



ICAO

ENVIRONMENT

ICAO STOCKTAKING SEMINAR
TOWARD THE 2050 VISION FOR
SUSTAINABLE AVIATION FUELS



Quantitative Policy Analysis for Sustainable Alternative Fuel Technologies

Juju Zhishen Wang

Massachusetts Institute of Technology





Background

- Many sustainable alternative fuel (SAF) technologies are approaching commercial production.
- Some examples are:
 - Neste partners with Air BP to deliver SAFs to Sweden
 - Fulcrum Sierra BioFuels Plant
 - Velocys UK waste to fuel project



Image source: Neste Press Release



Background

- Many sustainable alternative fuel (SAF) technologies are approaching commercial production.
- Some examples are:
 - Neste partners with Air BP to deliver SAFs to Sweden
 - Fulcrum Sierra BioFuels Plant
 - Velocys UK waste to fuel project

We want to know how the production costs of these SAFs compare to petroleum-derived fuels



Quantitative Policy Assessment

Model the economics of fuel production for a pathway of interest



Simulate potential policies' impact on economic viability




Use results to identify promising policy options for both policy makers and producers





Determining Minimum Selling Price

EX: Alcohol to Jet via iBuOH from corn grain





PRELIMINARY DATA, PLEASE DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE



Determining Minimum Selling Price

EX: Alcohol to Jet via iBuOH from corn grain



PRELIMINARY DATA, PLEASE DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE



Compare to Petroleum Jet Fuel Prices

Our Minimum
Selling Price

\$0.96/liter



Petroleum Jet
Fuel Price

\$0.53/liter¹

However... there are policies in place
to support alternative fuels

1. IATA Jet Fuel Price
Monitor accessed 4/18/19


PRELIMINARY DATA, PLEASE DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE



Policy Options (1/5)

- **Input Subsidy**

- Reduction in feedstock costs
- Ex. Brazil's "Social Fuel Standard"
- This is modelled as a percentage change in feedstock costs.




PRELIMINARY DATA, PLEASE DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE



Policy Options (2/5)

- **Capital Grant**

- Producer receives a subsidy for facility construction.
- Ex. US Department of Defence, Defence Production Act grant
- This is modelled as a decrease in capital expenditure costs




PRELIMINARY DATA, PLEASE DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE



Policy Options (3/5)

- **Output Subsidy**

- Producer receives a subsidy per quantity of production
- May be based on GHG emissions reductions, meaning the \$/litre depends on the life cycle CO₂ emissions of the fuel
- Ex. CORSIA




PRELIMINARY DATA, PLEASE DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE



Policy Options (4/5)

- **Loan Guarantee**

- Ensures that if a refinery defaults on the loan, it will be paid back
- This is modelled as a reduction in the cost of debt
- Other ways of modelling could include modifying the capital structure and cost of equity
- Ex. US Department of Energy Title 17 Innovative Energy Loan Guarantee Program



PRELIMINARY DATA, PLEASE DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE




Policy Options (5/5)

• Offtake Agreement

- A buyer guarantees that it will buy the product at a specified price
- This policy is modelled considering both the specified price and also the amount bought
- In the case that has been modelled, a buyer agrees to buy 50% of the fuel produced at the cost of 0.63 \$/litre. (This does not change MSP)
- Ex. Shell and Next Renewable Fuels

Histogram of Total Sales



PRELIMINARY DATA, PLEASE DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE




Interaction Between Policy Options

- Certain policies do not affect each other when combined.
 - Ex. Output Subsidy and Input Subsidy
- Some policies can influence other policies when they are combined
 - Ex. Combining capital grant and loan guarantee. The capital grant can change amount of debt which affects the result of a loan guarantee



Evaluation of Policy Options

- Certain policies only impact the **median MSP**.
 - Output subsidy
 - Capital grant
- There is a linear relationship between the magnitude of the policy and the impact on median MSP




PRELIMINARY DATA, PLEASE DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE



Evaluation of Policy Options

- Other policies can also impact the **variance** in MSP.
 - Input subsidy
 - Loan guarantee
 - Offtake agreement
- A decrease in variance means the project is less risky. This is an important consideration for project economics.



PRELIMINARY DATA, PLEASE DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE



Conclusions on Evaluation of Policy Options

- Different policies impact project economics in different ways. This is an important consideration for policy-makers, depending on their objectives.
- Some policies are effective at reducing median MSP.
 - Ex. Output subsidy, Capital grant
- Others are effective at reducing project risk.
 - Ex. Input subsidy, Loan guarantee, Offtake agreement



Real-world Policy Cases

Output Subsidy (RFS RIN values)	Input Subsidy (Data from Indonesia)	Capital Grant (CalRecycle Organics Recycling Project)	GHG Emissions Reduction Incentive - Jet only (CORSIA)
0.25 \$/Liter	27% feedstock cost subsidy	5 mil. USD capital grant	20 USD/t _{CO2} reduction credit (40 USD/t _{CO2} by 2035)




Technology Cases

Process	Feedstock
Micro - Fischer-Tropsch	Forest residues
HFS-SIP	Sugarcane
HEFA	Waste fats, oils and greases (FOG)
HEFA	Palm oil/palm fatty acid distillates (PFAD)
Fischer-Tropsch	Municipal solid waste
ATJ (via. iBuOH)	Corn



Technology Case Results

POLICY EFFECTS ON MSP



PRELIMINARY DATA, PLEASE DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE




Conclusions from Technology Cases

- The production cost of SAFs are generally more costly than petroleum derived fuels today.
- However, by considering the combined impact of multiple policies (based on real world policy examples), some pathways such as corn grain ATJ, MSW FT, and FOG HEFA may approach become cost competitiveness with petroleum jet fuels.



Useful Tool for Policy Makers

Example: These tools can be used to determine the magnitude of **breakeven policies** required to make SAF technologies pathways cost-competitive with traditional ones.



PRELIMINARY DATA, PLEASE DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE



Limitations in the Analysis

Policy modelling

- Currently only uniform policies are modeled. Policy variation over time is not accounted for.
- Tax laws and other local/specific conditions may influence results significantly. These are not accounted for in this study.
- We do not account for other options to reduce cost (potentially significantly), such as brownfield construction, or retrofitting of existing industrial facilities.

Pathway modelling

- We only capture a subset of available SAF pathways
- Study is for a n^{th} plant analysis. Costs are still uncertain, as these are new technologies
- Future commodity prices are highly uncertain (feedstock, electricity, NG)



Thank you



This research was funded by the U.S. Federal Aviation Administration Office of Environment and Energy through ASCENT, the FAA Center of Excellence for Alternative Jet Fuels and the Environment, Project 1 through FAA Award Number 13-C-AJFE-MIT under the supervision of James Hileman, Daniel Williams and Nathan Brown. Any opinions, findings, conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the FAA.





ICAO

North American
Central American
and Caribbean
(NACC) Office
Mexico City

South American
(SAM) Office
Lima

ICAO
Headquarters
Montréal

Western and
Central African
(WACAF) Office
Dakar

European and
North Atlantic
(EUR/NAT) Office
Paris

Middle East
(MID) Office
Cairo

Eastern and
Southern African
(ESAF) Office
Nairobi

Asia and Pacific
(APAC) Sub-office
Beijing

Asia and Pacific
(APAC) Office
Bangkok



THANK YOU



Year	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027
Mid	8.00	8.70	9.40	10.10	10.80	11.50	12.20	12.90
High	20.00	21.30	22.60	23.90	25.20	26.50	29.80	29.10
Alternative Low	6.00	6.40	6.80	7.20	7.60	8.00	8.40	8.80

Year	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035
Mid	13.60	14.30	15.00	16.00	17.00	18.00	19.00	20.00
High	30.40	31.70	33.00	34.40	35.80	37.20	38.60	40.00
Alternative Low	9.20	9.60	10.00	10.40	10.80	11.20	11.60	12.00

Pathway	GHG emissions (gCO ₂ e/MJ)
Baseline	89.0
SIP (Sugarcane)	50.6*
HEFA (FOG)	22.5
HEFA (PFAD)	20.7
FT (MSW)	40
ATJ via. iBuOH (Corn)	75*

All values are Unit Cost of Carbon in \$/tCO₂