



17<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Greenhouse Gas Control Technologies **GHGT-17**

20<sup>th</sup>-24<sup>th</sup> October 2024, Calgary, Canada

**Demonstration of highest capture rates for deep removal -  
Pilot plant test with CO<sub>2</sub> capture rates from 98% to >99.9% with an AMP/PZ-based solvent**

Peter Moser<sup>\*a</sup>, Georg Wiechers<sup>a</sup>, Peter van Os<sup>b</sup>, Roberta Veronezi Figueiredo<sup>b</sup>, Diego D. D. Pinto<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>RWE Power AG, Ernestinenstrasse 60, 45141 Essen, Germany

<sup>b</sup>TNO, Leeghwaterstraat 44, 2628 CA Delft, The Netherlands

<sup>c</sup>Hovyu B.V., Schiedam 3118JW, The Netherlands

---

**Abstract**

In the Clean Energy Transition Partnership project DRIVE (Deep Removal of CO<sub>2</sub> and InnoVative Electrification concepts), for the first time a holistic evaluation of deep removal technologies is carried out, comprising technical, economic, and environmental analysis and validation in long-time tests at real industrial conditions. At the CO<sub>2</sub> capture pilot plant at Niederaussem, Germany the key performance data of amine-based CO<sub>2</sub> capture with highest capture rates from 98 to >99% are assessed in extended testing campaigns (24/7) with the CESAR1 solvent, an aqueous solution of 3.0 M 2-amino-2-methylpropan-1-ol (AMP) and 1.5 M piperazine (PZ), after 6,500 h operation without exchange of the solvent inventory and without reclaiming. Systematic parameter studies and tests of different process configurations are carried out to validate process models for highest capture rates on the effect of solvent flow, desorption temperature, intercooler positioning, and the level of the solvent feed-in into the absorber column (3 or 4 active beds of structured packing). The performance analysis also comprises a careful monitoring of the emissions of AMP, PZ, NH<sub>3</sub>, and acetaldehyde by FTIR spectroscopy depending on the activated emission mitigation technologies (water wash, double water wash, dry bed (OASE aerozone™), acid wash, two flue gas pre-treatment technologies, and wet electric precipitator (WESP)). Additionally, organic degradation products, metals and accumulated inorganic trace compounds are analyzed.

*Keywords:* AMP, PZ, piperazine, CESAR1, capture rate, deep removal, emission mitigation, solvent degradation, pilot plant

---

Capturing CO<sub>2</sub> from industrial point sources is key for achieving the global climate ambitions (net zero by 2050) and the amine-based absorption technology is the most mature technological option for this, with several commercial plants in operation and under construction. Since the minimal specific energy consumption of the amine-based processes - and therefore also the minimal CO<sub>2</sub> avoidance costs - are achieved at CO<sub>2</sub> capture rates between 85-95% [1-3] it is sometimes overlooked that no general technical limits exist to significantly elevate the capture rate which means a huge potential to minimise the need for the offset of residual emissions by carbon dioxide removal (CDR) technologies, such as direct air capture, that have a high cost (DAC costs are currently around 600 €/tCO<sub>2</sub> [4]) and a high specific energy consumption due to the low CO<sub>2</sub> partial pressure in air. However, applying of deep CO<sub>2</sub> removal from industrial flue gases towards CO<sub>2</sub>-neutral and even CO<sub>2</sub>-negative operations has not yet been thoroughly realised in open pilot studies and representative long-time tests.

---

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +49-201-51797515, E-mail address: peter.moser@rwe.com

A recent theoretical study carried out by the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI, USA) indicates that achieving capture rates as high as 99.95% would be feasible using 30 wt% monoethanolamine (MEA) [5]. For a coal-fired power plant, it was estimated that the capture cost increases from \$46.1 to \$51.3 per ton CO<sub>2</sub> when increasing the capture rate from 90% to 99.95% (carbon-negative). This cost increase relates both to increased CAPEX (on average a 30% increase on equipment costs, and an 80% increase in absorber cost) and OPEX (11% higher, with attention to the increased thermal reboiler duty from 3.79 to 4.07 GJ/tCO<sub>2</sub>).

Another theoretical study investigated high CO<sub>2</sub> capture rates using a 95-99% CO<sub>2</sub> capture model for a plant with 35wt% MEA at a CCGT plant and reported that a high capture rate of 99% can be achieved at 7.7% increased energy penalties (from 3.50 to 3.77 GJ/tCO<sub>2</sub>) as compared to 95% capture if the packing height of the absorber is sufficient (24m) and at elevated desorber temperature (130°C) [6]. It was concluded that the operating costs of capture rates higher than 95% might be attractive if DAC is the alternative. The same study also pointed out that, with a plant designed for 95% capture rate, it is still possible to operate at 99% capture rate, but in that case the energy penalty increased by 12% [10].

At the National Carbon Capture Center (NCCC), demonstration of capture rates up to 99.1% was achieved with 5 m PZ (piperazine) and 12 m of packing in the absorber [7]. Only very short tests have been carried out using MHI's proprietary KM CDR Process™ based on the KS-21™ solvent at Kansai Electric Power Co., Inc.'s Nanko Power Station pilot system and at the Technology Centre Mongstad (TCM) in Norway in a range of the capture rate from 90% to 99.5%. However, presented data and conclusions are mainly predictions by an in-house simulator [8]. No information was published about amine emissions, solvent consumption due to changes in degradation rates and other possible operational issues (like foaming or disturbance of the water balance).

The only concrete data from tests at pilot plants (Niederaussem, TCM) with real flue gas and with CESAR1 have been published by the ALIGN-CCUS project, but are also limited to capture rates of <98% [9-11]. Also, very important in this context is the fact that the models used for evaluating the techno-economic feasibility of the deep removal operation regime have not yet been validated with real plant data. An accurate and comprehensive benchmarking exercise is key to establish the importance of point-source deep removal in achieving net zero emissions. This exercise is conducted in the DRIVE project based on testing campaigns (in total 14 months) with the CESAR1 solvent at Niederaussem and at capture rates between 98 and >99%. Flue gas source is a lignite-fired power plant and the capture plant capacity is 300 kg CO<sub>2</sub>/h at 90% capture rate. To investigate the process and operational performance at the negative CO<sub>2</sub> emission regime (CO<sub>2</sub> concentration in the treated flue gas < 400 ppmv CO<sub>2</sub>) an IR CO<sub>2</sub> analyser with the necessary accuracy was installed (0-3000 ppmv; detection limit 1%, linearity deviation +/-15 ppmv). Results from the systematic operational parameter tests are presented, which comprised variation of the liquid-to-gas ratio, the intercooling position, the lean loading (temperature in the desorber), and the active packing height and are compared with the results from optimised models. Also, the effect of highest capture rates on the emissions of the capture plant and the solvent degradation will be discussed.

## Acknowledgement

This Project has been funded by partners of the CETpartnership (<https://cetpartnership.eu>).

## Literature

- [1] M. Lucquiaud and J. Gibbins, "BAT Review for New-Build and Retrofit Post-Combustion Carbon Dioxide Capture Using Amine-Based Technologies for Power and CHP Plants Fuelled by Gas and Biomass as an Emerging Technology under the IED for the UK," 2021. <https://ukccsrc.ac.uk/best-available-techniques-bat-information-for-ccs/>.
- [2] G. Manzolini, E. Sanchez Fernandez, S. Rezvani, E. Macchi, E. L. V Goetheer, and T. J. H. Vlught, "Economic assessment of novel amine based CO<sub>2</sub> capture technologies integrated in power plants based on European Benchmarking Task Force methodology," *Appl. Energy*, vol. 138, pp. 546–558, 2015, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2014.04.066>.
- [3] P. H. M. Feron, A. Cousins, K. Jiang, R. Zhai, and M. Garcia, "An update of the benchmark post-combustion CO<sub>2</sub>-capture technology", *Fuel*, vol. 273, p. 117776, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2020.117776>.
- [4] IEAGHG, "Global Assessment of Direct Air Capture Costs," 2021.
- [5] Y. Du, T. Gao, G. T. Rochelle, and A. S. Bhowan, "Zero- and negative-emissions fossil-fired power plants using CO<sub>2</sub> capture by conventional aqueous amines," *Int. J. Greenh. Gas Control*, vol. 111, p. 103473, 2021,

- <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2021.103473>.
- [6] S. Michailos and J. Gibbins, “A Modelling Study of Post-Combustion Capture Plant Process Conditions to Facilitate 95–99% CO<sub>2</sub> Capture Levels From Gas Turbine Flue Gases,” *Front. Energy Res.*, vol. 10, May 2022, doi: 10.3389/fenrg.2022.866838.
- [7] T. Gao, J. L. Selinger, and G. T. Rochelle, “Demonstration of 99% CO<sub>2</sub> removal from coal flue gas by amine scrubbing,” *Int. J. Greenh. Gas Control*, vol. 83, pp. 236–244, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2019.02.013>.
- [8] T. Kamijo et al., “Negative Emission by high CO<sub>2</sub> Capture Ratio using Advanced KM CDR Process™,” *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2022, <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4286001>.
- [9] S. Garcia et al., “Impact of High Capture Rates and Solvent and Emission Management Strategies on the Costs of Full-Scale Post-Combustion CO<sub>2</sub> Capture Plants Using Long-Term Pilot Plant Data,” *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2022, <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4144048>.
- [10] P. Moser et al., “ALIGN-CCUS: Results of the 18-month test with aqueous AMP/PZ solvent at the pilot plant at Niederaussem – solvent management, emissions and dynamic behavior,” *Int. J. Greenh. Gas Control*, vol. 109, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2021.103381>.
- [11] C. Benquet, A. B. N. Knarvik, E. Gjernes, O. A. Hvidsten, E. Romslo Kleppe, and S. Akhter, “First Process Results and Operational Experience with CESAR1 Solvent at TCM with High Capture Rates (ALIGN-CCUS Project),” *SSRN Electron. J.*, no. October, pp. 13–15, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3814712>.