

Carbon capture from natural gas combined cycle (NGCC) power plants: solvent performance comparison at an industrial scale

Sharifzadeh, Mahdi¹; Shah, Nilay

Centre for Process Systems Engineering (CPSE), Department of Chemical Engineering, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom, SW7 2AZ.

Abstract

Natural gas is an important source of energy. This paper addresses the problem of integrating an existing natural gas combined cycle (NGCC) power plant with a carbon capture process using various solvents. The power plant and capture process have mutual interactions in terms of the flue gas flowrate and composition versus the extracted steam required for solvent regeneration. Therefore, evaluating solvent performance at a single (nominal) operating point is not indicative and solvent performance should be considered subject to the overall process operability and over a wide range of operating conditions. In the present research, a novel optimization framework was developed in which design and operation of the capture process are optimized simultaneously and their interactions with the upstream power plant are fully captured. The developed framework was applied for solvent comparison which demonstrated that GCCmax, a newly developed solvent, features superior performances compared to the MEA baseline solvents.

Key words

CO₂, Carbon capture, natural gas combined cycle (NGCC) power plant, energy efficiency, integrated process design and control, GCCmax.

¹ **Corresponding Author:** Dr Mahdi Sharifzadeh; Room C603, Roderic Hill Building, South Kensington Campus, Imperial College London, UK. SW7 2AZ. E-mail: mahdi@imperial.ac.uk; Tel: +44(0)7517853422.

This contribution was identified by the AIChE Session Chair, Dr Athanasios Papadopoulos (Centre for Research and Technology Hellas), as the **Best Presentation** in the session of **Design of CO₂ Capture Systems** during the 2014 AIChE Annual Meeting in Atlanta, GA, November 16-21, 2014.

Introduction

Increasing energy demand and associated pollution have posed an important challenge around the security of energy supply and environmental protection. Among various prospective scenarios, the International Energy Agency (IEA) asserts that fossil fuels are most likely to remain the dominant sources of energy for a foreseeable future¹. Therefore, carbon capture from existing fossil-fuel-driven energy infrastructure will be a major pathway for sustainability and environmental protection. Despite such clarity, there are various barriers against commercialization of carbon capture technologies. Firstly, the current energy infrastructure is relatively mature and the number of existing processes is significantly larger than the number of processes under construction. Therefore, enhancing energy efficiency and mitigating the emissions should require minimal process retrofit. Secondly, seamless integration of energy conversion processes with carbon capture technology requires the latter process to be at least as flexible as the former (standalone) process. Finally, in order to justify the process retrofit and overcome financial barriers, the energetic implications of the carbon capture process should be minimal.

Solvent-based CO₂ removal using aqueous amines is the most promising technology for carbon capture, as this technology is an end-of-pipe treatment and has been in use since the 1930s for natural gas sweetening². However, adaptation of this technology for post-combustion carbon capture is nontrivial as gas processing is significantly different from power generation in several aspects. Natural gas is often produced at an elevated pressure and does not contain any oxygen. Furthermore, in natural gas sweetening, a higher degree of CO₂ removal is required and the separated CO₂ is emitted to the atmosphere. Finally, gas processing is a relatively steady-state process. By comparison, post-combustion carbon removal is conducted at near atmosphere pressure and deep CO₂ separation is often uneconomic. In addition, power plants are subject to drastic variations in electricity demand and for the capture plant to remain integrated with the power plant, it should feature a high degree of flexibility.

Retrofitting the existing power generation processes with carbon capture technologies has been the focus of academic and industrial researchers. The International Energy Agency (IEA) conducted a comparative study³ on pre-combustion and post-combustion CO₂ capture in natural gas combined cycle (NGCC) power plants, as well as pre-combustion carbon capture from coal gasification plants. Post-combustion carbon capture from natural gas was identified as the lowest cost retrofit. Later, the National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL), in a

comprehensive study⁴, evaluated the implications of carbon capture from natural gas combined cycle (NGCC), integrated gasification combined cycle (IGCC), and pulverized coal (PC) power plants. The observation was that the energetic penalties associated with carbon capture from NGCC power plants are less than PC and IGCC power plants, mainly due to the lower carbon intensity of the natural gas and the higher conversion efficiency of NGCC plants. Large increases in the boiler water withdrawal and cooling water were observed for the scenario of NGCC power plant, integrated with carbon capture process. Recently, a group of European researchers⁵ conducted a comprehensive study on the carbon capture from a supercritical pulverised coal power plant and a natural gas combined cycle (NGCC) power plant. They employed two economic analysis methods; a top-down method in which the historical data from previous projects and similar studies were used, and a bottom-up method that was based on mass and energy analysis and detailed equipment costing. Significant difference between the results of two studies was reported (table 7 of reference⁵), illustrating the difficulties associated with reproducible and comparative economic analysis.

Furthermore, researchers have focused on the method of process integration from a thermodynamic point of view. The heat integration schemes investigated include steam extraction and condensate recycling⁶, integrating compressor inter-coolers to the low pressure section of the steam cycle⁷ or stripper reboiler⁸, preheating combustion air using waste heat from the capture plant⁹, and application of pressurized hot water instead of steam for solvent regeneration^{10,11}. Furthermore, the CO₂ concentration of the flue gas can be increased by recirculation of exhaust gases^{10,12,13} or using a supplementary burner placed in the duct connecting the turbine exhaust and heat recovery steam generation (HRSG) system¹²⁻¹⁴. Other researchers have explored the implications of the process configuration on the capital investment and energy costs.

It was shown that depending on the solvent heat of desorption, either a multi-pressure or vacuum desorber could be the optimal configuration¹⁵. Other configurations include the absorber with intercooling, condensate heating, evacuation using water ejector, stripper overhead compression, lean amine flash, split-amine flow to absorber and desorber, and their combinations. Le Moullec, et al.¹⁶ classified these configurations into three categories of (1) absorption enhancement, (2) heat integration and (3) heat pump applications. They enumerated twenty process configurations from the open literature and patents. In general, up to 37% energy saving in terms of the required reboiler steam was reported¹⁷. Damartzis et al.¹⁸ applied a module-based generalized design framework in order to optimize process flow diagram including the stream topologies, the heat redistribution and the cascades of desorption columns. They reported significant economic improvement

(15%-35%) and reductions in the reboiler duty (up to 55%). However, as discussed by Karimi¹⁹, a high degree of energy integration may result in poor dynamic behaviour, because in energy integrated processes, disturbances propagate in several paths. Therefore, a trade-off between energy saving and process controllability should be established²⁰.

Nevertheless, integrated operation of carbon capture processes may not be realizable without considering the main operational characteristics of the upstream power plant. Power plants are subjects to drastic variations in the electricity demand. Examples of such variations include regular daily and hourly variations in the consumer demand or stochastic variations such as extreme weather conditions or local events. It is expected that by the introduction of renewable energy resources the fluctuations in the electricity grid will also increase on the supply side, as some of these new resources such as solar or wind have intermittent generation characteristics. Thus, it is for the fossil-based power plants to operate flexibly and balance the supply deficit in order to meet the demand. Therefore, commercialization of new CO₂ capture technologies strongly depends on their adaptability in order to remain integrated as the upstream power plant experiences variations in the electricity demand. Recently, the flexibility of solvent-based carbon capture processes has been the focus of various research groups. Shah and Mac Dowell²¹ studied the multi-period operation of a coal-fired power plant. They adapted a time-varying solvent regeneration strategy in order to minimize the costs of CO₂ capture. Delarue, et al.²² had a similar observation that flexible operation of capture plant would offer a better economy. Lawal, et al.²³ studied the dynamic performance of carbon capture from a coal-fired sub-critical power plant. They concluded that the capture plant has a slower dynamic response than the power plant, which can prolong the power plant start-up or load-change due to steam extraction. In addition, it was observed that the interactions between the control loops in the power plant and capture plant limit the overall process controllability. Bypassing the flue gas, solvent storage and stripper-bypass can potentially offer flexibility and economic savings^{24,25}.

In the present paper, we explore model development and validation, scale up, NGCC power plant integration and flexible operation of the capture processes. The research questions also include the interactions between the power plant and carbon capture plant in terms of the flow and composition of the flue gas and the required steam for solvent regeneration, which have implications for the overall energy efficiency and operational flexibility. The performances of GCCmax and the MEA solvents for carbon capture from an NGCC power plant are studied. GCCmax is recently developed by Carbon Clean Solutions Limited (CCSL) and belongs to the class of amine-promoted buffer salt (APBS) solvents. MEA is chosen as the reference solvent for comparison.

Nevertheless, the research methodology is general in nature and can offer effective standards for carbon capture solvent development and comparison.

In the following sections first, the overall process block diagram and the process flow diagram of the sub-processes are presented and discussed. Then, the capture process model is briefly discussed and justified. The discussions continue with the implications of various operating modes of the combined cycle gas turbine (CCGT) for the flue gas flowrate and composition. These enable the application of an optimization framework for the problem of retrofitting an existing NGCC power plant using solvent-based capture process. Finally conclusions are made with respect to the implications GCCmax and MEA reference solvent in terms of technical and energetic performance measures.

Overall process block diagram

The overall process block diagram is shown in Figure 1. As shown in this figure, the natural gas combined cycle (NGCC) power plant comprises two trains of combined cycle gas turbines (CCGT), heat recovery and steam generation (HRSG) systems which are integrated to the steam turbines at three high, medium and low pressure levels. The advantages of parallel trains are due to the fact that in the presence of large variations in the electricity demand, it is possible to shut down a gas turbine and operate the other train close to its nominal operating conditions, i.e., at a high conversion efficiency. Based on a similar justification, in the present research, separate carbon capture and compression trains are considered in the downstream process, in order to enable flexible operation of the overall integrated process. Figure 1 shows that the NGCC power plant integrates with the carbon capture plant at three points. The flue gas is sent from the power plant to the capture plant for CO₂ separation. In addition, the capture plant relies on the steam from the power plant for regeneration of the solvent and it returns the condensates to the power plant for reuse and further steam generation.




Figure 1. The block diagram for a natural gas combined cycle (NGCC) power plant integrated with CO₂ capture and CO₂ compression processes.

Process flow diagram of natural gas combined cycle (NGCC) power plant

Figure 2 shows the process flow diagram of the natural gas combined cycle (NGCC) power plant, in more detail. This process consists of three sub-processes, combined cycle gas turbine (CCGT), heat recovery and steam generation (HRSG) system and steam turbines at high pressure (HP), medium pressure (MP) and low pressure (LP) levels. Firstly, air is compressed and fed to the combustor where natural gas feed is burned in order to release heat. Hot exhaust gases are expanded in the gas turbine in order to produce electricity. Then, the hot gases are exploited in the HRSG for generating steam at the three pressure levels. The steam from the high pressure steam drum is sent to the HP steam turbine. The discharge of HP turbine is mixed with the steam from the medium pressure steam drum and is superheated in the economisers before entering the MP steam turbine. The discharge of the MP steam turbine is mixed with the steam generated at the low pressure steam drum. A fraction of this steam stream is extracted and sent to the reboiler of the CO₂ capture plant for solvent regeneration. The pressure and temperature of the extracted steam is adjusted in the desuperheater using the condensates returning from the capture plant. In addition, a valve before the LP steam turbine ensures that the extracted steam is at the desired pressure. Both HP and MP turbines are of the back-pressure type. However, the LP turbine is a condensing turbine. The justification of using a condensing turbine is that the produced power is proportional to the pressure ratio between suction and discharge. Therefore, it is possible to enhance the

produced work by creating vacuum conditions at the turbine discharge using a surface condenser. The condensates from the surface condenser and the condensates returning from the carbon capture plant are mixed, deaerated, pressurized and recycled to the steam drums for further steam generation.

Process flow diagram of CO₂ capture and compression sections

Figure 3 shows the process flow diagram of the CO₂ capture and compression sections. In the first column, the flue gas from the power plant comes into direct contact with cooling water in order to reduce its temperature and remove any entrained particles. In the next column, absorber, the CO₂ is chemisorbed and removed by the solvent. The CO₂-rich solvent leaves from the absorber bottom, and the cleaned flue gas exits from the absorber top and is sent to the water wash column. The aim of the water wash column is minimizing the solvent loss by absorbing the solvent spilled from the top of the absorber. The CO₂-rich solvent from the bottom of the absorber is sent to the top of the desorber for CO₂ stripping and solvent regeneration. The CO₂-lean solvent from the desorber reboiler is recycled to the absorber for reuse and CO₂ separation. The absorption reactions are exothermic and favour low temperatures. By comparison, the desorption reactions are endothermic and favour high temperatures. Therefore, there is an opportunity for heat integration between hot CO₂-lean and cold CO₂-rich streams. The separated CO₂ from the desorber condenser is sent to the compression section. The compression section consists of seven compression stages. In each compression stage, due to pressure enhancement, the temperature of the CO₂ gas is increased, and needs to be cooled in the subsequent inter-stage cooler. As a result of sequential compression and cooling, most of the water content is condensed in the early stages. The remaining water is removed using an adsorption process in the dehydrators. The compressed CO₂ is sent from the last stage for storage and sequestration.




Figure 2. The process flow diagram of the natural gas combined cycle (NGCC) power plant.




Figure 3. The process flow diagram of the CO₂ capture and CO₂ compression processes

Research methodology

For the capture plant, the detailed of model development, pilot plant trials and model validation were reported in a previous contribution³⁴. The present research builds upon this initial results and aims at evaluating the performance of the GCCmax solvent in comparison with the MEA benchmark solvent, at a n industrial scale and when integrated to an NGCC power plant. In the following, firstly the problem statement for retrofitting an NGCC power plant with carbon capture and compression processes is presented. Then, model development and validation are briefly discussed. Then, the capture process model is scaled up and integrated to the power plant model. The main feature of interest is uncertainties in the power plant electricity demand that require flexible operation of the capture process in order to realize seamless process integration and retrofit. A novel optimization framework is proposed to address the posed retrofit problem. In the proposed optimization framework, the design and operation of the capture process are optimized simultaneously, and the interactions of the down steam capture process with the upstream in terms of the flue gas flowrate and composition and the required steam for solvent regeneration, as various electricity load scenarios are fully considered. Then, the implementation software tools are elaborated upon. Finally, the results are reported and discussed.

Problem statement

The present research addresses the problem of retrofitting an existing natural gas combined cycle (NGCC) power plant using solvent-based carbon capture and compression processes. The specifications of an existing NGCC power plant including the nominal operating conditions and the performance curves of process equipment under various partial load scenarios are given. It is intended to retrofit the power plant with CO₂ capture and compression plants, so that 90% of the CO₂ from natural gas combustion is captured and compressed to 111 bar for subsequent storage and sequestration. In addition, it is desired to ensure that the capture plant and its compression network remain operable at a wide range (i.e., 25%-100%) of electricity power demands.

Capture plant model development and validation

The accurate modelling of the solvent-based CO₂ capture processes for the purpose of solvent benchmarking and comparison requires a thorough understanding of the underlying physical and chemical phenomena involved, as discussed in the following.

Rate-based modelling of gas-liquid contactors

The rate-based model of the gas-liquid contactor is founded on the two-film theory. In this method, thermodynamic equilibrium is assumed only at the interface of vapour and liquid phases. Unlike equilibrium-based models, the exiting vapour phase is superheated and the exiting liquid phase is subcooled and they have different temperatures. The exchanged mass and energy between phases depend on the driving forces, transport coefficients, and the interfacial area. Often, both convective and diffusive transport phenomena are involved and component-coupling effects need to be considered²⁶. Various empirical correlations for calculating the mass transfer coefficient are proposed by researchers for random²⁷⁻²⁹ and structured packing²⁹⁻³¹. Finally, the bulk liquid and gas phases may have different flow configurations such as plug or mixed flows.

Reaction kinetics and thermodynamics

In the present research, the statistical associating fluid theory (SAFT) was adopted for modelling the chemical and phase equilibria. In this approach, the rate of reactions, the concentration of intermediate ionization species, and their thermophysical properties are not formulated directly. Instead, CO₂ and solvent are represented as molecule chains with associating sites. The concentration of CO₂ in association with the solvent molecules represents the actual CO₂ loading at different temperatures and pressures.

Justification of the modelling strategy

The combination of rate-based modelling and representation of chemical reactions using statistical associating fluid theory (SAFT) provides a consistent modelling approach. The justification is that for solvents such as MEA and GCCmax, the rate of reaction is significantly faster than the heat and mass transfer rates. Therefore, the knowledge of the reaction kinetics is unnecessary and chemical equilibrium sufficiently describes the actual system behaviour at the gas-liquid interface. This modelling approach offers several advantages; firstly unlike activity-based models, the same equation of state is used to describe both liquid and vapour phases. Secondly, the chemical equilibria are treated at the same level as phase equilibria. Furthermore, this approach results in significant model reduction because the speciation of intermediate ions is not included in the mathematical formulation and the uncertainties associated with their thermophysical parameters are disentangled from problem formulation. Most of all, the aforementioned approach establishes a connection between the chemical and physical behaviour of the mixture and the molecular structure of the involved materials. This is of particular importance to modelling new solvents as the required information can be acquired from the available data for the molecular segments of associating sites.

In the present research, the applied software tools were advanced modelling library gas-liquid contactors (AML-GLC) and gSAFT toolboxes developed by Process System Enterprise (PSE). The parametric values of thermodynamic models for the GCCmax solvent are obscured in order to respect the confidentiality agreements with Carbon Clean Solutions Limited (CCSL) and Process Systems Enterprise Ltd (PSE). The modelling equations of the gas-liquid contactors and the underlying assumptions are described in ³². More details on the thermodynamic model are given in reference ³³.

Pilot plant studies and model validation

As discussed in a previous contribution ³⁴, In order to ensure effective benchmarking and model validation, two sets of pilot plant runs were conducted using the monoethanolamine (MEA) and GCCmax solvents. MEA served as the baseline reference solvent. The pilot plant studies were conducted in the US National Carbon Capture Center (NCCC) located in Alabama, USA. Table 1 shows the results of model validation for MEA reference solvent ³⁴. Since the US NCCC pilot plant was not previously operated under natural gas exhaust conditions, the model validation was conducted based on historical data for a scenario of coal-fired exhausts. The last column in Table 1 reports the prediction of the model, when the system is operated for natural gas exhaust conditions. Table 1 shows a very good agreement between pilot plant data and simulation results, in terms of the captured CO₂ and the solvent composition. Minor discrepancies in the consumed steam are deemed to be associated with heat losses and temperature indicator errors. Table 2 reports the results of the GCCmax solvent model validation under natural-gas-fired conditions ³⁴. Two sets of pilot plant data were used, which are different with respect to the lean solvent temperature entering the absorber top. The justification was due to the fact that in different parts of the world, cooling water may be supplied at different temperatures. Again the model predictions are in good agreement with the pilot plant data with respect to the captured CO₂ and the solvent concentrations, giving confidence in the model's predictive capabilities. The discrepancies in the required steam and temperatures were attributed to lack of insulation or temperature measurement errors.

Table 1. Model validation for MEA baseline solvent ³⁴.

		Alabama-coal	Alabama-coal	Alabama NG
		Pilot Plant	Simulation	Simulation
Flue gas to the absorber				
Nitrogen+ Oxygen	Mass Fraction	0.786	0.786	0.909
Carbon Dioxide	Mass Fraction	0.165	0.165	0.067
Water	Mass Fraction	0.049	0.049	0.024
Total flowrate	Kg/s	0.6279	0.6280	0.6279
Flue Gas Temperature - Absorber Inlet	K	316.56	316.56	316.56
Lean Solvent - Absorber Inlet				
Amine	Mass Fraction	0.297	0.298	0.296
CO ₂	Mass Fraction	0.063	0.059	0.059
Water	Mass Fraction	0.640	0.643	0.645
Total	Kg/s	2.5200	2.5100	1.3000
Lean solvent temperature	K	316.15	316.15	316.15
Intercoolers outlet temperature	K	316.15	316.15	-
Reboiler Steam				
Steam pressure	bar	2.92	2.92	2.92
Steam temperature	K	405.60	405.60	405.60
Steam flowrate	Kg/s	0.18	0.15	0.07
Lean-Rich Heat Exchanger				
Lean in	K	388.87	388.9	389
Lean out	K	331.4	338.9	330.8
Rich in	K	327.91	330.4	321.7
Reboiler temperature	K	385.6	388.0	389.0
Absorber bottom pressure	bar	1.1	1.17	1.16
Absorber top pressure	bar	1.04	1.04	1.04
Desorber bottom (reboiler) pressure	bar	1.71	1.71	1.16
Desorber top pressure	bar	1.69	1.70	1.70
General specifications				
CO ₂ capture target	%	91.84	91.85	90
Inter-stage Cooling		Yes	Yes	No

Table 2. Model validation for GCCmax solvent ³⁴.

		Data Set 1	Data Set 1	Data Set 2	Data Set 2
Absorber inlet gas stream		Pilot Plant	Simulation	Pilot Plant	Simulation
Nitrogen + Oxygen	Mass Fraction	0.895	0.895	0.896	0.896
Carbon dioxide	Mass Fraction	0.065	0.065	0.065	0.065
Water	Mass Fraction	0.040	0.040	0.039	0.039
Temperature	K	313.1	313.1	312.8	312.8
Total flowrate	kg/s	0.995	0.995	0.9951	0.9951
Absorber					
Absorber top pressure	bara	1.160	1.160	1.160	1.160
Absorber bottom pressure	bara	unavailable	1.224	unavailable	1.221
Absorber outlet CO ₂ concentration	Mass Fraction	0.0053	0.0056	0.004	0.005
Lean solvent - absorber inlet temperature	K	304.1	304.1	325.4	325.4
Rich solvent - absorber outlet temperature	K	318.1	316.5	318.7	316.1
Lean solvent flowrate	kg/s	0.857	0.857	0.756	0.756
Desorber (regenerator)					
Desorber Bottom Temperature	K	388.6	388.6	395.4	395
Desorber Top Pressure	bara	1.701	1.708	2.031	2.03
CO ₂ stream	kg/s	0.0578	0.0611	0.060	0.0605
Reboiler Steam					
Steam pressure	bar	3.606	3.605	4.075	4.075
Steam temperature	K	402.8	402.8	408.5	408.5
Steam condensate Temperature	K	401.9	401.9	407.8	407.5
Steam flowrate	kg/s	0.091	0.078	0.086	0.0823
Lean-Rich Heat Exchanger Temperatures					
Lean solvent in	K	387.4	388.6	394.2	395.0
Lean solvent out	K	325.0	322.6	324.7	327.4
Rich solvent in	K	318.9	316.5	319.9	316.1
Rich solvent out	K	380.4	379.9	384.0	379.9
Lean solvent concentration					
GCCmax Solvent	Mass Fraction	0.410	0.410	0.439	0.439
Water	Mass Fraction	0.536	0.541	0.504	0.515
CO ₂	Mass Fraction	0.054	0.049	0.057	0.046
General specifications					
CO ₂ Capture target	%	89.1	91.7	92.50	92.13
Inter-stage Cooling		No	No	No	No

The validated pilot plant model was used to extract several technical key process indicators (KPIs) which are important measures that quantify the difficulties associated with CO₂ separation from the flue gas in terms of the required heating and cooling duties, required packing, and solvent circulation. These measures are scaled with respect to the amount of pure CO₂ captured, to become independent of the pilot plant throughput and enable comparisons. Table 3 shows the key process indicators for the baseline solvent (MEA) and the GCCmax solvent³⁴. The first indicator is the heating duty, in terms of the required energy needed in the desorber reboiler for separating 1 ton of CO₂. Around a 25.4-29.4% reduction in heating duty was observed. Furthermore, a comparison between the values of the second KPI, suggest significant reductions (73-84.4%) in the cooling duties. The third key process indicator is concerned with the volume of packing in the absorber and desorber columns showing improvements in the case of GCCmax solvent. The last KPI is concerned with the required solvent circulations, and is an indicator of the electricity power needed for pumping. The observed improvements are between 58.8-64.7%.

Table 3. Key process indicators (KPIs) for the GCCmax solvent and baseline MEA solvent³⁴.

Key Process Indicators (KPIs)	Unit	MEA	GCCmax (Data1)	GCCmax (Data2)
Heating duty	(MJ/ton CO ₂)	3986	2813	2975
Cooling duty	(MJ/ton CO ₂)	5644	1524	884
Volume of packing	(m ³ /ton CO ₂ hr ⁻¹)	46.619	45.64	45.91
Solvent circulation flowrate	(ton solvent/ton CO ₂)	34	14	12

Process Scale-up

The validated model was applied for analysis at the large scale corresponding to the retrofitted power plant. The assumptions behind process scale up are summarized in the following. The bulk liquid and gas phases are assumed to be well-mixed at each stage. Phase equilibrium was assumed only at the vapour–liquid interface. It was assumed that the reaction kinetics is significantly faster than the heat and mass transfer rates and therefore, equilibrium chemical reactions sufficiently represent the species composition at the gas-liquid interface. In the present study, the effects of solvent degradation and heat losses were not considered. In practice, for large-scale CO₂ capture processes, achieving the aforementioned performances will require effective gas and liquid distributors. In addition, the process should be carefully insulated and the composition of the solvent should be tightly controlled using make-up.

Solution algorithm: Simulation-optimization framework

The aforementioned problem statement falls into the category of Integrated Process Design and Control (IPDC). The motivation of the integrated approach, as opposed to sequential process design and control design, is due to the fact that when the process design is fixed, there is little room left to improve its operational performance. Therefore, it is highly recommended that operational characteristics should be considered at the early design stages (i.e., process retrofit in the context of this research). A comprehensive review of the methods for integrated process design and control is provided by Sharifzadeh ²⁰.

The challenge is that the full-space formulation of integrated process and control design for large scale industrial problems such as the abovementioned retrofit problem results in numerically intractable optimization problems. Therefore, an objective of the present research was to identify critical process variables and ensure process operability at the plant-wide level, with a reasonable computational complexity. To this end, a novel simulation-optimization framework was developed and tailored for the above-mentioned retrofit problem, as shown in Figure 1 and discussed in the following.

The proposed optimization framework is shown in Figure 1. Here, the overall process is decomposed into three parts; simulation is used for the power plant and compression plant; optimization is applied to the capture process. These three parts are linked together through flow of materials and energy. As shown in Figure 1, the CO₂ capture process receives the flue gas from the NGCC power plant and depends on the steam supply for regeneration of the solvent. The flowrate of flue gas depends on the electricity power demand and changes as

the NGCC power plant experiences variations. In addition, the composition of the flue gas depends on the ratio of the combustion air and natural gas. However, the ratio of combustion air and natural gas is subject to constraints on (1) the maximum allowable temperature of the turbine suction area, and (2) maximum allowable temperature of the turbine discharge gases. Therefore, the operation of CO₂ capture plant is highly entangled with the operational procedure followed for power plant load reduction. As will be shown in the first part of the Results section, the second constraint (i.e., maximum allowable temperature of the turbine discharge gases) becomes active first and by its satisfaction, the first constraint is automatically met.

The variables involved in the optimal design of the CO₂ capture process can be classified as (i) process design variables and (ii) process control variables. The differentiation is necessary as process design variables (such as the dimensions of process equipment) have a physical realization. After the process is commissioned, they are fixed and cannot be changed without costly process modifications. By contrast the control variables (such as the flowrate of the reboiler steam or the circulation rate of the solvent) are available during the process operation in order to adapt the capture process to the variations in the upstream power plant.

In the proposed optimization framework, without loss of generality, we focus on optimizing the capture plant in order to manage the numerical size of the problem. The solution algorithm for the optimization framework is as follows:

Algorithm I:

Step (1) The power plant model is run for a series of steady-state electricity load reduction (100%, 75%, and 50%) scenarios, and a series of default values for the extracted steam and condensate recycle rates. The results of the simulation will determine the flowrate and composition of the flue gas in each scenario.

Step (2) Given the flowrate and composition of the flue gas at various load reduction scenarios, the design and control variables of the capture plant are optimized (as discussed in the following).

Step (3) The results of the optimization determine the optimal values of the extracted steam and recycled condensates. These values are compared to the previous values of the extracted steam and recycled condensates and if the differences are less than the tolerance, the solution is found. Otherwise, the value of the extracted steam and recycled condensates are updated in the power plant model and the algorithm is repeated from Step (1).

Note the compression section does not have mutual interaction with the power plant and capture process. The required energy for CO₂ compression is calculated once the above iterative calculation (Steps 1-3) is converged.

In the present study, the economic analysis was concerned only with the capture process. However, the energetic study also studied the interactions between the power plant and capture plant in terms of the required steam and flowrate and composition of the flue gas in addition to the electricity power required for CO₂ compression.

The abstract formulation of the proposed optimization program (blue envelope in Figure 1) is as follows:

$$\text{Objective} = \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{TAC}_s) = \sum_{s=1}^{N_s} \mu_s \times \mathbf{TAC}_s \quad \text{Problem} - 1$$

Subject to

Constraints associated with first principles (transport phenomena, thermodynamics)

Technical Constraints: maximum reboiler temperature (limited by the possibility of solvent degradation)

Control Constraints: 90% CO₂ Capture, maximum turbine discharge temperature

Disturbances: Composition and flowrate of flue gas for various power load reduction scenarios

Process design decision variables: The dimensions of absorber, desorber, and heat exchangers

Control (recourse) decision variables: Circulation flowrate, Reboiler steam flowrate

In the above formulation, **E** is the expected value, **s** is the index of the load reduction scenarios, **μ_s** is the likelihood of each scenario and **N_s** is the total number of scenarios. **TAC** refers to the total annualized cost (TAC) of the capture plant, and was calculated as:

$$\text{Total Annualized Costs} = \frac{\text{Fixed Capital investment}}{\text{Plant effective Life}} + \text{Total Annual Energy costs} \quad (1)$$

where the value of 5 years was considered for the capture plant effective life, in order to combine the plant life and the time value of money. The costs of process equipment were calculated according to the costing correlations provided in ³⁵. A Lang factor of 6 was considered for estimating the total capital investment ³⁶. The utility costs considered were 65 \$/MWh for electricity ³⁷, 0.048 \$/tonne for cooling water ³⁸, and 14.5 \$/tonne for steam. The MEA solvent loss is around 1400 mg/m³ of flue gas. Equivalent value for the GCCmax is around 28 mg/m³. However, since the GCCmax is not priced yet, the costs of solvent losses is not included in the objective function. Solvent degradation was not considered in this study. The considered load reduction scenarios were 100%, 75% and 50% and were assumed to be equally likely. Since the overall process (Figure 1) consists of two parallel trains, the 50% load reduction in each train will be sufficient to realize a large range of potential operational part-load scenarios (25-100%). The part-load operation of power plants is limited to their

turndown ratio (approximately 50%). The turndown ratio is dictated by the technical limitations such as excessive pressure drops across the power plant, or the surge margins of the compressor and turbines. In the present research, three operational scenarios were considered; in the first scenario both gas turbines are operated at full-load (100%). This scenario refers to the highest conversion efficiency, i.e., the highest CO₂ concentration and smallest steam demand per ton of captured CO₂. In the third scenario, both gas turbines are operated at 50%, which refers to the worst conversion efficiency and hence, the lowest CO₂ concentration and the largest steam demand per ton of captured CO₂. The second scenario is intermediate, where both gas turbines are operated at 75%. These scenarios cover all the operating regions thoroughly. It is notable that there are other operating scenarios where the gas turbines could be operated at different loads (e.g., operating one of trains at full load and shutting down the other), which could be more energy efficient. However, the aforementioned scenarios are more comprehensive with respect to CO₂ concentration and flowrate.

From the optimization programming point of view, the above formulation conforms to a two-stage recourse-based optimization under uncertainty³⁹. From the Control Engineering point of view the above formulation conforms to a steady-state inversely controlled process model (ICPM)^{40,41}. Here the treatment is based on the property that the inverse solution of process model can be applied in order to evaluate the best achievable control performance. The idea is shown in Figure 4, adapted from⁴¹. In a steady-state inversely controlled process model, the values for the manipulated variables (MVs) required for maintaining the controlled variables (CVs) at constant setpoints are calculated using the inverse of process model. As discussed by Sharifzadeh^{20,41} using this strategy, it is possible to ensure that the process remains operable under various disturbance scenarios (i.e., electricity load reduction). It is notable that application of a *dynamic* inversely controlled process model⁴² also enables studying the process controllability during transient states. However, we defer such detailed analysis to our future research. In the context of the present study concerning carbon capture from the NGCC power plant, two model inversions were conducted. Firstly, the temperature of the turbine discharge gases (as discussed and justified later in the result section) is chosen as the controlled variable (CV). The corresponding manipulated variable (MV) is the flowrate of the combustion air which is varied in order to maintain the temperature of the turbine discharge gases constant at its maximum allowable value. The second controlled variable was the CO₂ capture target. Here, the corresponding manipulated variables are the reboiler steam flowrate and the solvent circulation rate which are optimally varied in order to keep the controlled variable at the 90% CO₂ capture target. It is notable that in the context of present study, the NGCC power plant model is

applied in order to derive realistic disturbance scenarios (red envelop in Figure 4) in terms of the flowrate and composition of the flue gas for the carbon capture process. The challenge is that there are mutual interactions between the capture process and the power plant, shown by arrays in Figure 4. While the steam needed for solvent regeneration depends on the flowrate and composition of the flue gas, the overall fuel consumption and hence the flue gas itself, also depends on the required steam in the desorber reboiler. In the present study such mutual interactions is captured using the iterative steps in Algorithm I, as outlined earlier.




Figure 4. Optimizing a steady-state inversely controlled process model, adapted from ⁴⁰.

Model development and implementation software tools

The NGCC power plant and compression process were modelled in gCCS ⁴³, a software tool developed by Process Systems Enterprise Ltd (PSE). The specification of the NGCC power plant model was received from PSE from one of their earlier industrial projects. The important characteristics of the developed model were calculation of the efficiency of the compressors and turbines using performance curves and calculation of material flowrates based on pressure differences. The capture plant model was developed using the Advanced Model Library for Gas-Liquid Contactors (AML:GLC) ⁴⁴ and gSAFT ⁴⁵. As described extensively earlier, the main characteristics of the capture process model were rate-base modelling of mass and heat transfer phenomena and representation of chemisorption reactions using SAFT equation of state. The heat-exchangers were modelled using gCCS in the *operational* mode. The implication is that the surface area was an optimization variable, and given the heat transfer coefficient, the temperatures of the hot and cold streams were calculated. In the present study, the gPROMS default values for the solution parameters were used (e.g., 10^{-5} for absolute tolerance). Similar to other

NLP algorithms, the solution time depends on the initial guess for the optimization variables, and typically takes 1-2 days to converge.

Results of optimization programming

The Results Section is organized as follows. Firstly, it is investigated how the CCGT control strategy influences the flue gas composition and flowrate. These discussions enable underpinning the interactions between the power plant and capture process during electricity load reduction scenarios. Then, the results of the optimization Problem 1 are reported and discussed. Finally, the implications of NGCC power plant retrofit and integration with capture plant for the overall energy conversion are evaluated and discussed.

Control strategy for combined cycle gas turbine (CCGT)

This section discusses the operation of CCGT at steady-state which has profound implications for the flowrate and composition of the flue gas. When the power plant is operated at full load, the ratio of the combustion air and natural gas flowrates is adjusted in order to maximize energy conversion. However, as the electricity power demand is reduced, the flowrate of natural gas is reduced accordingly and maintaining a constant ratio with combustion air flowrate would increase the temperature of the combustor exhaust gases and turbine discharge gases which could potentially damage the process equipment. Therefore, a control strategy is needed that systematically safeguards the process equipment.




Figure 5. The Control structure for combined cycle gas turbine (CCGT) during power plant load reduction: (a) the temperature of combustor exhaust gases is controlled (b) the temperature of turbine discharge gases is controlled.

In practice, there are two control structures in use ⁴⁶, shown in Figures 5a and 5b. Both control structures have a similar control loop in that, the setpoint of the natural gas flow controller is adjusted according to the electricity power demand. However, the two control structures differ in the selected controlled variable in the second control loop. In the first control structure (Figure 5.a), the temperature of the combustor exhaust gases is controlled. By comparison, in the second control structure (Figure 5.b), the temperature of the turbine discharge gases is controlled. The first control strategy requires a recurrent procedure. The reason is that maintaining the temperature of the combustor exhaust gases at a constant value results in an increase in the temperature of the turbine discharge gases which can damage the downstream HRSG section. Therefore, the operational strategy in the first control structure consists of two iterative control modes:

Mode (i): The flowrate of the natural gas is reduced while the flowrate of the combustion air is maintained constant (dotted line in Figure 6a). This results in a reduction in the temperature of the turbine discharge gases (descending dotted line in Figure 6c).

Mode (ii): The temperature of combustion exhaust gases is controlled using the combustion air flowrate (constant dotted line in Figure 6d) as the flowrate of the natural gas is further reduced. This results in an increase (ascending dotted line in Figure 6c) in the temperature of the turbine discharge gases until it reaches a limit where there is a risk of thermal shock to the downstream equipment. The control system switches to Mode (i).

Unlike the first control strategy, the second control strategy requires only one operational mode. The reason is that by controlling the temperature of the turbine discharge gases (solid line in Figure 6c) the temperature of combustion exhaust gases decreases (solid line in Figure 6d). In other words, the constraint on the turbine discharge temperature becomes active first and automatically satisfies the constraint on the combustion exhaust temperature. Figures 6a and 6b suggest that the second control strategy is optimal with respect to the CO₂ separation as it produces less flue gas with a higher CO₂ content, i.e., easier carbon capture task.




Figure 6. The flowrate of flue gas (a), The CO₂ mass fraction of flue gas (b), the temperature of turbine discharge gases (c) and the temperature of combustion exhaust gases (d) for the control structures (a) and (b) in Figure 5.

Overall energy conversion efficiency and implications of carbon capture and compression

Table 4 reports the results summary for the scenario in which the capture process is operate with the GCCmax solvent. The features of interest include the flowrate of natural gas feed, the flowrate and composition of the flue gas, the generated power, the required steam for solvent regeneration, the power needed for CO₂ compression, the cost of produced electricity and the overall energy efficiency. Similar results are reported in Table 5 where the MEA reference solvent is used. In both scenarios, the flowrate of natural gas is gradually reduced from the nominal value of 26.87 kg/s by almost 50% and the design and operation of the capture plant are optimized according to the simulation-optimization framework shown in Figure 1. These Tables exhibit common observations regarding the implications of electricity load reduction for power generation with CO₂ capture. In all scenarios, CO₂ capture and compression impose energetic penalties in terms of the required steam for solvent regeneration and the electric power needed for CO₂ compression. In addition, as the electricity load is decreased, the energy conversion efficiency is reduced, due to the reduced efficiency of process equipment

such as turbines and compressors. The combination of these penalties reduces the net produced electricity and decreases the overall energy efficiency.

Table 4. The results of flexible operation of NGCC power plant for various electricity load, with and without CO₂ capture and compression plants: GCCmax solvent.

		Nominal ^a	100% load	75% load	50% load
NG flowrate ^b	kg/s	26.87	26.87	21.08	15.25
Flue gas flowrate	kg/s	1214.8	1214.8	1022.6	801.5
Flue gas composition: N ₂	Mass fraction	0.7601	0.7601	0.7611	0.7623
Flue gas composition: O ₂	Mass fraction	0.1169	0.1169	0.1230	0.1294
Flue gas composition: H ₂ O	Mass fraction	0.0647	0.0647	0.0615	0.0581
Flue gas composition: CO ₂	Mass fraction	0.0583	0.0583	0.0544	0.0502
Generated power in NGCC ^b	MW	747.18	698.78	510.43	341.75
Extracted steam ^b	kg/s	-	68.24	52.4	36.76
Power consumed in compressors ^b	MW	-	20.68	15.88	11.64
Net produced electricity ^b	MW	747.18	678.1	494.55	330.1
Energy content of feed (HHV) ^b	MW	1292.62	1292.62	1014.07	733.66
CO ₂ captured	Kg/s	63.74	63.74	50.07	36.20
Electricity costs	\$/MWh	65.00	71.62	77.04	83.50
Overall conversion efficiency	%	57.8	52.46	48.77	44.99

Notes: ^a Nominal refers to the standalone scenario where the power plant is operated at its nominal operating point without CO₂ capture and compression plants. ^b the reported flowrates and power values are for the overall process and include the two trains of CCGT, HRSG, CO₂ capture and compression sections.

Table 5. The results of flexible operation of NGCC power plant for various electricity load, with and without CO₂ capture and compression plants: MEA baseline solvent.

		Nominal ^a	100% load	75% load	50% load
NG flowrate ^b	kg/s	26.87	26.87	21.08	15.25
Flue gas flowrate	kg/s	1214.8	1214.8	1022.6	801.5
Flue gas composition: N ₂	Mass fraction	0.7601	0.7601	0.7611	0.7623
Flue gas composition: O ₂	Mass fraction	0.1169	0.1169	0.1230	0.1294
Flue gas composition: H ₂ O	Mass fraction	0.0647	0.0647	0.0615	0.0581
Flue gas composition: CO ₂	Mass fraction	0.0583	0.0583	0.0544	0.0502
Generated power in NGCC ^b	MW	747.18	679.94	495.89	331.09
Extracted steam ^b	kg/s	-	98.12	77.16	54.59
Power consumed in compressors ^b	MW	-	20.68	15.88	11.64
Net produced electricity ^b	MW	747.18	659.26	480.01	319.45
CO ₂ captured	Kg/s	63.74	63.74	50.07	36.20
Energy content of feed (HHV) ^b	MW	1292.45	1292.45	1013.95	733.53
Electricity costs	\$/MWh	65.00	73.67	79.38	86.29
Overall conversion efficiency	%	57.8	51.01	47.34	43.55

Notes: ^a Nominal refers to the standalone scenario where the power plant is operated at its nominal operating point without CO₂ capture and compression plants. ^b the reported flowrates and power values are for the overall process and include the two trains of CCGT, HRSG, CO₂ capture and compression sections.

The implications of load reduction for operation of the capture plant are more convoluted. To enable the discussions more details are provided in Tables 6 and 7 which report the design and operational specifications for the load reduction scenarios, in the case of GCCmax and MEA solvents, respectively. As the electricity load is reduced, the concentration of CO₂ in the flue gas (Tables 4 and 5) decreases, which suggests a more difficult separation task. On the contrary, more contact area (shown by packing volume KPI in Tables 6 and 7) becomes available between the gas and liquid phases. Then, it is for the optimization algorithm to adjust the solvent circulation rate and reboiler steam for each electricity load scenario and establish a trade-off between the capital investment and the energy costs. Overall a minor decrease in the heating and cooling indicators and solvent circulation indicators are observed for load reduction scenarios. Another important feature of interest is the design and operation of the absorber column. The absorber experiences the largest variations during load reduction due to drastic variations in the flue gas flowrates. While the desired extent of CO₂ capture constrains the required gas-liquid contact area, a tall/thin column would result in very high pressure drops at full load operation and a short/fat column would result in channelling during part-load operation. Therefore, it was for the optimization algorithm to find a compromise design which satisfies the CO₂ capture constraint and ensures process operability in all load reduction scenarios. Tables 6 and 7 suggest that the optimized columns were neither fat nor thin but almost square. The justification for the large heat transfer areas is the fact that the overall economy is governed by the required reboiler steam. Such a large heat transfer area may require special equipment such as plate heat exchangers. Since the heat-transfer area was the same in all scenarios, the approach temperatures are smaller in part-load scenarios as less solvent is circulated. Finally, a comparison between the KPIs in Tables 6 and 7 suggests that GCCmax features superior performance as it required 45% less column packing, 30% less steam, 54% less cooling water, and 7% less pumping energy (shown by solvent circulation rate), per unit mass of captured CO₂. The estimated total annualized costs of the capture process at full-load were 3.15×10^7 \$/year and 3.91×10^7 \$/year for GCCmax and MEA solvents, respectively.

Table 6. The results of GCCmax solvent for various load reduction scenarios (all the results are reported for one train)

		50% load	75% load	100% load
Absorber				
Diameter	m	13.58	13.58	13.58
Length	m	12.47	12.47	12.47
Absorber top pressure	Pa	1.29E+05	1.18E+05	1.03E+05
Absorber bottom pressure	Pa	1.35E+05	1.35E+05	1.35E+05
Lean Solvent to absorber				
Flowrate	kg/s	840.622	1139.86	1383
Temperature	K	313.15	313.15	313.15
Water	Mass fraction	0.5036	0.5036	0.5036
CO ₂	Mass fraction	0.0864	0.0864	0.0864
GCCmax	Mass fraction	0.4100	0.4100	0.4100
Lean-Rich Heat Exchanger				
Area	m ²	69398	69398	69398
Lean inlet temperature	K	384.3	384.3	384.3
Lean outlet temperature	K	328.1	329.5	330.8
Rich inlet temperature	K	327.0	327.9	328.4
Rich outlet temperature	K	383.9	383.4	382.8
Desorber				
Diameter	m	6.59	6.59	6.59
Length	m	6.11	6.11	6.11
Reboiler				
Reboiler temperature	K	384.3	384.3	384.3
Reboiler pressure	Pa	2.21×10 ⁵	2.21×10 ⁵	2.21×10 ⁵
Stream flowrate	kg/s	18.38	26.20	34.12
Steam inlet pressure	Pa	3.61×10 ⁵	3.61×10 ⁵	3.61×10 ⁵
Steam inlet temperature	K	402.8	402.8	402.8
Condenser temperature	K	313.15	313.15	313.15
Lean solvent cooler temperature	K	313.15	313.15	313.15
Carbon capture target	%	90.0	90.0	90.0
Key process indicators (KPIs)				
Packing volume	m ³ / (tonne CO ₂ hr)	30.9	22.4	17.5
Heating duty	MJ/tonne CO ₂	2166	2251	2348
Cooling duty	MJ/ tonne CO ₂	1990	2179	2305
Circulation rate	ton solvent/ tonne CO ₂	46.7	46.5	45.7
Total Purchased Equipment costs	\$	8.47×10 ⁶	8.47×10 ⁶	8.47×10 ⁶
Annualized Energy Costs	\$/year	1.13×10 ⁷	1.62×10 ⁷	2.13×10 ⁷
Total Annualized Costs (TACs)	\$/year	2.15×10 ⁷	2.63×10 ⁷	3.15×10 ⁷

Table 7. The results of MEA baseline solvent for various load reduction scenarios (all the results are reported for one train)

		50% load	75% load	100% load
Absorber				
Diameter	m	14.99	14.99	14.99
Length	m	14.75	14.75	14.75
Absorber top pressure	Pa	1.28E+05	1.20E+05	1.03E+05
Absorber bottom pressure	Pa	1.35E+05	1.35E+05	1.35E+05
Lean Solvent to absorber				
Flowrate	kg/s			
Temperature	K	313.9	313.9	313.9
Concentration				
Water	Mass fraction	0.6504	0.6504	0.6504
MEA	Mass fraction	0.2820	0.2820	0.2820
CO ₂	Mass fraction	0.0676	0.0676	0.0676
Lean-Rich Heat Exchanger				
Area	m ²	60174.5	60174.5	60174.5
Lean inlet temperature	K	388.6	388.6	388.7
Lean outlet temperature	K	332.7	334.3	334.3
Rich inlet temperature	K	326.8	327.7	327.9
Rich outlet temperature	K	384.3	382.7	381.6
Desorber				
Diameter	m	11.47	11.47	11.47
Length	m	10.20	10.20	10.20
Reboiler				
Reboiler temperature	K	388.6	388.6	388.7
Reboiler pressure	Pa	1.85×10 ⁵	1.85×10 ⁵	1.85×10 ⁵
Stream flowrate	kg/s	27.30	38.58	49.06
Steam inlet pressure	Pa	3.05×10 ⁵	3.05×10 ⁵	3.05×10 ⁵
Steam inlet temperature	K	400.6	400.6	400.6
Condenser temperature	K	313.9	313.9	313.9
Lean solvent cooler temperature	K	313.9	313.9	313.9
Carbon capture target	%	90.0	90.0	90.0
Key process indicators (KPIs)				
Packing volume	m ³ / (tonne CO ₂ ×hr)	55.95	40.7	32.2
Heating duty	MJ/tonne CO ₂	3241.2	3329.9	3348.2
Cooling duty	MJ/ tonne CO ₂	4754.6	4991.7	4998.2
Circulation rate	ton solvent/ tonne CO ₂	53.1	51.6	49.3
Total Purchased Equipment costs	\$	8.28×10 ⁶	8.28×10 ⁶	8.28×10 ⁶
Annualized Energy Costs	\$/year	1.54×10 ⁷	2.18×10 ⁷	2.76×10 ⁷
Total Annualized Costs (TACs)	\$/year	2.64×10 ⁷	3.31×10 ⁷	3.91×10 ⁷

Conclusions

The present research studied scale up and integration of a solvent-based carbon capture process into a natural gas combined cycle (NGCC) power plant for a novel solvent, GCCmax, and the MEA reference solvent. The aim was to establish and quantify the superior performance of the new solvent at an industrial scale. Furthermore, the present research provided in-depth insights into retrofit and flexible operation of NGCC power plants. It was observed that the control strategy for the combined cycle gas turbine (CCGT) during load reduction, has profound implications for the flowrate and composition of flue gas, and hence affects carbon capture costs. It was also observed that NGCC power plants are less efficient at part-load operational scenarios. In the present research, the method of integrated process design and control was adapted and solved. The proposed optimization algorithm successfully established a trade-off between the design and operational criteria. The overall total annual costs in terms of capital investment and energy costs were minimized while the process operability was ensured under all load reduction scenarios.

Since comparison between various economic analysis available in open literature is challenging due to different scope of system analysis, modelling details and the economic estimation methods, and in the absence of economic data from industrial-scale demonstration plants, the present study chose to apply a set of key process indicators (KPIs) enabling objective and reproducible comparisons. In all scenarios the GCCmax performed better KPIs than the MEA reference solvent. GCCmax belongs to the family of the amine-promoted buffer salt (APBS) solvents. It features a lower heat of absorption compared to MEA and its kinetics is enhanced by a buffer salt. This combination enables GCCmax to require less regeneration energy and to feature a higher CO₂ loading, resulting in a superior performance compared to the MEA benchmarks. While the comparative study was tailored to the aforementioned solvents, the research methodology is generic and provides effective standards and benchmarking criteria for new solvent development.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the financial support by Carbon Clean Solutions (CCSL) under UK-Department of Energy & Climate Change (DECC) grant. We are also thankful to Process Systems Enterprise Ltd (PSE) for technical support and providing modelling libraries.

References

1. International Energy Agency (IEA). World energy outlook. Paris: International Energy Agency (IEA), 2014.
2. Bottoms RR. Process for separating acidic gases. US patent no. 1783901, 1930.
3. International Energy Agency (IEA). Greenhouse gas R&D Programme. Retrofit of CO₂ capture to natural gas combined cycle power plants. Paris: report number 2005/1.
4. National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL). Cost and performance baseline for fossil energy plants, Volume 1: Bituminous coal and natural gas to electricity. Revision 2. November 2010, report number DOE/NETL-2010/1397.
5. Manzolini G, Sanchez Fernandez E, Rezvani S, Macchi E, Goetheer ELV, Vlught TJH. Economic assessment of novel amine based CO₂ capture technologies integrated in power plants based on European Benchmarking Task Force methodology. *Applied Energy*. 2015; 138: 546–558.
6. Lucquiaud M, Gibbins J. On the integration of CO₂ capture with coal-fired power plants: A methodology to assess and optimise solvent-based post-combustion capture systems. *Chemical Engineering Research and Design*. 2011; 89: 1553-1571.
7. Romeo LM, Bolea I, Y Lara, Escosa JM. Optimization of intercooling compression in CO₂ capture systems. *Applied Thermal Engineering*. 2009; 29: 1744-1751.
8. Karimi M, Hillestad M, Svendsen HF. Capital costs and energy considerations of different alternative stripper configurations for post combustion CO₂ capture. *Chemical Engineering Research and Design*. 2011; 89: 1229-1236.
9. Pfaff I, Oexmann J, Kather A. Optimised integration of post-combustion CO₂ capture process in greenfield power plants. *Energy*. 2010; 35: 4030-4041.
10. Jonshagen K, Sipöcz N, Genrup M. A novel approach of retrofitting a combined cycle with post combustion CO₂ capture. *Journal of Engineering for Gas Turbines and Power*. 2010; 133: 011703-1-011703-7.
11. Khalilpour R, Abbas A. HEN optimization for efficient retrofitting of coal-fired power plants with post-combustion carbon capture. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*. 2011; 5: 189-199.
12. Biliyok C, Yeung H. Evaluation of natural gas combined cycle power plant for post-combustion CO₂ capture integration. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*. 2013; 19: 396-405.

13. Luo X, Wang M, Chen J. Heat integration of natural gas combined cycle power plant integrated with post-combustion CO₂ capture and compression. *Fuel*. 2015; 151: 110-117.
14. Li H, Ditaranto M, Berstad D. Technologies for increasing CO₂ concentration in exhaust gas from natural gas-fired power production with post-combustion, amine-based CO₂ capture. *Energy*. 2011; 36: 1124-1133.
15. Oyekan BA, Rochelle GT. Energy performance of stripper configurations for CO₂ capture by aqueous amines. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*. 2006; 45: 2457-2464.
16. Le Moullec Y, Neveux T, Al Azki A, Chikukwa A, Hoff KA. Process modifications for solvent-based post-combustion CO₂ capture. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*. 2014; 31: 96-112.
17. Ahn H, Luberti M, Liu Z, Brandani S. Process configuration studies of the amine capture process for coal-fired power plants. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*. 2013; 16: 29-40,
18. Damartzis, T., Papadopoulos, A.I., Seferlis, P., Process flowsheet design optimization for various amine-based solvents in post-combustion CO₂ capture plants. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 2015: In press. (doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.04.129).
19. Karimi M, Hillestad M, Svendsen HF. Investigation of the dynamic behavior of different stripper configurations for post-combustion CO₂ capture. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*. 2012; 7: 230-239.
20. Sharifzadeh M. Integration of process design and control: A review. *Chemical Engineering Research and Design*. 2013; 91: 2515-2549.
21. Mac Dowell N, Shah N. The multi-period optimisation of an amine-based CO₂ capture process integrated with a super-critical coal-fired power station for flexible operation. *Computers & Chemical Engineering*. 2015; 74: 169-183.
22. Delarue E, Martens P, D'haeseleer W. Market opportunities for power plants with post-combustion carbon capture. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*. 2012; 6: 12-20.
23. Lawal A, Wang M, Stephenson P, Obi O. Demonstrating full-scale post-combustion CO₂ capture for coal-fired power plants through dynamic modelling and simulation. *Fuel*. 2012; 101: 115-128.
24. Chalmers H, Gibbins J. Initial evaluation of the impact of post-combustion capture of carbon dioxide on supercritical pulverised coal power plant part load performance. *Fuel*. 2007; 86: 2109-2123.

25. Cohen SM, Rochelle GT, Webber ME. Optimal operation of flexible post-combustion CO₂ capture in response to volatile electricity prices. *Energy Procedia*. 2011;4: 2604-2611.
26. Seader JD, Henley EJ, Roper DK. *Separation Process Principles* (3rd edition). Hoboken, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2013.
27. Onda K, Takeuchi H, Okumoto Y. Mass transfer coefficients between gas and liquid phases in packed columns. *Journal of Chemical Engineering of Japan*. 1968;1: 56-62.
28. Bravo JL, Fair JR. Generalized correlation for mass transfer in packed distillation columns. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Process Design and Development*. 1982; 21: 162-170.
29. Billet R, Schultes M. Predicting mass transfer in packed columns. *Chemical Engineering & Technology*. 1993; 16: 1-9.
30. Bravo JL, Rocha JA, Fair JR. Mass transfer in Gauze Packings. *Hydrocarbon Processing*. 1985;64:56-60.
31. Bravo JL, Rocha JA, Fair JR. A comprehensive model for the performance of columns containing structured packings. *Institution of Chemical Engineers Symposium Series*. 1992; 128: A489-A507.
32. Mac Dowell N, Samsatli NJ, Shah N. Dynamic modelling and analysis of an amine-based post-combustion CO₂ capture absorption column. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*. 2013; 12: 247-258.
33. Mac Dowell N, Llovel F, Adjiman CS, Jackson G, Galindo A. Modeling the fluid phase behavior of carbon dioxide in aqueous solutions of monoethanolamine using transferable parameters with the saft-vr approach. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*. 2010;49: 1883-1899.
34. Sharifzadeh M, Shah, N. Comparative studies of CO₂ capture solvents for gas-fired power plants: Integrated modelling and pilot plant assessments. Accepted for publication at *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*.
35. Couper JR, Penney WR, Fair JR. *Chemical process equipment selection and design* (3rd edition). Burlington: Elsevier Science, 2012.
36. Peters MS, Timmerhaus KD, West RE. *Plant design and economics for chemical engineers* (5th edition). London: McGraw-Hill Chemical Engineering Series, 2003.
37. Electricity wholesale market [Internet]. Washington: US Energy Information Administration; US Department of Energy, c2001-15. [cited 2015 April 8]. Available from: <http://www.eia.gov/electricity/wholesale/>
38. Ulrich GD, Vasudevan PT. How to estimate utility costs. *Chemical Engineering*. 2006; April: 66-69.

39. Grossmann IE. Advances in mathematical programming models for enterprise-wide optimization. Computers & Chemical Engineering. 2012; 47: 2-18.
40. Sharifzadeh M, Thornhill NF. Optimal selection of control structures using a steady-state inversely controlled process model. Computers & Chemical Engineering. 2012; 38: 126-138.
41. Sharifzadeh M. Implementation of a steady-state inversely controlled process model for integrated design and control of an ETBE reactive distillation. Chemical Engineering Science. 2013; 92: 21 -39.
42. Sharifzadeh M, Thornhill NF. Integrated design and control using a dynamic inversely controlled process model. Computers & Chemical Engineering. 2013; 48: 121–134.
43. gCCS: Whole chain CCS systems modelling software tool. Process Systems Enterprise. [Internet] [cited 2015 April 8], Available from: <http://www.psenderprise.com/power/ccs/gccs.html>).
44. Advanced Model Library - Gas-Liquid Contactors (AML:GLC) software tool. Process Systems Enterprise. [Internet] [cited 2015 April 8], Available from: http://www.psenderprise.com/processbuilder/libraries/aml_glc.html)
45. gSAFT software tool. Process Systems Enterprise. [Internet] [cited 2015 April 8], Available from: <http://www.psenderprise.com/gproms/options/physprops/saft/>).
46. Weber PT. Modeling gas turbine engine performance at part-load. A Thesis for UTSR Gas Turbine Industrial Fellowship Program, Electric Power Research Institute, Southwest Research Institute, University of Wyoming. [Internet] [cited 2015 April 8], Available from: <http://www.swri.org/utsr/presentations/WeberPatrickRept.pdf>

