



HAL
open science

National corridors for climate change mitigation: managing industrial CO₂ emissions in France

Jeff Bielicki, Guillaume Calas, Richard S. Middleton, Minh Ha-Duong

► To cite this version:

Jeff Bielicki, Guillaume Calas, Richard S. Middleton, Minh Ha-Duong. National corridors for climate change mitigation: managing industrial CO₂ emissions in France. *Greenhouse Gases: Science and Technology*, 2014, 3 (4), pp.262-277. 10.1002/ghg.1395 . hal-00944665

HAL Id: hal-00944665

<https://enpc.hal.science/hal-00944665>

Submitted on 11 May 2014

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

National Corridors for Climate Change Mitigation: Managing Industrial CO₂ Emissions in France

Jeffrey M. Bielicki^{a,b,*}, Guillaume Calas^{c,e}, Richard S. Middleton^d, Minh Ha-Duong^c

First online: 12 DEC 2013

^aDepartment of Civil, Environmental, and Geodetic Engineering, The Ohio State University, 483b Hitchcock Hall, 2070 Neil Avenue, Columbus, OH 43210, U.S.A.

^bThe John Glenn School of Public Affairs, The Ohio State University, 250c Page Hall, 1810 College Road, Columbus, OH 43210. U.S.A.

^cCentre International de Recherche sur l'Environnement et le Développement, CNRS, Campus du Jardin Tropical, 45 bis, avenue de la Belle Gabrielle, 94736 Nogent-sur-Marne Cedex, France.

^dEarth and Environmental Sciences, Los Alamos National Laboratory, MS T003, Los Alamos, NM 87545, U.S.A.

^ePresent Address: Calera Corporation, 100A Albright Way, Los Gatos, CA, 95032, U.S.A.

*Corresponding Author: bielicki.2@osu.edu; phone: (614) 688-2131; fax (614) 292-3780.

Keywords: CO₂ Capture and Storage; Industrial CO₂; Pipeline Routes; Social and Political Acceptance; Qualitative Scenarios; Optimization

Abstract

Planning for the deployment of carbon dioxide capture and storage (CCS) infrastructure must consider numerous uncertainties regarding where and how much CO₂ is produced and where captured CO₂ can be geologically stored. We used *SimCCS* engineering-economic geospatial optimization models to determine the characteristics of CCS deployment in France and corridors for pipelines that are robust to *a priori* uncertainty in CO₂ production from industrial sources and CO₂ storage locations. We found a number of stable routes that are robust to these uncertainties, and thus can provide early options for pipeline planning and rights-of-way acquisition.

1 Introduction

The need to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by present energy systems and industrial systems is well established for environmental, social, economic, and health reasons.^{1, 2} Carbon dioxide (CO₂) is the most worrisome GHG because of its long residence time in the atmosphere and the present societal reliance on energy and industrial processes that emit it. A transition away from systems that vent CO₂ emissions to the atmosphere requires the deployment of numerous technologies, many of which are mature enough to be readily deployed.³

Much effort has focused on reducing CO₂ emissions from electric power plants that emit CO₂ as a consequence of combusting fossil fuels (namely coal, but also natural gas and oil). In 2010, fossil-fueled electric power plants contributed approximately 41% of worldwide CO₂ emissions.⁴ In addition,

many industrial facilities also emit CO₂ as a byproduct of the conversion processes that produce their marketable goods. High CO₂-emitting facilities include cement manufacturers, oil and ethanol refineries, ammonia producers, and iron and steel mills, among others. For example, cement manufacturing emitted approximately 1.9 GtCO₂ in 2006, and accounts for approximately 5% of anthropogenic CO₂ emissions,⁵ whereas steel production emitted approximately 2.7 GtCO₂ in 2011.⁶

CO₂ capture and storage (CCS) is one technological option that reduces CO₂ emissions.^{3, 7} CCS is an important component of the portfolio of climate mitigation technologies, in part because it is the only technology that can address CO₂ emissions from across sectors of the economy. CCS is a process whereby CO₂ is collected from large point sources, compressed and transported (most likely by pipeline) to locations where it is injected into deep sedimentary basins. CO₂ emissions from industrial sources may be substantial, and, in contrast to energy sources, may be better located relative to prospective basins for CO₂ storage. These candidate storage basins have contained fluids such as oil, natural gas, and unusable brine for millions of years, suggesting that the CO₂ will likely be contained and isolated from the atmosphere. Mechanisms that trap CO₂ in these reservoirs can be classified into four categories⁷: (1) structural trapping, (2) residual trapping, (3) solubility trapping, and (4) mineral trapping. The dominant trapping mechanism may evolve over time⁷ and vary by the type of reservoir; long-term trapping in saline aquifers may be dominated by structural⁸ or residual⁹ mechanisms whereas solubility mechanisms dominate in oil⁹ and gas¹⁰ reservoirs.

In some quarters, the focus of CO₂ management has turned to how CO₂ may be put to beneficial reuse in order to have a business case for CCS activities, and CCS thus been re-branded as CCUS to emphasize the possibility of “U”tilizing CO₂. Large volumes of CO₂ may be used to enhance oil recovery (CO₂-EOR)¹¹ or natural gas recovery¹² and produce methane from unmineable coal seams.¹³ The United States has over 40 years of

industrial scale experience with CO₂-EOR, and the ability to put CO₂ for uses such as these has been the focus of much effort to develop the requisite knowledge.¹⁴ CO₂ that is captured from anthropogenic sources is sometimes called "byproduct CO₂" as opposed to "extracted CO₂" that is mined from natural deposits such as salt domes.¹⁵ Other potential options to use the large volumes of byproduct CO₂ include pressure support for geothermal energy production from hydrothermal sources,¹⁶ use as the fluid to stimulate impervious formations capable of producing electricity from geothermal heat¹⁷ and as the primary working fluid in geothermal energy applications in sedimentary basins.¹⁸

A transition away from CO₂-emitting economies requires policy, planning, and regulatory treatment that encourages adoption, and societal acceptance of the associated activities in order for these new means diffuse broadly. Political and institutional commitments to CO₂ emissions reduction can occur through a variety of means, including quotas that cap the amount of CO₂ that can be emitted and pricing mechanisms that make it more costly for a facility to emit CO₂. Norway was the first country to enact a CO₂ tax, in 1991, which then led to the first industrial scale CO₂-injection-for-storage project at Sleipner, in 1996. A few places worldwide have followed with mechanisms that impose costs on facilities that emit CO₂ to the atmosphere: the European Union Exchange Trading System (EU-ETS), the Australian Carbon Tax, the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) in the U.S. Northeast, the Chicago Climate Exchange, and the California Cap-and-Trade program. In addition, CCS infrastructure planning and deployment must consider a variety of interacting factors. For example, CO₂ pipeline infrastructure must be deployed in a way that is most acceptable and minimally disruptive while designed to connect locations that will be useful over time, given the possible evolution in CO₂ emissions locations and quantities as well as the availability of CO₂ disposal options for reuse or storage. Originally implemented in 2005, the EU-ETS provided CO₂ emissions allowances to six GHG intensive industries: electricity generation, cement manufacturing, glass production, iron production, chemicals production, and paper and pulp production. After the collapse of permit trading prices in 2007, the EU-ETS was re-designed and broadened for Phase III, from 2013 to 2020. Of importance for this paper, Phase III of the EU-ETS consolidates the 27 individual CO₂ emissions caps for each of the member countries into one EU-wide cap, and broadens its application beyond the original six industries; Facilities from industrial sectors in Europe must also possess emissions allocations in order to emit CO₂ to the atmosphere. Without political support that considers the realities of the current physical, economic, and social systems, well-intentioned policy and planning will likely have limited success.

We investigated the desirable spatial arrangement of CCS activities in France, arising from three scenarios for the availability of CO₂ disposal options combined with three scenarios for CO₂ emissions from stationary sources. We construct the potential storage options from a 2011 roadmap for CCS by the French Environment and Energy Agency, Agence de l'Environnement et de la Maîtrise de l'Energie (ADEME)¹⁹ that includes qualitative descriptions of the extent of CCS deployment as a consequence of technical, societal, and regulatory enablers. The CO₂ production scenarios are based on data for

CO₂ emissions from sources in the electricity and industrial sectors of France from 2003 to 2011 and are constructed *a priori* uncertainty in the locations and quantities of CO₂. We applied a coupled engineering-economic, geospatial optimization model to the nine combinations of these scenarios to identify the cost-minimized deployment of CCS and the robustness of potential pipeline routes to these differences in CO₂ storage availability and uncertainty in CO₂ emissions. France has typically emphasized energy system planning and public management, but there has been no CO₂ transportation pipeline for private reuse of CO₂ to date.

2 Case Study: France

France is an ideal case study for the deployment of CCS for CO₂-emitting facilities from the energy and industrial sectors: (a) France participates in the EU-ETS; (b) the majority of its CO₂ emissions come from industrial sources; (c) France has actively pursued relevant understanding of the technical, social, and political mechanisms and their influence on CCS deployment; and (d) France has typically emphasized energy system planning and public management, but there has been no CO₂ transportation pipeline for private reuse of CO₂ to date..

Originally implemented in 2005, the EU-ETS provided CO₂ emissions allowances to six GHG intensive industries: electricity generation, cement manufacturing, glass production, iron production, chemicals production, and paper and pulp production. After the collapse of permit trading prices in 2007, the EU-ETS was re-designed and broadened for Phase III, from 2013 to 2020. Of importance for this paper, Phase III of the EU-ETS consolidates the 27 individual CO₂ emissions caps for each of the member countries into one EU-wide cap, and broadens its application beyond the original six industries; Facilities from industrial sectors in Europe must also possess emissions allocations in order to emit CO₂ to the atmosphere.

The amount of CO₂ emitted from France between 2003 and 2011 ranged between 131 and 203 MtCO₂/year, most of which did not come from the electricity sector. In 2011, electricity generated in France totaled 530 TWh, 421 TWh (79.4%) of which came from nuclear power plants, 66.5 TWh from renewables (mostly hydroelectric) and 45.1 TWh from facilities that use fossil fuels as the primary source of energy.²⁰ In that year, CO₂ emissions in France totaled 148.3 MtCO₂, only one-fifth of which (30.2 MtCO₂) came from facilities with the primary purpose of producing energy.²¹ As a consequence, France emitted only 13.9 MtCO₂ from the electricity sector in 2011. An equal amount of CO₂ was emitted from oil refineries that year, and steel mills emitted 19.5 MtCO₂.

Despite having minimal CO₂ emissions from the electricity sector and relatively little remaining coal reserves when compared to other major economies actively pursuing CCS development (e.g., 160 million tonnes vs. 438 *billion* tonnes in the United States and 40 billion tonnes in Australia)²² France has actively pursued CCS research. For example, the

Lacq Pilot CCS project injected 51,000 tCO₂ into a depleted gas reservoir between January 2010 and March 2013. Overall,

France has three sedimentary basins; the Paris Basin is the largest and includes the Dogger and Trias aquifers as candidate CO₂ storage reservoirs. A few studies have sought to estimate the CO₂ storage capacities of these aquifers, one of which estimated that the Dogger could store 13.6 GtCO₂ and that the Trias aquifer could store 15.5 GtCO₂.²³

In 2010, ADEME developed a CCS roadmap for France through an expert stakeholder-driven scenario process, using well-defined methods.¹⁹ The ADEME panel identified three major topics that will be influential in the development and deployment of CCS: (1) incentives and regulatory policy, more generally, within France, in Europe, and throughout the world; (2) the technical and societal impediments to deployment; and (3) the deployment, maintenance, and operation of the CO₂ transportation infrastructure, including the entities involved with planning and financing this infrastructure. The ADEME study identified four “visions” for the deployment of CCS based on the intersection of two mechanisms underlying the viability of large-scale deployment: the degree to which deployment is impeded by technical and societal restrictions, and the existence of incentives and regulation. The four ADEME Visions are summarized in Table 1.

[Table 1 approximately here]

We used two versions of the Scalable Infrastructure Model for CO₂ Capture and Storage, *SimCCS*, a geospatial economic-engineering optimization model, that simultaneously considers CO₂ capture, transportation, and storage. *SimCCS*^{CAP}^{24, 25} deploys spatially optimized infrastructure based on a quantity target, whereas *SimCCS*^{PRICE}^{26, 27} deploys the optimal spatial configuration in response to a CO₂ price. *SimCCS*^{PRICE} thus considers the costs of the CCS system to be deployed and the costs incurred by paying the CO₂ price for emitting CO₂ to the atmosphere. Section 3 provides more details on the *SimCCS* models.

We limited our analysis to CO₂ capture and transportation within France, leaving the possibility of international pipelines for future work. Other analyses of infrastructure for CCS in Europe have investigated potential national²⁸ and international^{29, 30} pipeline networks. These analyses, however, have not been based on roadmaps that incorporate non-technical constraints on deployment. Further, unlike *SimCCS*, these methodologies do not have the spatial resolution to incorporate characteristics of the land and surface interests that will influence routing.

[Table 2 approximately here]

Our storage scenarios are based on the scenarios developed by the ADEME process for the interaction between varying degrees of (a) regulation and incentives and (b) technological and societal constraints. We developed three scenarios for CO₂ storage options (Table 2), conforming to the potentials articulated in Visions 2-4 of the ADEME CCUS roadmap for France:

A. **North Sea.** CO₂ captured from French sources is transported by surface pipelines to a hub in northern France at Le Havre. This CO₂ is then transported in a subsea pipeline to a larger hub at Rotterdam where it is further transported for injection into locations under the North Sea, either for storage or CO₂-EOR. Since Le Havre serves as a hub for further transportation to other offshore locations, there is no capacity constraint.

B. **North Sea and Onshore in the Parisian Basin.** In addition to the hub at Le Havre, CO₂ could be transported onshore to locations atop the Parisian Basin. We use effective storage capacities that are less than 10% of previous estimates²³: 1.1 GtCO₂ in total over our three Trias injection locations and 900 MtCO₂ in total over our three Dogger injection locations. We used the six potential injection locations,³¹ as shown in Table 3.

C. **Offshore.** This storage scenario corresponds to Vision 3. In addition to the hub at Le Havre for CO₂ to be stored in the North Sea, a hub is developed in Southern France at Marseille for offshore storage in the Mediterranean Sea. The Marseille hub, like that at Le Havre, is not modeled with a capacity constraint.

[Table 3 approximately here]

and scaled them using their sensitivity analyses and the parameters for our storage locations. Erreur : source de la référence non trouvée

[Figure 1 approximately here]

Previous research on CO₂ sources in France identified clusters in five industrial areas that can provide early opportunities for CO₂ capture and transportation: Lorraine, lower Seine, Paris, Nord-Pas-de-Calais, and Provence Alpes-Côte d'Azur.^{32, 33} We acquired CO₂ emissions data for point sources in France from the IREP database²¹ for 2003 through 2011, and chose 39 of the largest CO₂ emitters located within these five clusters, based on

their CO₂ emissions at the midpoint (2007) of the data. Figure 1 shows the locations of these sources and the eight potential CO₂ disposal options in Scenarios A-C. For sources, colors indicate economic sector, and size indicates yearly CO₂ emissions capacity. Green stars indicate the location of sinks in the Parisian Basin or hub locations for offshore pipelines to the North Sea (ID 7) or the Mediterranean Sea (ID 8).

[Table 4 approximately here]

[Figure 2 approximately here]

Figure 2 shows the total CO₂ emissions from all of the 1,577 sources in the IREP database for France and from the 39 sources that were selected for this study. Between 2003 and 2011, France averaged emissions of 164 MtCO₂/yr; the amount of CO₂ emitted from these 39 sources varied over time (Figure 3), and accounted for between 35% and 48% of the total CO₂ emissions in France. In this subset of the data, sources in the electricity sector emitted 13.9 MtCO₂, an equal amount of CO₂ was emitted from oil refineries that year, and steel mills emitted 19.5 MtCO₂. Some sources did not exist at the beginning of the time period we used (2003), and some did not exist at the end of the time period (2011). Further, the 2009 global recession is evident in the decrease in industrial output and CO₂ emissions; some sources' CO₂ emissions dipped to near zero.

[Figure 3 approximately here]

We constructed three scenarios for CO₂ production based on these data for these 39 sources during the time span of this data. These scenarios were established to represent uncertainty in future CO₂ production for each individual facility: (1) average, (2) maximum, and (3) minimum. The minimum scenario, thus assigns zero to those facilities that did not emit CO₂ during the timespan, either because they were temporarily or permanently not operating. We used *SimCCS* to determine how much of the CO₂ that is produced by each facility in each scenario should be captured, and thus how much would be left to be emitted.

3 The Scalable Infrastructure Model for CO₂ Capture and Storage (*SimCCS*)

SimCCS, is a coupled engineering-economic geospatial optimization model that determines the cost-minimized optimal deployment of the integrated CO₂ capture, transport, and storage system.²⁴ *SimCCS* has been used to model CCS deployment in California according to a cap on CO₂ emissions,²⁴ and extended to model responses to a CO₂ price,²⁶ temporal evolution in these prices,³⁴ and to address reservoir uncertainty on

infrastructure. *SimCCS* has also been applied to a range of CO₂ emission sources including coal and natural gas power plants,³⁵ oil shale industry,³⁶ oil sands production,²⁷ and ethylene manufacturing.²⁵ The *SimCCS* approach has been the point of departure for other CCS infrastructure models³⁰ and for wind³⁷ and hydrogen³⁸ energy technology deployment.

SimCCS includes a range of economic and engineering considerations. Capture costs are separated into capital, fixed operation and maintenance (O&M), and variable O&M costs. Consequently, the model can capture the tradeoff between infrastructure capacity and capture utilization rates. Transportation costs are based on a combination of right-of-way costs and construction costs, including materials, labor, and planning costs. Pipeline costs vary significantly with pipeline capacity. *SimCCS* splits storage and injection costs into two parts: upfront reservoir costs (such as surveying and permitting) and injection costs. Injection cost for an individual reservoir is driven by the number and cost of wells required to inject the optimized amount of CO₂. Each well has a fixed cost (such as the drilling and material costs) and a variable O&M cost (such as pumping, tracers, and pore space purchase). Each reservoir has a fixed storage capacity and a maximum injection rate. Overall, *SimCCS* optimizes the infrastructure in order to minimize total costs while (i) capturing a target (or cap) amount of CO₂, or (ii) maximizing captured CO₂ while keeping CCS costs below the CO₂ price. Since leakage in the system is assumed to be zero, that amount of CO₂ captured by a *SimCCS* cost-minimizing optimization equals the amount stored in the geologic reservoir.

We used established cost estimates for CO₂ storage in Europe from the Zero Emissions Platform (ZEP)³⁹ and scaled them using their sensitivity analyses and the parameters for our storage locations. The ZEP approach establishes broad “most likely”, “maximum”, and “minimum” values for relevant storage parameters, and uses them to estimate storage costs. For generic onshore saline aquifer storage with no legacy wells that can be reworked for CO₂ injection for storage, the “most likely” field capacity is 66 MtCO₂, which ranges between 40 and 200 MtCO₂. The “most likely” well injection rate is 0.8 MtCO₂/year per well, ranging between 0.2 and 2.5 MtCO₂/yr. And the “most likely” well depth is 2000 m, ranging between 1000 and 3000 m. We used three parameters to adjust the ZEP results by the parameters from our injection locations: field capacity, well injection rate, and well depth. We base our cost estimates on a conservatively lower well injection rate of 0.4 MtCO₂/year, and use the depths and estimated capacities specific to our storage options (Erreur : source de la référence non trouvée) to estimate CO₂ storage costs for this study.

We used CO₂ capture costs from available literature, but considerably less effort has investigated the cost to capture CO₂ from industrial sources than from coal-fired power plants. We used published studies and publicly available reports^{31, 40, 41, 42} that provided estimates of capture costs, including the assumption of 90% capture efficiency. In some cases the literature provided ranges of estimates. Estimating the cost to capture CO₂ from a specific facility requires detailed engineering-economic approaches that are tailored to

the individual plant. Each facility will have its own characteristics, and detailed studies such as these, while important for the management, operation, and decision-making of any specific plant, are beyond the scope of this paper. For our simulations, we chose realistic representative capture costs for each facility according to its industrial sector (Table 4).

[Table 4 approximately here]

The map used by *SimCCS* to identify potential routes for CO₂ pipelines incorporates various aspects of the physical, social, and cultural topography that are combined to produce a “cost surface”. This cost surface indicates the degree to which pipeline infrastructure should avoid that location.³⁷ We used the cost surface developed for France,³¹ which includes routing considerations to avoid:

- Existing infrastructure, including roads, highways, and railroads
- Existing rights-of-way, including existing pipelines and transmission lines
- Nature reserves, including biological, biosphere, and nature reserves
- Elevation changes (slope and aspect)
- National and regional parks
- Special protected areas
- Population density

SimCCS applies a modified version of Dijkstra’s shortest path algorithm to the cost surface in order to determine potential pipeline routes between all combinations of sources and sinks (grey in Figure 4). These potential routes thus avoid, to the extent possible, places where it may be more costly to build pipelines.

[Figure 4 approximately here]

Since energy is required to operate capture, compression, and pumping equipment throughout the CCS supply chain, these “energy penalties” can result in additional CO₂ production if the electricity used to satisfy the extra energy is derived from processes that

emit CO₂. If this additional CO₂ is not captured, and instead emitted to the atmosphere, the net change in CO₂ emissions to the atmosphere will be less than the amount of CO₂ being captured and stored. Quantifying the CO₂ emissions that are avoided requires an assessment of where and how the extra energy is being produced. If the electricity comes from a coal-fired power plant, for example, there will be extra CO₂ emissions. But if the electricity for the energy penalty is produced by a nuclear power plant, there will not be any additional CO₂ emissions and the CO₂ that is captured and stored will equal the avoided CO₂. Methods have been developed to incorporate avoided CO₂ into pipeline planning⁴³, but our analysis focused on the CO₂ captured by the sources we include in our three CO₂ production scenarios and stored in the three sink availability scenarios. We did not model electricity sources and flows or the internal characteristics of a power plant that may provide its own makeup electricity to satisfy the energy penalties, and thus we did not attempt to quantify the extra CO₂ that could be emitted as a result of the energy penalties incurred by infrastructure *SimCCS* deploys. As a consequence, we implicitly assumed that the electricity for the energy penalties comes from elsewhere in the economy, but we do not allocate that electricity to specific sources and thus we cannot quantify the difference between the amount of CO₂ that is captured and stored and the net amount of CO₂ emitted to the atmosphere.

4 Results and Discussion

Figure 5 shows the average costs of the CCS system for all of the nine combinations of the three CO₂ production quantities and the three storage options as a function of the amount of CO₂ captured and stored. Figure 6 shows the amount of CO₂ captured and stored as a function of the CO₂ price for these nine combinations. This figure corresponds to the marginal costs associated with Figure 5, with the axes switched. Holding the storage options constant, scenarios involving the minimum amount of CO₂ production are always more costly than those with the average amount of CO₂ over the timeline, and these average CO₂ production scenarios are, in turn, more costly than scenarios that consider the maximum amount of CO₂.

[Figure 5 approximately here]

[Figure 6 approximately here]

Average system costs decrease as the number of storage options increase because additional storage options may be cheaper and/or located closer to the CO₂ sources, resulting in a possible decrease in storage and/or transportation costs. If these additional storage options are not cost-effective to deploy, the economies of scale that can occur

when pipelines are networked together to combine CO₂ flows into larger diameter pipelines are unchanged. As a consequence, holding the CO₂ sources constant while increasing the options for CO₂ disposal can only reduce average costs.⁴⁴ In the application here, systems with storage scenario A (offshore hub at Le Havre) are more costly than those with storage scenario C (offshore hubs at Le Havre and Marseille). Storage scenario B, where CO₂ can be transported to Le Havre for storage under the North Sea or to locations within the Parisian Basin, is the cheapest scenario. Single point-to-point pipelines are inefficient at the system level, and having a few larger sinks can reduce costs through economies of scale. But somewhere between these two end cases, arrangements can exist that might minimize costs due to the flexibility of storage options.

Marginal costs are critical for understanding when a particular source could begin to cost-effectively capture CO₂. A CO₂ price of €65/tCO₂, for example, means that *SimCCS^{PRICE}* optimally identifies the combination of sources, pipelines, and sinks whereby the amount of managed CO₂ is maximized while ensuring that the system-wide marginal cost is less than €65/tCO₂. That is, when making the CCS system handle one more unit of CO₂, that unit of CO₂ will cost €65/tCO₂ or more.

Some differences exist between the results for storage scenario A (Le Havre) and storage scenario C (Le Havre and Marseille) within a single CO₂ production scenario. Both of these storage scenarios transport CO₂ for offshore storage; the availability of these hubs is the major difference between the two scenarios. Adding the hub at Marseille expands the disposal options, which can reduce the CO₂ price at which CCS is cost-effective because the system-wide costs may be reduced as a result of building a shorter pipeline or deploying slightly more costly sources that are more proximal to the additional storage option. The lower-cost network, due to increased storage options, can facilitate more CO₂ being captured and stored for any given CO₂ price.

The plateaus in Figure 6 arise because the majority of the CO₂ being produced by the sources is captured and stored in systems with lower CO₂ prices. When the minimum CO₂ production is considered, CCS begins to be deployed at €61/tCO₂ (Scenario C) and €63/tCO₂ (Scenario A), but deployment begins at the same CO₂ price for the average and maximum CO₂ production scenarios: 55 €/tCO₂ and 45 €/tCO₂, respectively. While CCS begins to be deployed at the same CO₂ price in this maximum CO₂ scenario, the rest of the curve for the amount of CO₂ being captured is shifted to the left and system-wide cost-savings can be realized.

[Figure 7 approximately here]

Figure 7 shows the breakdown in costs for the two cases at each end of the spectrum of CO₂ production and storage options. The top image shows the characteristics of the

most optimistic system—the Most Deployable Options (MDO)—where the maximum amount of CO₂ production is considered along with the most storage options (Scenario B). The bottom image shows the characteristics of the most pessimistic system—the Least Deployable Options (LDO)—where the minimum amount of CO₂ production is considered with only one offshore storage option (Scenario A). These stacked area graphs show the costs for CO₂ capture (red), transport (green), and storage (blue). The grey area represents the system-wide CCS cost which includes the CO₂ price applied to any emissions. When the capture cost (i.e., stacked blue, green, and red areas) and CO₂ price are identical, the stacked areas and the grey area cost coincide. Solid lines indicate how much CO₂ is captured and dashed lines indicate how much CO₂ is emitted.

As stated above, the optimal systems deployed by *SimCCS* are built “all at once” at a constant CO₂ price. The results in Figure 7 show that much more CO₂ is captured, at lower CO₂ prices, and at lower average costs, for the MDO than for the LDO. A single CO₂ source—a lime manufacturer—captures 1.2 MtCO₂/yr for systems designed for CO₂ emissions prices from €27/tCO₂ to €41/tCO₂. CCS systems designed for a €41/tCO₂ price capture an additional 8.4 MtCO₂/yr from three electricity-generating sources. The amount of CO₂ captured then climbs relatively steadily for systems designed for CO₂ prices up to €75/tCO₂ until flattening again at 83 MtCO₂/yr. In contrast, in the LDO case, CO₂ is first captured for systems designed for a CO₂ price of €63/tCO₂ when the system manages 3.8 MtCO₂/yr; for systems designed for CO₂ prices above €63/tCO₂ the amount captured increases relatively steadily to until a system designed for €78/tCO₂ captures 31 MtCO₂/yr.

For the LDO case, CO₂ capture flattens when 5 tCO₂/yr of capturable CO₂ are not captured, and are thus emitted to the atmosphere at a €78/tCO₂ price. In contrast, more than twice this amount (12.3 tCO₂/yr) of capturable CO₂ is emitted in the MDO case when the capture curve flattens. While more CO₂ is emitted (i.e., not captured) at the high end of the CO₂ prices, much more CO₂ is captured in the MDO than in the LDO: 83 MtCO₂/yr for MDO vs. 32 tCO₂/yr for LDO. In addition, the average of total system costs, including both CCS infrastructure costs and costs incurred from emitting CO₂ (CO₂ emissions x CO₂ price), is 15-20% less for the MDO system than the LDO system.

[Figure 8 approximately here]

Figure 8 shows the spatial deployment of the integrated CCS system for CO₂ prices of €40/tCO₂, €60/tCO₂, and €75/tCO₂ for the MDO (top row), LDO (bottom row), and a scenario between MDO and LDO (middle row) combinations. The “between combination” (BDO) is the average amount of CO₂ production combined with the two offshore storage options. Green lines in Figure 8 indicate where pipelines are deployed on the potential routes (grey). Only the MDO has CO₂ captured at €40/tCO₂ price, where the

one lime manufacturer in northern France captures and transports its CO₂ for injection into one of the Trias injection locations in the Parisian Basin. This system expands substantially by €60/tCO₂, where an integrated network captures CO₂ from 32 sources and transports that CO₂ to five storage locations, all of which are located onshore. This network is more extensive at €75/tCO₂, as it connects all but three of the costliest and smallest sources with the onshore reservoirs.

In contrast, a system designed for €60/tCO₂ for the BDO case will deploy only three sources close to the offshore hubs. By €75/tCO₂, CO₂ is captured from all but eight of the sources and is transported by four single (not networked) pipelines, to the offshore hubs, three of which terminate at Le Havre. The pipelines extend from near Nantes (in the west), along the northern coast to near Lille (in the North), and near Metz (in the East) to the northern offshore hub at Le Havre, and from just north of Saint Etienne south to the offshore hub on the Mediterranean Sea at Marseille. The LDO deploys two of these routes at €75/tCO₂: the routes from near Nantes to Le Havre and near Metz to Le Havre.

[Figure 9 approximately here]

Altogether, Figure 9 shows the relative frequencies by which potential pipeline routes are chosen across all nine combinations of CO₂ production and storage options—for 1,203 optimizations conducted by two models of the geospatial deployment of CCS infrastructure, one that optimizes based on the least cost solution to a CO₂ quota (Figure 9, top row) and one that optimizes based on the least cost solution to a CO₂ price (Figure 9, bottom row). In Figure 9, pipeline routes are color-coded by the quintile in which they are deployed, for the aggregate results by CO₂ production scenario (right), CO₂ storage option (middle), and altogether (left) according to CO₂ quotas (top) and CO₂ prices (bottom). . Green indicates that the route was deployed in the top 20% of the time, whereas red indicates that the route was deployed the bottom 20%. The percentages in the legends indicate the percentage of model runs within each quintile. The routes that are deployed most often, and are thus most robust to the emissions and storage uncertainties, are in the top quintile (shown in green).

Figure 9 can be used to indicate where the priorities for pipeline planning and Rights-of-Way (ROW) acquisition should be focused, given the fluctuations in CO₂ emissions and the *a priori* uncertainty of CO₂ storage options. The route south from Saint Etienne to Marseille and the routes that extend from Le Havre southwest to near Nantes, northeast to near Lille, and east along a route south of Paris are all in the top quintile of deployed routes. In addition, a segment of this latter east-west route extending from Reims (just east of Paris) west to Metz where two other segments, one from Nancy to the south and one from the east, are also among the most deployed routes.

5 Conclusions

We investigated pathways for CCS deployment in France using the concept of a “corridor” in numerous ways: (a) our storage scenarios were based on a prior expert-elicitation process that developed scenarios based on institutional and social conditions that encourage, to varying degrees, CCS deployment;¹⁹ (b) our case study is for a country where the majority of its large point source CO₂ emissions are from the industrial, not electrical, sector (France); (c) our CO₂ production scenarios are based on the characteristics of eight years of large point source CO₂ emissions; and (d) we produced a map that indicates priorities for pipeline routes based on how robust these routes are to the *a priori* uncertainty in CO₂ production and CO₂ storage options.

We constructed options for CO₂ storage based on the qualitative scenarios elicited from experts and used them in combination with three scenarios for CO₂ production. These CO₂ production scenarios were based on summary statistics of the emissions by multiple industrial sources in France between 2003 and 2011. While there was variability in the quantities and locations of CO₂ emissions in France over this timeframe, the application of quantitative modeling to qualitative scenarios demonstrates how approaches that optimize infrastructure deployment can be combined with qualitative scenarios that incorporate various degrees of political and social restrictions to assist planning under a variety of situations and in advance of actual deployment.

Even with uncertainty in how many options there may be in the future and where and how much capturable CO₂ may be produced, we found that a number of corridors for pipelines within France exist across the combinations of scenarios; pipeline routes that are robust to the uncertainty in these parameters exist and may be the focus of advance planning and investment for ROWs.

6 Acknowledgments

This international cooperation was supported in part by ADEME convention 10 94 C0012.

7 Tables and Figures

Table 1: Visions for CCS Deployment in France (ADEME, 2011)

		Restrictions due to Technical and Societal Concerns	
		Strong	Weak
Restrictions due to Incentives and Regulatory Policy	Strong	Vision 1: Incremental deployment of CCS.	Vision 2: Restricted to a few large sources and sectors that cannot implement other means to reduce CO ₂ emissions.
	Weak	Vision 3: Strong pooling of CO ₂ from multiple sources and storage in offshore reservoirs.	Vision 4: Large-scale CCS deployment with storage in onshore and offshore reservoirs.

As used by ADEME, 'strong' restrictions significantly impede deployment, whereas 'weak' restrictions impose only minimal barriers."

Table 2 : Case Studies and Sinks for CO₂

Case Study	Onshore (IDs)	Offshore (IDs)
A. <i>North Sea</i>		North Sea (7)
B. <i>North Sea and Parisian Basin</i>	Trias (1-3), Dogger (4-6)	
C. <i>Offshore</i>		North Sea (7), Mediterranean Sea (8)

Table 3: CO₂ Sink Locations, Reservoirs, and Characteristics

ID		Injection Depth [km]	Capacity [MtCO ₂]	Cost [€/tCO ₂]
1	Trias (Bar-le-Duc)	1,000	300	3.55
2	Trias (Orléans)	1,500	500	4.35
3	Trias (Meaux)	2,500	300	5.95
4	Dogger (Orléans)	1,000	225	3.55
5	Dogger (Melun)	2,000	450	5.15
6	Dogger (Châlons)	1,000	225	3.55
7	Le Havre (North Sea Hub)	2,000*		19.30
8	Marseille (Mediterranean Hub)	2,000*		19.30

Unless otherwise noted, injection depths and capacities are from Coussy (2009), BRGM (2009)⁴⁵, and Calas (2011)

*Base case in ZEP (2012).

Table 4: Major CO₂ Sources and Characteristics in Five Industrial Areas in France

Sector	IDs	Total Capturable CO₂ (MtCO ₂ /yr)	CO₂ Capture Costs (€/tCO ₂)
Cement	1, 2, 34-37	6.41	48.87
Chemicals	4, 13, 15, 16, 26, 33, 39	8.11	41.35
Electricity	8-11, 27-32	22.77	34.59
Lime	3	1.16	7.52
Iron and Steel	14, 17, 18, 38	25.53	53.38
Refining	5-7, 12, 19-25	16.82	41.35

CO₂ capture costs ^{27, 33, 38, 39} are converted from USD to € at an exchange rate of 1.3 € to USD.




Figure 1: Carbon Dioxide Sources and Sinks – *Sources*: Thirty-nine sources and IDs are shown. Colors indicate economic sector, and size indicates yearly CO₂ emissions capacity. *Sinks*: Green stars indicate the location of sinks in the Parisian Basin (Trias Aquifer, IDs 1-3, depth 1500-1800m; Dogger Aquifer, IDs 4-6, depth 2000-2500m) or hub locations for offshore pipelines to the North Sea (ID 7) or the Mediterranean Sea (ID 8).




Figure 2: Total CO₂ Emissions in France and the Total CO₂ Emissions from the 39 Sources Selected in Five Industrial Areas - Over the span of the nine years between 2003 and 2011, France averaged emissions of 164 MtCO₂/yr. Over this timespan, CO₂ emissions from the 39 sources in this study ranged from 35% and 48% of the total CO₂ emissions in France.




Figure 3: CO₂ Emissions for Each Source (Primary Axis) and by Sector (Secondary Axis) for the 39 CO₂ Sources in France Considered – CO₂ emissions by each source can fluctuate, with some sources having zero emissions at the beginning of the time span, some at the end, and some temporarily fluctuating to almost zero during the time span.




Figure 4: Cost Surface and Candidate Pipeline Network – The cost surface used to generate the candidate network (grey) indicates the degree to which locations should be avoided when routing CO₂ pipeline infrastructure. The candidate network indicates potential routes that can be chosen to link CO₂ sources (black circles) and CO₂ sinks (green diamonds).




Figure 5: Average Cost Curves for CCS Deployment in all Nine Combinations of CO₂ Production and Storage Options – Blue lines and markers are the results for storage scenario A, where CO₂ is transported to Le Havre as a hub for offshore storage. Red markers and lines are the results for when injection into the Parisian Basin is available in addition to Le Havre. Orange Markers and lines are the results for offshore storage only—scenario C with hubs at Le Havre and Marseille. Circles indicate the average CO₂ production from each source was modeled. Diamonds indicate that the maximum CO₂ production from each source was modeled. Triangles indicate that the minimum CO₂ production from each source was modeled.




Figure 6: CO₂ Capture Curves for Nine Combinations of CO₂ Production and Storage Scenarios – This figure corresponds to the marginal costs associated with Figure 5, with the axes switched. Colors and markers are the same as those in Figure 5.




Figure 7: Cost and Performance Characteristics of Integrated CCS Systems for Most Deployable Options (Max – B) and the Least Deployable Options (Min – A) Combinations of CO₂ Production and Storage Scenarios - The stacked area graphs show the costs for CO₂ capture (red), transport (green), and storage (blue). The grey area represents the system-wide CCS cost which includes the CO₂ price applied to any

emissions. When the capture cost (i.e., stacked blue, green, and red areas) and CO₂ price are identical, the stacked areas and the grey area cost coincide. Solid lines indicate how much CO₂ is captured and dashed lines indicate how much CO₂ is emitted.




Figure 8: Spatial Deployment of CCS CO₂ Pipelines in France for Select CO₂ Prices and Combinations of Deployable Options Based on CO₂ Storage Options Availability and CO₂ Production Quantities – The amount of CO₂ captured from sources is shown as the red portion of the pink pie, and the amount of CO₂ delivered to a sink is the blue portion of the light blue pie. Green lines indicate where pipelines are deployed in the potential routes (grey). The top row contains the most promising combination of scenarios (maximum CO₂ production and offshore and onshore storage options) whereas the bottom row contains the least promising combination of scenarios (minimum CO₂ production and one offshore storage option).




Figure 9: Corridors for CO₂ Pipelines in France Indicating the Percentage of the Model Runs in which Pipeline Segments were Deployed – Pipeline routes are color-coded by the quintile in which they are deployed, for the aggregate results from the CO₂ Quota models (top row) and the CO₂ Price models (bottom row). Green indicates that the route was deployed in the top 20% of the time, whereas red indicates that the route was deployed the bottom 20%. The percentages in the legends indicate the percentage of model runs within each quintile. The smaller images show the results aggregated by storage scenarios A-C (middle columns) and by CO₂ production scenarios (right columns).

8 References

- 1 IPCC (2007). "Climate Change 2007: Mitigation. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change." Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, N.Y. USA.
- 2 GEA (2012). "Global Energy Assessment - Toward a Sustainable Future." Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA and the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg, Austria.
- 3 Pacala, S. and Socolow, R. (2004). "Stabilization Wedges: Solving the Climate Problem for the Next 50 Years with Current Technologies." *Science*, 305, 968-972.
- 4 IEA (2012). "CO₂ Emissions from Fuel Combustion: Highlights." *IEA Statistics, International Energy Agency*. Available at: <http://www.iea.org/co2highlights/co2highlights.pdf>
- 5 IEA (2008) "Cement Technology Roadmap: Carbon Emissions Reductions to 2050." *International Energy Agency*. Available at: <http://www.iea.org/publications/freepublications/publication/Cement.pdf>
- 6 WSA (2012). "Sustainable Steel 2012: Policy and Indicators." *World Steel Association*. Available at: <http://www.worldsteel.org/dms/internetDocumentList/press-release-downloads/2012/Sustainable-Steel-2012/document/Sustainable%20Steel%202012.pdf>
- 7 IPCC (2005). "Special Report on Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage." Metz, B., Davidson, O., Coninck, H., Loos, M., and Meyer, J. P., *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 2005; p 431.
- 8 Johnson, J., and Nitao, J., and Knauss, K. (2004) "Reactive Transport Modelling of CO₂ Storage in Saline Aquifers to Elucidate Fundamental Processes, Trapping Mechanisms, and Sequestration Partitioning." Geological Society of London Special Publication on Carbon Sequestration Technologies. Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, UCRL-JRNL-205627.
- 9 Han, W., McPherson, B., Lichtner, P., and Wang, F. (2010). "Evaluation of Trapping Mechanisms in Geologic CO₂ Sequestration: Case Study of SACROC Northern Platform, a 35-Year CO₂ Injection Site". *American Journal of Science*, 310, 282-324.
- 10 Gilfillan, S., Lollar, B., Holland, G., Blagburn, D., Stevens, S., Schoell, M., Cassidy, M., Ding, Z., Zhou, Z., Lacrampe-Couloume, G., and Ballentine, C. (2009). "Solubility trapping in formation water as dominant CO₂ sink in natural gas fields." *Nature*, 458, 614-618.
- 11 Bachu, S., Shaw, J., and Pearson, R. (2004). "Estimation of Oil Recovery and CO₂ Storage Capacity in CO₂ EOR Incorporating the Effect of Underlying Aquifers." *Society of Petroleum Engineers*, 89340-MS.
- 12 Oldenburg, C., Stevens, S., and Benson, S. (2004). "Economic Feasibility of Carbon Sequestration with Enhanced Gas Recovery (CSEGR)." *Energy*, 29(9-10), 1413-1422.
- 13 White, C., Smith, D., Jones, K., Goodman, A., Jikich, S., LaCount, R., DuBose, S., Ozdemir, E., Morsi, B., and Schroeder, K. (2005). "Sequestration of Carbon Dioxide in Coal with Enhanced Coalbed Methane Recovery: A Review" *Energy and Fuels*, 19(3), 559-724.
- 14 NETL (2010). "Storing CO₂ and Producing Domestic Crude Oil with Next Generation CO₂-EOR Technology: An Update." U.S. Department of Energy, National Energy Technology laboratory. DOE/NETL 2010/1417.
- 15 Middleton, R., Levine, J., Bielicki, J., Rice, M., Viswanathan, H., Carey, J., and Stauffer, P. (2013) Ethylene extracted vs byproduct "Ethylene:CO₂-EOR – jumpstarting commercial-scale CO₂ capture and storage". Submitted to *Environmental Science & Technology*.
- 16 Buscheck, T., Elliot, T., Celia, M., Chen, M., Sun, Y., Hao, Y., Lu, C., Wolery, T., and Aines, R. (2013). "Integrated Geothermal-CO₂ Reservoir Systems: Reducing Carbon Intensity through Sustainable Energy Production and Secure CO₂ Storage". *Energy Procedia*, 37, 6587-6594.

- 17 MIT (2006). "The Future of Geothermal Energy." Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.
- 18 Randolph, J., and Saar M. (2011). "Combining Geothermal Energy Capture with Geologic Carbon Dioxide Sequestration." *Geophysical Research Letters*, (38), L10401.
- 19 ADEME (2011) Le captage, transport, stockage géologique et la valorisation du CO₂. Feuille de route stratégique. Available at: <http://www2.ademe.fr/servlet/KBaseShow?catid=24277#thm1tit5>
- 20 EIA (2013). "International Energy Statistics." *U.S. Energy Information Administration*, Available at: <http://www.eia.gov/cfapps/ipdbproject/iedindex3.cfm>
- 21 IREP (2013). "Registre Francais des Emissions Polluantes." *Ministère de l'Ecologie, du Développement Durable, et de l'Energie*. Available at: <http://www.irep.ecologie.gouv.fr/IREP/index.php>
- 22 EIA (2012). "U.S. Coal Reserves." *U.S. Energy Information Administration*. Available at: <http://www.eia.gov/coal/reserves/>
- 23 Bonijoly, D., Ha-Duong, M., Leynet, A., Bonneville, A., Broseta, D., Fradet, A., Le Gallo, Y., Munier, G., Nédelec, B., and Lagneau, V. (2009) "METSTOR: a GIS to look for potential storage zones in France." *Energy Procedia*, 1(1), 2809-2816.
- 24 Middleton, R., Bielicki, J., (2009). A scalable infrastructure model for carbon capture and storage: SimCCS. *Energy Policy* 37, 1052-1060.
- 25 Middleton, R. (2013) "A new optimization approach to energy network modeling: anthropogenic CO₂ capture coupled with enhanced oil recovery." *International Journal of Energy Research*. DOI: 10.1002/er.2993
- 26 Kuby, M., Bielicki, J., Middleton, R., (2011). Optimal Spatial Deployment of CO₂ Capture and Storage Given a Price on Carbon. *International Regional Science Review* 34, 285-305.
- 27 Middleton, R., Brandt, A., (2013). "Using Infrastructure Optimization to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Oil Sands Extraction and Processing." *Environmental Science & Technology* 47, 1735-1744.
- 28 Klok, O., Schreiner, P., Pages-Bernaus, A., Tomasgard, A., (2010). Optimizing a CO₂ value chain for the Norwegian Continental Shelf. *Energy Policy* 38, 6604-6614.
- 29 Mendeleevitch, R., Herold, J., Oei, P.-Y., Tissen, A., (2010). "CO₂ Highways for Europe: Modelling a Carbon Capture, Transport and Storage Infrastructure for Europe." CEPS Working Document No. 340.
- 30 Morbee, J., Serpa, J., Tzimas, E., (2012). "Optimised deployment of a European CO₂ transport network." *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control* 7, 48-61.
- 31 Calas, G. (2011). "Le transport de dioxyde de carbone par canalization: Modalités de développement et modélisation en France des réseaux de transport dans le cadre du captage et stockage de CO₂." *Mémoire de Master 2 Recherche, Économie du Développement Durable, de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie*
- 32 Ha-Duong, M. (2009) "SOCECO₂. Économie et sociologie de la filière capture et stockage géologique du CO₂. Poster at the ANR symposium "Quelle recherche pour les énergies du futur?" November 19-20, 2009. Available at: <http://minh.haduong.com/files/AfficheSOCECO2-2552x3402.png>
- 33 Coussy, P. (2009). "French CC Roadmap: SocECO₂ Project Scenarios". Communication to the Recent advances in CCS economics and sociology workshop, Pau, France, 9-10 April 2009. Available at: <http://www.centre-cired.fr/IMG/pdf/Coussy-2009-SOCECO2Scenarios.pdf>

34
35
36
37
38

- 39 ZEP (2011). “The Costs of CO₂ Storage: Post-demonstration CCS in the EU”. *European Technology Platform for Zero Emission Fossil Fuel Power Plants*. Available at: <http://www.zeroemissionsplatform.eu/library/publication/168-zep-cost-report-storage.html>
- 40 GCCSI (2012) “The Global Status of CCS: 2012”. *Global CCS Institute*. Canberra, Australia. Available at: <http://www.globalccsinstitute.com/publications/global-status-ccs-2012>.
- 41 UNIDO (2010). “Carbon Capture and Storage in Industrial Applications.” *United Nations Industrial Development Organization. Technology Synthesis Report*. Working Paper – November 2010. Available at: http://www.unido.org/fileadmin/user_media/Services/Energy_and_Climate_Change/Energy_Efficiency/CCS_%20industry_%20synthesis_final.pdf
- 42 IEA (2011). “Technology Roadmap: Carbon Capture and Storage in Industrial Applications.” *International Energy Agency and United Nations Industrial Development Organization*. Available at: http://www.unido.org/fileadmin/user_media/Services/Energy_and_Climate_Change/Energy_Efficiency/CCS/CCS_Industry_Roadmap_WEB.pdf
- 43 Fimbres Weihs, G., and Wiley, D. (2012). “Steady-State Design of CO₂ Pipeline Networks for Minimal Cost Per Tonne of CO₂ Avoided.” *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 8, 150-168.
- 44 Bielicki, J. (2009). Integrated Systems Analysis and Technological Findings for Carbon Capture and Storage Technology Deployment. *Ph.D. Dissertation*. Harvard University.
- 45 BRGM (2009). “SOCECO2 - Evaluation technico-économique et environnementale de la filière captage, transport, stockage du CO₂ à l’horizon 2050 en France.” Final Report: BRGM/RP-57036-FR. Available at: <http://www.centrecired.fr/IMG/pdf/06-BRGM-57036-SOCECO2-EvaluationTechnicoEconomiqueEtEnvironnementale.pdf>