen. Finally, defining the maximum capacities of biomass CHP plants over all weather years in “Iteration 4” in the system drastically increases the total annual cost in “Iteration 5.” It should be noted that the difference between the maximum and average capacities of biomass CHP plants in “Iteration 4” is estimated to be 110 GW, which increases the total annual cost by 15%.




Figure 7. Total annual cost distribution as a boxplot between Iteration 0 and Iteration 5.

### 3.3. Robust European Energy System Design

Figure 8 illustrates the energy system design obtained as a result of the iterative approach, which ensures the security of supply while decreasing the potential over-engineering of the system components. The proposed system design involves 154 GW of biomass CHP plants, 203 GW of hydropower plants (including run-of-river, reservoir and pumped storage), 654 GW of open-field PV without tracking, 842 GW of onshore wind energy, and 78 GW of offshore wind energy. Comparing the proposed capacities with the maximum capacity of each technology in “Iteration 0,” it can be seen that the capacities of wind and PV are decreased by 728 and 829 GW, respectively. Additionally, the system consists of 130 TWh (0.6% of the technical potential is stated by Caglayan et al. [40]) and 562 GWh of hydrogen storage in salt cavern and vessels, respectively. Batteries play a role in the system, with 590 GWh of storage capacity, especially in regions with high PV shares to compensate the inter-daily fluctuations. The storage capacities of lithium-ion batteries, gas vessels and salt caverns are significantly lower than the proposed capacities.

A comparison between the proposed robust capacities and the average capacity values independently obtained for each weather year reveals that these two capacity values are very similar, especially in Spain and France. The most substantial deviation in VRES technologies between robust system design and the averages of each weather year is observed in Slovenia, with a 65% increase in open-field PV without tracking. Slovenia is followed by Ireland, Switzerland, and Latvia with respect to deviations in the same technology. However, it must be

noted that the relatively lower capacities in these countries (between 0.3 to 4 GW) is the main reason for this significant deviation. Nevertheless, it can be stated that the average capacities across all weather years are sufficient to supply a large portion of the demand.

In addition to the VRES technologies, a drastic increase in the biomass CHP plants is observed if a robust system design is targeted. However, this increase is expected because of the optimization without time series aggregation and also the assigned role for biomass as a back-up generation technology. All time series, including the extreme periods (i.e., peak generation or demand periods), are partly smoothed through the use of 30 typical days. As a result, these revealed extreme periods, which were not covered in previous analyses, require a higher capacity for the biomass CHP plant, as it is the only technology that allows for the capacity expansion.




Figure 8. Proposed fully renewable European energy system design with assured security of supply across 38 weather years. The lines represent the proposed pipeline grid.

### **3.4. Average Electricity and Hydrogen Transport between Regions**

To understand the dynamics between regions, the net annual hydrogen and electricity transport and its direction must be derived, and this is shown in Figure 9 with the flow direction. Electricity transport is estimated for both HVDC and HVAC cables, with the hydrogen pipelines used for net hydrogen transport.

Focusing on electricity transport reveals the electricity flow across continental Europe in several directions. Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, and United Kingdom all import electricity from Norway owing to its location and cheaper electricity generation. Electricity transport is evident not only from Norway but also from Finland and Sweden. However, an interesting potential electricity flow is seen in Norway with respect to regions “83\_no” and “84\_no”. In spite of their low electricity and hydrogen demand, these regions import electricity to increase electrolyzer full load hours in order to produce more hydrogen. Moreover, it can be seen that Ireland and the United Kingdom supply electricity in western European countries such as France, Belgium and the Netherlands. Hence, cheap electricity and its transmission are preferred over the utilization of relatively more expensive locations.

The flows shown for hydrogen are relatively more succinct, with a pattern that can be easily followed. Similar behavior can be seen in the electricity flow from Nordic countries and the United Kingdom to continental Europe for hydrogen flow. With respect to hydrogen transport in the Nordic countries, it is apparent that the amount of hydrogen transport increases from the north towards the south, which indicates the accumulation of individual regional contributions being transported towards continental Europe. Once the hydrogen pipeline reaches northwestern Germany (“31\_de”), it is then distributed to the neighboring regions of continental Europe. Similarly, there is large-scale hydrogen transport from the United Kingdom to “26\_fr”. Northern Italy is also interesting, because of the hydrogen transported from France and Slovenia but exported to Austria, which is mainly because of the excess hydrogen production in the peak power generation periods via PV in Italy. Moreover, hydrogen export from Austria to southern Germany also indicates that Austria might serve as a conduit for hydrogen transport in the region.






Figure 9. Net energy flow between regions for electricity (left) and hydrogen (right).

### 3.5. The Roles of Regions in a Robust Energy System

In order to analyze the potential roles of European regions within the proposed future energy system, the results obtained regarding electricity and hydrogen net transport, total demand and electricity generation are used to identify four groups of countries (see Figure 10).

**Both hydrogen and electricity exporters:** The regions in the upper right of the figure belong to this group. As the name indicates, both commodities are exported to the neighboring regions. Ireland has the largest amount of hydrogen and electricity export, with values of  $85 \text{ TWh a}^{-1}$  and  $95 \text{ TWh a}^{-1}$ , respectively. After Ireland, “94\_uk”, “84\_no” and “15\_fr” are the regions with the highest export figures.

**Both hydrogen and electricity importers:** Regions importing both commodities and shown in the lower left of the figure belong to this group. For instance, “92\_uk”, “90\_uk”, “33\_de”, “23\_fr” and “52\_it” constitute those regions with the highest import of electricity and hydrogen. Amongst these, “90\_uk”, including London, “92\_uk”, including Liverpool and Manchester, and “52\_it”, including Milan, have high demand but also high enough generation to supply the demand. Nevertheless, after the utilization of the good locations for electricity generation, the remaining areas in these regions cannot compete with the neighboring regions in terms of electricity generation costs. Therefore, some portion of the demand is supplied by generation within these regions and the remainder is imported. A different dynamic is observed in the regions “33\_de” (North Rhine-Westphalia) and “23\_fr” (Paris). Unlike the aforementioned regions with high imports but which still utilize the local sources, “33\_de” and “23\_fr” mainly supply their demand by importing electricity from most of their neighboring regions.



**Hydrogen importer – electricity exporter:** This category is located in the upper left part of the figure. As can be seen, there are not many regions that import hydrogen but export electricity. The most apparent of these is northwestern Germany (“31\_de”), which exports approximately 50 TWh a<sup>-1</sup> of electricity to the neighboring regions and imports almost 30 TWh a<sup>-1</sup> of hydrogen. Although electricity transport is limited by the capacities of the HVAC and HVDC cables connecting the regions, the maximum capacity defined for hydrogen pipelines is not a limiting factor due to the relatively lower capacity requirements. In many regions, hydrogen demand is supplied by the cheapest electricity generation locations; in this specific region, it is imported from the Nordic countries. However, as the distance increases from these cheap locations (making electricity transport more difficult due to the cable capacities), the utilization of the local sources becomes necessary. As a result, in “31\_de”, for example, both onshore and offshore wind energy is utilized due to the relatively cheaper electricity generation it offers compared to the other locations in northern continental Europe. Overall, this region imports the hydrogen produced in the north while exporting electricity generated by the local sources.

**Hydrogen exporter – electricity importer:** This is the group on the lower right. As is apparent, there are not many regions in this category. Nevertheless, “81\_no” and “82\_no” can be used as an example of it. What happens in these regions is as follows: electricity is imported to maintain reasonable full load hours for the electrolyzer and then the hydrogen produced is exported via the imported electricity. In other words, the imported electricity is not used to supply the electricity demand in these regions but to maintain electrolyzer full load hours and produce hydrogen.




Figure 10. Net transport of electricity versus hydrogen, with electricity generation and total demand within the regions indicated as the marker size and colors, respectively.

Another role that a region might play in terms of hydrogen can be that of a conduit. Such regions can be identified by looking at the pipeline capacities and whether or not the region imports hydrogen. Correspondingly, the distribution of net hydrogen transport and the proposed pipeline connections are shown in Figure 11. For convenience, the colors of this figure identify each region as a net importer or exporter for the same reasons described above in relation to Figure 9 and Figure 10. Net hydrogen transport indicates the quantity of hydrogen transport, in addition to the direction of this via the sign. In other words, if the value is positive, hydrogen leaves the region (hydrogen export) and vice versa. Looking at the Nordic countries, larger pipeline capacities toward continental Europe can be observed. Gathering the hydrogen produced in all of the regions except “75\_fi” (southern Finland), a large pipeline passes through southern Sweden (“88\_se” and “89\_se”), which does not export a significant amount of hydrogen. Then, the connection passes by regions in Denmark with a slight increase in their capacities. Therefore, these regions do not benefit from the large hydrogen pipelines connecting them, but serve as a conduit that enables hydrogen transport to the non-neighborly regions. The northern United Kingdom sees the same behavior, with hydrogen produced in both the United Kingdom and Ireland being transported to continental Europe via the connection between “90\_uk” and “26\_fr”. Then, it is distributed to the neighboring regions.

A comparison of the proposed hydrogen pipeline grid for the European hydrogen backbone [46] reveals the similarities in the connections. Some examples of these similarities are those between Denmark and Sweden, the Netherlands and Germany, as well as Belgium. Additionally, the resemblance of pipeline grids within countries such as Germany, Spain and Italy is evident. Nevertheless, there are some deviations in the connections. The European hydrogen backbone [46] does not include the connections in northwestern France, nor that between France and Italy, which are proposed in the presented assessment.

The importance of conduit regions cannot be fully conveyed in this analysis due to the perfect European market assumption made at the beginning. However, it must be noted that the negation of any of these connections would change the proposed energy system design. For instance, a public acceptance issue raised in Denmark could disconnect the Nordic regions from continental Europe. Another hindrance of these connections could be unforeseen political developments in the style of Brexit. Therefore, despite the high generation and cheaper hydrogen production potential compared to continental Europe, a more decentralized design would be required in such a case. Moreover, this would probably result in a changing of the roles of countries as hydrogen importers or exporters, as a new balance in the system would need to be attained. Overall, it is worth emphasizing the importance of these conduit regions in the energy system’s design.




Figure 11. Geospatial distribution of net hydrogen transport across regions with proposed pipeline connections.

#### 4. Summary & Outlook

This study proposes an iterative approach to attaining a robust, fully renewable European energy system design that takes into account the high spatial resolution of renewable modeling, as well as different design results on the basis of historical weather years. The optimization model consists of 96 regions with hourly temporal resolution and takes a hypothetical hydrogen infrastructure into account.

Creating groups of VRES technologies increases the spatial resolution of the optimization problem, with a slight increase in the complexity compared to a higher number of regions. It can be seen that the total annual cost decreases with higher resolutions due to the cheap locations identified in each region. Furthermore, these cheap locations become cost-competitive with biomass, which results in a decrease in the capacity of the CHP plants required in the final system design. The use of 60 VRES groups per technology type was found to be sufficient to represent the variability of renewables within each region. It was previously well known that the use of different weather years greatly impacts the system design, and this study further emphasizes this point. The results clearly show that, for the European domain, the consideration

of several weather years instead of only a single representative one can lead to a necessary increase in the system cost by roughly 25%.

Taking into account the annual variations and spatial variability of the renewables, an iterative approach was proposed to obtain a robust, fully renewable European energy system design. This design consists of 1574 GW wind and PV capacities, 42% of which correspond to open-field PV systems. Additionally, 154 GW of biomass CHP plants and 203 GW of hydropower plants were incorporated into the design. The total, respective capacity of 258 GW and 134 GW of electrolyzers and hydrogen re-electrification technologies are also used in the model. Only 0.6% (130 TWh) of the technical potential of salt caverns is realized for hydrogen storage, in addition to 562 GWh and 587 GWh of vessel and lithium-ion batteries.

When different roles were defined for the regions investigated in this analysis, it became clear that the Nordic countries, as well as Ireland and the United Kingdom, were primarily exporters in terms of hydrogen and electricity, owing to the cheap cost of electricity generation in these locations. In addition to these regions, northwestern Germany and southern France are also considered exporter regions. As was expected, large demand centers, such as the regions containing London, Paris, and Milan, are net electricity and hydrogen importers.

The results indicate that a fully renewable European energy system is feasible. It can be said that detailed assessments of the data used in the energy system design are crucial. Moreover, it is apparent that the iterative approach proposed in this work prevents the over-engineering of the robust system design compared to the use of maximum capacities.

### **Acknowledgments**

This work was supported by the Helmholtz Association under the Joint Initiative, “EnergySystem 2050: A Contribution of the Research Field Energy.” In addition, the authors acknowledge the financial support from the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy of Germany in the context of project METIS (project number 03ET4064A).

### **References**

- [1] European Commission. Energy Roadmap 2050. 2012. <https://doi.org/10.2833/10759>.
- [2] European Commission. EU Reference Scenario 2016 - Energy, transport and GHG emissions - Trends to 2050. 2016. <https://doi.org/10.2833/001137>.
- [3] Schiebahn S, Grube T, Robinius M, Tietze V, Kumar B, Stolten D. Power to gas: Technological overview, systems analysis and economic assessment for a case study in Germany. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 2015;40:4285–94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2015.01.123>.
- [4] Robinius M, Otto A, Syranidis K, Ryberg DS, Heuser P, Welder L, et al. Linking the Power and Transport Sectors—Part 2: Modelling a Sector Coupling Scenario for Germany. *Energies* 2017;10:957. <https://doi.org/10.3390/en10070957>.
- [5] Robinius M, Otto A, Heuser P, Welder L, Syranidis K, Ryberg D, et al. Linking the Power and Transport Sectors—Part 1: The Principle of Sector Coupling. *Energies* 2017;10:956. <https://doi.org/10.3390/en10070956>.
- [6] Resch B, Sagl G, Törnros T, Bachmaier A, Eggers J-B, Herkel S, et al. GIS-Based Planning and Modeling for Renewable Energy: Challenges and Future Research Avenues. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information* 2014;3:662–92. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijgi3020662>.

- [7] Ruhnau O, Bannik S, Otten S, Praktijnjo A, Robinius M. Direct or indirect electrification? A review of heat generation and road transport decarbonisation scenarios for Germany 2050. *Energy* 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2018.10.114>.
- [8] Grube T, Doré L, Hoffrichter A, Hombach LE, Raths S, Robinius M, et al. An option for stranded renewables: Electrolytic-hydrogen in future energy systems. *Sustainable Energy and Fuels* 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c8se00008e>.
- [9] IRENA. *Hydrogen from renewable energy: Technology outlook for the energy transition*. Abu Dhabi: 2018.
- [10] Quarton CJ, Tlili O, Welder L, Mansilla C, Blanco H, Heinrichs H, et al. The curious case of the conflicting roles of hydrogen in global energy scenarios. *Sustainable Energy & Fuels* 2020;4:80–95. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C9SE00833K>.
- [11] Dolci F, Thomas D, Hilliard S, Guerra CF, Hancke R, Ito H, et al. Incentives and legal barriers for power-to-hydrogen pathways: An international snapshot. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2019.03.045>.
- [12] Samsatli S, Staffell I, Samsatli NJ. Optimal design and operation of integrated wind-hydrogen-electricity networks for decarbonising the domestic transport sector in Great Britain. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 2016;41:447–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2015.10.032>.
- [13] Tlili O, Mansilla C, Robinius M, Syranidis K, Reuss M, Linssen J, et al. Role of electricity interconnections and impact of the geographical scale on the French potential of producing hydrogen via electricity surplus by 2035. *Energy* 2019;172:977–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2019.01.138>.
- [14] Guandalini G, Robinius M, Grube T, Campanari S, Stolten D. Long-term power-to-gas potential from wind and solar power: A country analysis for Italy. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2017.03.081>.
- [15] Welder L, Ryberg DS, Kotzur L, Grube T, Robinius M, Stolten D. Spatio-temporal optimization of a future energy system for power-to-hydrogen applications in Germany. *Energy* 2018;158:1130–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2018.05.059>.
- [16] Reuß M, Grube T, Robinius M, Stolten D. A hydrogen supply chain with spatial resolution: Comparative analysis of infrastructure technologies in Germany. *Applied Energy* 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.04.064>.
- [17] Heuser P-M, Ryberg DS, Grube T, Robinius M, Stolten D. Techno-economic analysis of a potential energy trading link between Patagonia and Japan based on CO<sub>2</sub> free hydrogen. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 2019;44:12733–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2018.12.156>.
- [18] Reichenberg L, Hedenus F, Odenberger M, Johnsson F. The marginal system LCOE of variable renewables – Evaluating high penetration levels of wind and solar in Europe. *Energy* 2018;152:914–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2018.02.061>.
- [19] Aboumahboub T, Tzscheuschler P, Hamacher T. Optimizing World-wide Utilization of Renewable Energy Sources in the Power Sector. *Renewable Energy and Power Quality Journal* 2010;1:15–21. <https://doi.org/10.24084/repqj08.207>.
- [20] Brown T, Schlachtberger D, Kies A, Schramm S, Greiner M. Synergies of sector coupling and transmission reinforcement in a cost-optimised, highly renewable European energy system. *Energy* 2018;160:720–39.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2018.06.222>.

- [21] Pavičević M, Mangipinto A, Nijs W, Lombardi F, Kavvadias K, Jiménez Navarro JP, et al. The potential of sector coupling in future European energy systems: Soft linking between the Dispa-SET and JRC-EU-TIMES models. *Applied Energy* 2020;267:115100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2020.115100>.
- [22] Lux B, Pfluger B. A supply curve of electricity-based hydrogen in a decarbonized European energy system in 2050. *Applied Energy* 2020;269:115011. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2020.115011>.
- [23] Siala K, Mahfouz MY. Impact of the choice of regions on energy system models. *Energy Strategy Reviews* 2019;25:75–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esr.2019.100362>.
- [24] Siala K, de la Rúa C, Lechón Y, Hamacher T. Towards a sustainable European energy system: Linking optimization models with multi-regional input-output analysis. *Energy Strategy Reviews* 2019;26:100391. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esr.2019.100391>.
- [25] Zappa W, Junginger M, van den Broek M. Is a 100% renewable European power system feasible by 2050? *Applied Energy* 2019;233–234:1027–50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2018.08.109>.
- [26] Steinke F, Wolfrum P, Hoffmann C. Grid vs. storage in a 100% renewable Europe. *Renewable Energy* 2013;50:826–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2012.07.044>.
- [27] Moser M, Gils H-C, Pivaro G. A sensitivity analysis on large-scale electrical energy storage requirements in Europe under consideration of innovative storage technologies. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 2020;269:122261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.122261>.
- [28] Bussar C, Moos M, Alvarez R, Wolf P, Thien T, Chen H, et al. Optimal Allocation and Capacity of Energy Storage Systems in a Future European Power System with 100% Renewable Energy Generation. *Energy Procedia* 2014;46:40–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2014.01.156>.
- [29] Bussar C, Stöcker P, Cai Z, Moraes Jr. L, Magnor D, Wiernes P, et al. Large-scale integration of renewable energies and impact on storage demand in a European renewable power system of 2050—Sensitivity study. *Journal of Energy Storage* 2016;6:1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.est.2016.02.004>.
- [30] Bussar C, Stöcker P, Cai Z, Moraes L, Alvarez R, Chen H, et al. Large-scale Integration of Renewable Energies and Impact on Storage Demand in a European Renewable Power System of 2050. *Energy Procedia* 2015;73:145–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2015.07.662>.
- [31] Löffler K, Burandt T, Hainsch K, Oei P-Y. Modeling the low-carbon transition of the European energy system - A quantitative assessment of the stranded assets problem. *Energy Strategy Reviews* 2019;26:100422. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esr.2019.100422>.
- [32] Schlott M, Kies A, Brown T, Schramm S, Greiner M. The impact of climate change on a cost-optimal highly renewable European electricity network. *Applied Energy* 2018;230:1645–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2018.09.084>.
- [33] Child M, Kemfert C, Bogdanov D, Breyer C. Flexible electricity generation, grid exchange and storage for the transition to a 100% renewable energy system in Europe. *Renewable Energy* 2019;139:80–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2019.02.077>.

- [34] Bogdanov D, Farfan J, Sadovskaia K, Aghahosseini A, Child M, Gulagi A, et al. Radical transformation pathway towards sustainable electricity via evolutionary steps. *Nature Communications* 2019;10:1077. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-08855-1>.
- [35] Caglayan DG, Heinrichs HU, Stolten D, Robinius M. The Impact of Temporal Complexity Reduction on a 100% Renewable European Energy System with Hydrogen Infrastructure. *Preprints* 2019;2019100150. <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints201910.0150.v1>.
- [36] Caglayan DG, Heinrichs HU, Linssen J, Robinius M, Stolten D. Impact of different weather years on the design of hydrogen supply pathways for transport needs. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 2019;44:25442–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2019.08.032>.
- [37] Pfenninger S. Dealing with multiple decades of hourly wind and PV time series in energy models: A comparison of methods to reduce time resolution and the planning implications of inter-annual variability. *Applied Energy* 2017;197:1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.03.051>.
- [38] Kotzur L, Markewitz P, Robinius M, Stolten D. Time series aggregation for energy system design: Modeling seasonal storage. *Applied Energy* 2018;213:123–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2018.01.023>.
- [39] Bruninx K, Orlic D, Couckuyt D, Grisey N, Betraoui B, Anderski T, et al. Modular Development Plan of the Pan-European Transmission System 2050 - D2.1: Data sets of scenarios for 2050. 2015.
- [40] Caglayan DG, Weber N, Heinrichs HU, Linßen J, Robinius M, Kukla PA, et al. Technical potential of salt caverns for hydrogen storage in Europe. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 2020;45:6793–805. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2019.12.161>.
- [41] Rienecker MM, Suarez MJ, Gelaro R, Todling R, Bacmeister J, Liu E, et al. MERRA: NASA's Modern-Era Retrospective Analysis for Research and Applications. *Journal of Climate* 2011;24:3624–48. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00015.1>.
- [42] Ryberg DS, Heinrichs HU, Robinius M, Stolten D. RESKit - Renewable Energy Simulation toolkit for Python 2019. <https://github.com/FZJ-IEK3-VSA/RESKit>.
- [43] Ryberg DS, Caglayan DG, Schmitt S, Linßen J, Stolten D, Robinius M. The future of European onshore wind energy potential: Detailed distribution and simulation of advanced turbine designs. *Energy* 2019;182:1222–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2019.06.052>.
- [44] Ryberg DS. Generation Lulls from the Future Potential of Wind and Solar Energy in Europe. RWTH Aachen University, 2019.
- [45] Caglayan DG, Ryberg DS, Heinrichs H, Linßen J, Stolten D, Robinius M. The techno-economic potential of offshore wind energy with optimized future turbine designs in Europe. *Applied Energy* 2019;255:113794. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.113794>.
- [46] Wang A, Leun K van der, Peters D, Buseman M. *European Hydrogen Backbone*. Utrecht: 2020.