

FUTURE FUELS



KAJ PORTIN, FEBRUARY 2020



Vessel emissions

-40%

-70%



Fleet emissions

-50%

2008


2030

2050

Where to go?



Future fuel scenarios for shipping




Smith, T., Raucci, C., Haji Hosseini S., Rojon I., Calleya J., De La Fuente, S., Wu P., Palmer K. CO₂ emissions from international shipping. Possible reduction targets and their associated pathways. Prepared by UMAS, October 2016, London.

FIGURE 4

Energy use and projected fuel mix 2018-2050 for the simulated IMO ambitions pathway with main focus on design requirements

Units: EJ/yr




LSFO, low-sulphur fuel oil; MGO, marine gas oil; LPG, liquefied petroleum gas;

LNG, liquefied natural gas; HFO, heavy fuel oil;

Advanced biodiesel, produced by advanced processes from non-food feedstocks

©DNV GL 2019

The vessel perspective








The fuel perspective

Notes:


- This pathway is valid for the bulk of the global shipping industry.
- In niches, other solutions may be more logical and profitable.
- Electrification of vessels will happen in segments where possible (IWW, short distance ferries, etc.)
- The advent of on-road electromobility will continue to drive down battery and possibly fuel cell prices.
- For longer haul applications, physics preclude the use of full battery electric ships.
- H2, ammonia seen to play a niche role for the coming 2 decades due to missing rules/regulations/experience
- Synthetic fuels are "hydrogen carriers"; built from green hydrogen and other elements to build a useable and practical fuel

Why lean burn gas engines $\Rightarrow$ Low emissions




GTP = Global Temperature Change Potential GWP = Global Warming Potential

Comparison of CO₂ emissions for different fuels




GHG emissions development 1993-2018

Example on Greenhouse Gas emissions 1993-2018



WE CAN START RIGHT NOW!



FUEL ROADMAP

2020

2030

2050

Pros

Cons



- Cleanest fossil fuel, -5 to -20% GHG depending on engine type (well-to-wake) LNG infrastructure, rules and regulations exist, fuel is available
- Bio/syn GHG -70 to -100% depending on source (well to wake)
- Clear transition pathway as same infra can be used for all

- Methane slip, must be reduced with on/off engine techs as novel combustion (e.g. HCCI, RCCI), Oxicat or Sandbed

- No emissions
- Can be blended with LNG

- Massive investments in infra and challenges in handling the fuel (minus 253°C)

- Only NOx emissions (=SCR)

- Toxic, not available, no rules & regulations

- Carbon neutral, only NOx emissions

- Toxic, not available yet

Hydrocarbons in Wärtsilä ICE – fuel flexibility is key

SG = Spark Ignited

- Otto process
- Fuel: gas
- low pressure gas

DF = Dual Fuel


- Otto process + pilot
- Diesel process
- Fuel: gas + liquid fuels
- low pressure gas

GD = Gas Diesel



- Diesel process + pilot
- Fuel: gas + liquid fuels
- high pressure gas
- large fuel mixture ratio

Diesel

- Diesel process
- Fuel: MDO, HFO and Crude oil



FUEL FLEXIBILITY BY MODULAR ARCHITECTURE



A modular design of the engine is providing a flexible platform for a wide variety of applications and fuels.

Summary

- GHG is an important topic, but local emissions should not be forgotten
- Natural gas operation result significantly lower emissions already today, and provides gaseous fuel infrastructure for future fuels
- GHG reduction enablers
 - Fuel flexible engine technologies
 - Renewables - both on liquid and gaseous fuels
 - Hybrid solutions

