

ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMIC
ASSESSMENT OF HYDROGEN PRODUCTION
FROM METHANE AND FROM ETHANOL

UMARUL IMRAN BIN AMRAN

MASTER OF SCIENCE

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG



SUPERVISOR'S DECLARATION

I hereby declare that I have checked this thesis and in my opinion, this thesis is adequate in terms of scope and quality for the award of the degree of Master of Science

(Supervisor's Signature)

Full Name : DR. MOHAMAD RIZZA BIN OTHMAN

Position : SENIOR LECTURER

Date :



STUDENT'S DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the work in this thesis is based on my original work except for quotations and citations, which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously or concurrently submitted for any other degree at Universiti Malaysia Pahang or any other institutions.

(Student's Signature)

Full Name : UMARUL IMRAN BIN AMRAN

ID Number : MKC15012

Date : 18 SEPTEMBER 2018

ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT OF HYDROGEN
PRODUCTION FROM METHANE AND FROM ETHANOL

UMARUL IMRAN BIN AMRAN

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements
for the award of the degree of
Master of Science

Faculty of Chemical Engineering and Natural Resources

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG

SEPTEMBER 2018

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my special appreciation and thanks to my supervisor, Dr-Ing. Mohamad Rizza bin Othman for his continuous support and his idea during my study as research student under your guidance. My fullest appreciation goes as well to my co-supervisor, Prof. Dr Arshad Ahmad for his support and advice during my study.

A special thanks to my family especially to my mother and my father for their support to complete this study. Your prayer for me had helped me during my research. I am also indebted to ministry of higher education under MyMaster, Universiti Malaysia Pahang and Universiti Teknologi Malaysia for funding my research. I also want to thank all of friends who supported and motivated me in writing and motivate me to achieve the goal. I am sincerely grateful to staffs of Chemical Engineering and Natural Resources Faculty who helped me in many ways and made me stays in UMP easier and unforgettable.

ABSTRAK

Permintaan bahan api fosil semakin meningkat dari tahun ke tahun tetapi sumber bahan api fosil berkurangan. Pada masa kini, para penyelidik cuba mencari sumber alternatif baru bagi mengurangkan kebergantungan terhadap bahan api fosil. Hidrogen merupakan salah satu bahan api alternatif yang menarik untuk dikaji. Tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk menilai terhadap kesan alam sekitar dan ekonomi bagi dua laluan proses penghasilan hidrogen iaitu metana (Kes1) dan etanol (Kes 2). Proses simulasi telah dijalankan dalam kajian ini dengan menggunakan perisian Aspen Plus versi 8.6. Reaksi stim reformasi metana dan etanol disimulasi berasaskan kepada tindakbalas kinetik. Data kinetik telah diperolehi melalui kajian literatur. Tindakbalas dilakukan dalam perisian Aspen Plus dengan menggunakan blok RPlug dengan menyusun kembali model kinetik Langmuir-Hinselwood-Watson (LHHW) dan model kinetik *power-law*. Pada masa yang sama, penulenan bagi hidrogen turut menggunakan kaedah simulasi. Pengesahsahihan data telah menunjukkan keputusan yang hampir sama dalam literatur. Selain itu juga, analisis sensitiviti juga telah dijalankan untuk melihat kesan beberapa parameter seperti suhu, tekanan, berat pemangkin dan nisbah masukan ke dalam rektor untuk kedua-dua kajian kes. Selepas itu, penilaian terhadap alam sekitar dan ekonomi telah dibuat. Data yang diperolehi telah digunakan untuk membuat perbandingan antara kedua-dua kajian kes. Penilaian kitaran hayat (LCA) telah digunakan dalam kajian ini untuk menilai kesan alam sekitar menggunakan perisian GaBi menggunakan kaedah ReCiPe untuk menilai impak alam sekitar bagi semua proses yang terlibat dalam kajian ini. Unit berfungsi bagi LCA dalam kajian ini adalah 1 kg untuk hidrogen. Secara keseluruhannya, 16 kategori impak telah dikaji dan hanya 3 menunjukkan kategori yang banyak memberi impak iaitu perubahan iklim, pengurangan fosil dan pengurangan air. Perbebasan gas rumah hijau tinggi untuk kes 2 iaitu 30.84 kg CO₂ eq. berbanding dengan kes 1 iaitu 9.44 kg CO₂ eq. Manakala, pengurangan fosil tinggi kes 2 iaitu 12.54 kg oil eq. berbanding kes 1 sebanyak 4.044 kg oil eq. Kes 2 juga menyebabkan penyusutan sumber air yang tinggi sebanyak 23.35 m³ eq berbanding kes 1 sebanyak 4.01 m³ eq. Penilaian ekonomi terhadap kedua-dua kajian kes telah dibuat. Kos modal untuk penghasilan hidrogen bagi kes 1 adalah kurang berbanding dengan kes 2 dengan perbezaan 7.92%. Manakala, kos utiliti untuk kes 1 lebih rendah berbanding kes 2 dengan perbezaan sebanyak 12.81%. Secara keseluruhannya, kes 1 iaitu hidrogen daripada metana adalah lebih mesra alam dan lebih jimat dalam kos CAPEX dan OPEX berbanding kes 2 walaupun daripada sumber tenaga yang boleh diperbaharui iaitu etanol.

ABSTRACT

The demand for fossil fuel increased year by year but the sources of fossil fuel is decreasing. Nowadays, researchers are looking at alternative energy sources to reduce the dependency on fossil fuel. Hydrogen is an interesting energy source alternative to be studied. The aim of this study is to perform environmental and economic assessment for two hydrogen production pathways namely from methane (Case 1) and ethanol (Case 2). Rigorous simulation of both processes was done using Aspen Plus version 8.6. The reaction of steam reforming from methane and ethanol were kinetic based simulation. The kinetic data was obtained from the literature. The reactions were modelled using RPlug blocks with rearranged Langmuir-Hinselwood-Hougen-Watson (LHHW) kinetic model and power law kinetic model. The purification of hydrogen was based on rigorous model in the simulation. The validation results show good agreement with results found in the literature. In addition, sensitivity analysis was carried out observing the effect of several parameters such as temperature, pressure, catalyst weight and feed ratio to the reactor performance for both cases. After that, environment and economic assessment were performed. The data obtained were used for comparison purposes. The environment assessment was based on life cycle assessment (LCA) to evaluate the environmental impact of all processes involved in hydrogen production using GaBi software based on ReCiPe method. The LCA functional unit used for both case studies was 1 kg of hydrogen. Overall, 16 categories impact assessment were carried out and only three were highly significant namely climate change, fossil depletion and water depletion. Case 2 shows high impact on climate change with 30.84 kg CO₂ eq compared to Case 1 with 9.44 kg CO₂ eq. On the other hand, Case 2 shows higher fossil fuel resource depletion with 12.54 kg oil eq compared to Case 1 with 4.044 kg oil eq. Furthermore, Case 2 also has a higher water resources depletion of 23.35 m³ eq. compared to Case 1 which is only 4.01 m³ eq. The capital cost for Case 1 is 7.92% less compared to Case 2. Meanwhile, the total utilities cost for Case 1 is 12.81% less compared to Case 2. In conclusion, the hydrogen production from methane, Case 1, is environmental friendlier and less costing in term of CAPEX and OPEX than Case 2..

TABLE OF CONTENT

DECLARATION	
TITLE PAGE	
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRAK	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
TABLE OF CONTENT	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF SYMBOLS	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Motivation	1
1.2 Problem statement	4
1.3 Objective of the study	4
1.4 Scopes of Studies	4
1.5 Research Contributions	5
1.6 Overview of the thesis	5
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1 Overview	7
2.2 Hydrogen as Energy Resource	7
2.2.1 Hydrogen from Methane	8

2.2.2	Hydrogen from Ethanol	13
2.3	Environmental and Economic Assessment	17
2.3.1	Life cycle analysis (LCA)	18
2.3.2	Economic feasibility	23
2.4	Concluding Remarks	25
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH FRAMEWORK & PROCESS MODELLING		26
3.1	Research Framework	26
3.2	Process Description	28
3.2.1	Hydrogen production from methane (Case 1)	29
3.2.2	Hydrogen production from ethanol (Case 2).	30
3.3	Process Simulation	32
3.3.1	Reactor Modelling	34
3.3.2	Separation model	50
3.3.3	Overall Flowsheet Simulation Results	53
3.3.4	Concluding Remarks	56
CHAPTER 4 ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC ANALYSIS		58
4.1	Introduction	58
4.2	LCA Goal and Scope	58
4.2.1	Case 1 system boundaries	58
4.2.2	Case 2 system boundaries	60
4.3	Life Cycle Inventory (LCI)	60
4.4	Life cycle impact assessment	62
4.5	Life Cycle Results Interpretation	62
4.5.1	Hydrogen Production from Methane (Case 1)	62

4.5.2	Hydrogen Production from Ethanol (Case 2)	66
4.6	Comparison Between Hydrogen Production from Methane (Case 1) and Hydrogen Production from Ethanol (Case 2).	69
4.6.1	Concluding Remarks	73
4.7	Economic Assessment	73
4.7.1	Economic Analysis of Case 1	74
4.7.2	Economic analysis of Case 2	75
4.7.3	Economic Comparison	76
4.7.4	Concluding Remarks	77
	CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION	78
5.1	Conclusion	78
5.2	Recommendation for future works	79
	REFERENCES	80
	APPENDIX A-1 STREAM SUMMARY FROM ASPEN PLUS FOR CASE 1	89
	APPENDIX A-2 MODEL SUMMARY FROM ASPEN PLUS FOR CASE 1	91
	APPENDIX B-1 STREAM SUMMARY FROM ASPEN PLUS FOR CASE 2	95
	APPENDIX B-2 MODEL SUMMARY FROM ASPEN PLUS FOR CASE 2	97
	APPENDIX C-1 DETAILS FROM THE GABI FOR CASE 1	101
	APPENDIX C-2 DETAILS FROM GABI FOR CASE 2	103
	APPENDIX D-1 CAPCOST DETAILS FOR CASE 1	105
	APPENDIX D-2 CAPCOST DETAILS FOR CASE 2	106
	APPENDIX E-1 LIST OF PUBLICATIONS AND CONFERENCES	107

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	Hydrogen consumption in the world	2
Table 2.1	Kinetic parameter for MSR.	10
Table 2.2	The kinetic parameter for WGS	11
Table 2.3	The elements in LCIA	22
Table 3.1	Summaries for Case 1	33
Table 3.2	Summaries for Case 2	34
Table 3.3	Kinetic parameter methane steam reforming	36
Table 3.4	Summaries for operating condition for validation	36
Table 3.5	Kinetic parameter for water gas shift	45
Table 3.6	Kinetic parameters for the kinetic reactions in absorber and stripper	51
Table 3.7	Summaries of design and operating condition for validation	52
Table 3.8	Comparison of Li et al. (2016) and simulation results	52
Table 3.9	Summaries results for the simulation	54
Table 3.10	Summary stream table for hydrogen production for Case 1	54
Table 3.11	Summaries of results for simulation.	55
Table 3.12	Summaries stream results for mole flow rate	56
Table 4.1	Main inventory data for the Case 1	61
Table 4.2	Main inventory data for Case 2	61
Table 4.3	Impact categories for each subsystems for case 1	64
Table 4.4	Impact categories for each subsystems for case 2	67
Table 4.5	The utilities cost per unit (Turton et al., 2013)	74
Table 4.6	The summary of capital cost for the hydrogen production from methane	75
Table 4.7	Summary utilities for hydrogen production from methane	75
Table 4.8	Summary capital cost for hydrogen production from ethanol	76
Table 4.9	Summary utilities used in hydrogen production from ethanol	76
Table 4.10	The comparison of the capital cost between Case 1 and Case 2	77
Table 4.11	The comparison utilities cost for Case 1 and Case 2	77

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1	The simulation of methane steam reforming from Boyano et al. (2012)	12
Figure 2.2	The conventional methane steam reforming from Antzara et al. (2014)	13
Figure 2.3	Process flow for ethanol reforming from Gutiérrez-Guerra et al. (2015).	16
Figure 2.4	Schematic ethanol reforming from Rossetti et al. (2015b)	17
Figure 2.5	LCA Framework	19
Figure 3.1	Research framework	28
Figure 3.2	Process flow diagram of hydrogen production from methane.	30
Figure 3.3	Simplified process flow for hydrogen production from ethanol	32
Figure 3.4	Aspen Plus modelling of case 1	33
Figure 3.5	Aspen Plus modelling of case 2	33
Figure 3.6	The methane conversion effect on length of the reactor (a) from Singh et al (2014) (b) simulation using Aspen Plus	37
Figure 3.7	Weight of catalyst for MSR effect on molar flowrate of hydrogen	38
Figure 3.8	Temperature of MSR on molar flowrate of hydrogen.	39
Figure 3.9	The pressure of MSR on molar flow rate of hydrogen	39
Figure 3.10	Steam feed ratio on conversion of methane	40
Figure 3.11	The effect of molar ratio of steam to ethanol (a) from previous study (b) from simulation using Aspen Plus.	42
Figure 3.12	Catalyst weight effect on molar flowrate of hydrogen	43
Figure 3.13	Temperature of ethanol reforming on molar flowrate of hydrogen	44
Figure 3.14	The effect of pressure on molar flowrate of hydrogen.	44
Figure 3.15	The steam ratio feed to ethanol effect on conversion of hydrogen	45
Figure 3.16	Partial pressure of water effect on conversion of carbon monoxide (a) previous study (b) from simulation.	47
Figure 3.17	Sensitivity analysis of catalyst weight on molar flowrate of carbon monoxide	47
Figure 3.18	Sensitivity analysis of temperature on the molar flowrate of carbon monoxide.	48
Figure 3.19	Sensitivity analysis of pressure on molar flowrate of carbon monoxide	49
Figure 3.20	Sensitivity analysis of ratio steam to ethanol on the conversion of carbon monoxide.	49
Figure 3.21	The simulation flowsheet for CO ₂ removal	52
Figure 4.1	System boundaries for Case 1.	59
Figure 4.2	System boundaries for Case 2.	60

Figure 4.3	Environmental impact results for the most significant impact category in case 1.	65
Figure 4.4	Contribution environment impact categories in hydrogen production from ethanol	68
Figure 4.5	Environmental impact results for the most significant impact category in Case 2.	68
Figure 4.6	Environment impact comparison between Case 1 and Case 2	70
Figure 4.7	Comparison between system boundaries with case study in climate change	71
Figure 4.8	Comparison between system boundary with case study in fossil depletion	72
Figure 4.9	Comparison between system boundaries with case study in water depletion.	73

LIST OF SYMBOLS

A	Subscript
B	Subscript
C	Subscript
D	Subscript
Atm	Atmospheric pressure unit
°C	Celsius
Cal/mol	Calories per mol
Bar	Pressure unit
g	Gram
kg	Kilogram
kw	kilowatt
kg/hr	Kilogram per hour
kmol/hr	Kilomole per hour
h	Hour
j	subscript
j/mol	Joule per mol
Ln	Natural logarithm
M	Subscript
m	meter
MJ/h	Megajoule per hour
m ²	Meter square
m ³	Meter cubic
MT/annum	Metric tonne per annum
MW	megawatt
CH ₄	Methane
H ₂ O	Water
H ₂	Hydrogen
CO	Carbon monoxide
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
MEA	Monoethanolamine
s	Seconds
\$	US dollar

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

COMBRET	Combustion chamber
CAPEX	Capital Expenditure
CEPCI	Chemical Engineering plant cost index
C_P	Purchased cost
C_{TM}	Total module cost
C_{BM}	Base cost condition
C_{GR}	Grassroot cost
ESR	Ethanol steam reforming
Exp	Exponential
E-101	Heat exchanger 1 for Case 1
E-102	Heat exchanger 2 for Case 1
E-103	Heat exchanger 3 for Case 1
E-104	Heat exchanger 4 for Case 1
E-105	Heat exchanger 5 for Case 1
E-106	Heat exchanger 6 for Case 1
E-107	Reboiler stripper for Case 1
E-201	Heat exchanger 1 for Case 2
E-202	Heat exchanger 2 for Case 2
E-203	Heat exchanger 3 for Case 2
E-204	Heat exchanger 4 for Case 2
E-205	Heat exchanger 5 for Case 2
E-206	Heat exchanger 6 for Case 2
E-207	Reboiler stripper for Case 2
$^{\circ}E$	Enthalpy
ENTRL-RK	Electrolyte non-random two liquid model redlich kwong
Eq.	Equivalent
FU	Functional unit
GHG	Greenhouse gas
GWP	Global warming potential
HWGS	High temperature water gas shift
LWGS	Low temperature water gas shift
k	Pre-exponential factor
k_1	Rate constant of MSR
k_2	Rate constant of WGS
K	Adsorption equilibrium
K_1	Adsorption equilibrium for CO
K_2	Adsorption equilibrium for H ₂ O
K_3	Adsorption equilibrium for CO ₂
K_4	Adsorption equilibrium for H ₂
LCA	Life cycle assessment
LHHW	Langmuir-Hinshelwood Hougen Watson
MSR	Methane steam reforming
N	Number of components
OPEX	Operating expenditure
P	Partial pressure
P_{CH_4}	Partial pressure for CH ₄
P_{H_2O}	Partial pressure for H ₂ O

P_{H_2}	Partial pressure for H_2
P_{CO}	Partial pressure for CO
P_{eth}	Partial pressure for ethanol
PFD	Process flow diagram
PSA	Pressure swing adsorption
R	Universal gas constant
R-101	Methane/Ethanol steam reforming reactor for Case 1
R-102	High temperature water gas shift reactor for Case 1
R-103	Low temperature water gas shift reactor for Case 1
R-201	Methane/Ethanol steam reforming reactor for Case 2
R-202	High temperature water gas shift reactor for Case 2
R-203	Low temperature water gas shift reactor for Case 2
RADFRAC	Rigorous distillation/separation column
RKSMHV2	RedlichKwong Soave Modified huron Vidal mixing rule
SB1	System boundary 1
SB2	System boundary 2
SB3	System boundary 3
SB4	System boundary 4
SB5	System boundary 5
SB1-1	System boundary 1 for Case 1
SB1-2	System boundary 2 for Case 1
SB1-3	System boundary 3 for Case 1
SB1-4	System boundary 4 for Case 1
SB1-5	System boundary 5 for Case 1
SB2-1	System boundary 1 for Case 2
SB2-2	System boundary 2 for Case 2
SB2-3	System boundary 3 for Case 2
SB2-4	System boundary 4 for Case 2
SB2-5	System boundary 5 for Case 2
T	Absolute temperature
T_0	Reference temperature
T-101	Absorption column for Case 1
T-102	Stripper tower for Case 1
T-201	Absorption column for Case 2
T-202	Stripper tower for Case 2
WGS	Water gas shift
x_i	Mole fraction of component
y_i	Activity coefficient of component

REFERENCES

- Abbasi, T., & Abbasi, S. A. (2011). 'Renewable' hydrogen: Prospects and challenges. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 15(6), 3034-3040.
- Acar, C., & Dincer, I. (2014). Comparative assessment of hydrogen production methods from renewable and non-renewable sources. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 39(1), 1-12.
- Afgan, N. H., & Carvalho, M. G. (2008). Sustainability assessment of a hybrid energy system. *Energy Policy*, 36(8), 2903-2910.
- Akande, A., Aboudheir, A., Idem, R., & Dalai, A. (2006). Kinetic modeling of hydrogen production by the catalytic reforming of crude ethanol over a co-precipitated Ni-Al₂O₃Ni-Al₂O₃ catalyst in a packed bed tubular reactor. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 31(12), 1707-1715.
- Amadeo, N. E., & Laborde, M. A. (1995). Hydrogen production from the low temperature water gas shift reaction: kinetics and simulation of the industrial reactor. *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, 20, 949-956.
- Antzara, A., Heracleous, E., Bukur, D. B., & Lemonidou, A. A. (2014). Thermodynamic Analysis of Hydrogen Production via Chemical Looping Steam Methane Reforming Coupled with in Situ CO₂ Capture. *Energy Procedia*, 63, 6576-6589.
- Authayanun, S., Suwanmanee, U., & Arpornwichanop, A. (2015). Enhancement of dilute bio-ethanol steam reforming for a proton exchange membrane fuel cell system by using methane as co-reactant: Performance and life cycle assessment. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 40(36), 12144-12153.
- Balat, M. (2008). Potential importance of hydrogen as a future solution to environmental and transportation problems. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 33(15), 4013-4029.
- Ball, M., & Wietschel, M. (2009). The future of hydrogen – opportunities and challenges☆. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 34(2), 615-627.
- Basile, A., Curcio, S., Bagnato, G., Liguori, S., Jokar, S. M., & Iulianelli, A. (2015). Water gas shift reaction in membrane reactors: Theoretical investigation by artificial neural networks model and experimental validation. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 40(17), 5897-5906.

- Bej, B., Pradhan, N. C., & Neogi, S. (2013). Production of hydrogen by steam reforming of methane over alumina supported nano-NiO/SiO₂ catalyst. *Catalysis Today*, 207, 28-35.
- Bion, N., Duprez, D., & Epron, F. (2012). Design of nanocatalysts for green hydrogen production from bioethanol. *ChemSusChem*, 5(1), 76-84.
- Boyano, A., Morosuk, T., Blanco-Marigorta, A. M., & Tsatsaronis, G. (2012). Conventional and advanced exergoenvironmental analysis of a steam methane reforming reactor for hydrogen production. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 20(1), 152-160.
- Braga, L. B., Silveira, J. L., da Silva, M. E., Tuna, C. E., Machin, E. B., & Pedroso, D. T. (2013). Hydrogen production by biogas steam reforming: A technical, economic and ecological analysis. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 28, 166-173.
- Camero, C., & Sowlati, T. (2014). Assessment and optimization of forest biomass supply chains from economic, social and environmental perspectives – A review of literature. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 36, 62-73.
- Caravaca, A., de Lucas-Consuegra, A., Calcerrada, A. B., Lobato, J., Valverde, J. L., & Dorado, F. (2013). From biomass to pure hydrogen: Electrochemical reforming of bio-ethanol in a PEM electrolyser. *Applied Catalysis B: Environmental*, 134-135, 302-309.
- Chaubey, R., Sahu, S., James, O. O., & Maity, S. (2013). A review on development of industrial processes and emerging techniques for production of hydrogen from renewable and sustainable sources. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 23, 443-462.
- Chen, W.-H., Jheng, J.-G., & Yu, A. B. (2008). Hydrogen generation from a catalytic water gas shift reaction under microwave irradiation. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 33(18), 4789-4797.
- Chen, Z. X., Prasad, P., Yan, Y. B., & Elnashaie, S. (2003). Simulation for steam reforming of natural gas with oxygen input in a novel membrane reformer. *Fuel Processing Technology*, 83(1-3), 235-252.
- Christoforou, E. A., & Fokaides, P. A. (2016). Life cycle assessment (LCA) of olive husk torrefaction. *Renewable Energy*, 90, 257-266.

- Contreras, J. L., Salmones, J., Colín-Luna, J. A., Nuño, L., Quintana, B., Córdova, I., . . . Fuentes, G. A. (2014). Catalysts for H₂ production using the ethanol steam reforming (a review). *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 39(33), 18835-18853.
- de Lucas-Consuegra, A., Calcerrada, A. B., de la Osa, A. R., & Valverde, J. L. (2014). Electrochemical reforming of ethylene glycol. Influence of the operation parameters, simulation and its optimization. *Fuel Processing Technology*, 127, 13-19.
- Dincer. (2000). Renewable energy and sustainable development: a crucial review. *Renewable & Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 4(2), 157-175.
- Dincer, I., & Zamfirescu, C. (2012). Sustainable hydrogen production options and the role of IAHE. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 37(21), 16266-16286.
- Dufour, J., Serrano, D. P., Gálvez, J. L., Moreno, J., & González, A. (2011). Hydrogen Production from Fossil Fuels: Life Cycle Assessment of Technologies with Low Greenhouse Gas Emissions. *Energy & Fuels*, 25(5), 2194-2202.
- Energy, D. o. (2015). Department of Energy FY 2015 Congressional Budget Request.
- Er-rbib, H., & Bouallou, C. (2014). Methanation catalytic reactor. *Comptes Rendus Chimie*, 17(7-8), 701-706.
- Er-rbib, H., & Bouallou, C. (2014). Modeling and simulation of CO methanation process for renewable electricity storage. *Energy*, 75, 81-88.
- Fernandes, F. A. N., & Soares, A. B. (2006). Methane steam reforming modeling in a palladium membrane reactor. *Fuel*, 85(4), 569-573.
- Galera, S., & Ortiz, F. J. G. (2015). Life cycle assessment of hydrogen and power production by supercritical water reforming of glycerol. *Energy Conversion and Management*, 96, 637-645.
- Giraldi, M. R., François, J.-L., & Martin-del-Campo, C. (2015). Life cycle assessment of hydrogen production from a high temperature electrolysis process coupled to a high temperature gas nuclear reactor. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 40(10), 4019-4033.
- Gutiérrez-Guerra, N., Jiménez-Vázquez, M., Serrano-Ruiz, J. C., Valverde, J. L., & de Lucas-Consuegra, A. (2015). Electrochemical reforming vs. catalytic reforming

- of ethanol: A process energy analysis for hydrogen production. *Chemical Engineering and Processing: Process Intensification*, 95, 9-16.
- Haarlemmer, G. (2015). Simulation study of improved biomass drying efficiency for biomass gasification plants by integration of the water gas shift section in the drying process. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 81, 129-136.
- Hajjaji, N., Pons, M. N., Renaudin, V., & Houas, A. (2013). Comparative life cycle assessment of eight alternatives for hydrogen production from renewable and fossil feedstock. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 44, 177-189.
- Han, S. J., Bang, Y., Song, J. H., Yoo, J., Park, S., Kang, K. H., & Song, I. K. (2016). Hydrogen production by steam reforming of ethanol over dual-templated Ni-Al₂O₃ catalyst. *Catalysis Today*, 265, 103-110.
- Haseli, Y., Dincer, I., & Naterer, G. F. (2008). Thermodynamic analysis of a combined gas turbine power system with a solid oxide fuel cell through exergy. *Thermochimica Acta*, 480(1-2), 1-9.
- Hla, S. S., Morpeth, L. D., & Dolan, M. D. (2015). Modelling and experimental studies of a water-gas shift catalytic membrane reactor. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 276, 289-302.
- Holladay, J. D., Hu, J., King, D. L., & Wang, Y. (2009). An overview of hydrogen production technologies. *Catalysis Today*, 139(4), 244-260.
- Hwang, J., Chang, W., Weng, F., Su, A., & Chen, C. (2008). Development of a small vehicular PEM fuel cell system. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 33(14), 3801-3807.
- Hwang, J., Wang, D., & Shih, N. (2005). Development of a lightweight fuel cell vehicle. *Journal of Power Sources*, 141(1), 108-115.
- Hwang, J. J. (2013). Sustainability study of hydrogen pathways for fuel cell vehicle applications. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 19, 220-229.
- Inc, A. T. (2014). Rate-Based Model of the CO₂ Capture Process by MEA using Aspen Plus. Burlington (USA).
- ISO14040. (2006). Environmental Management-Life Cycle Assessment-Principles and Framework.

- Kadier, A., Simayi, Y., Kalil, M. S., Abdeshahian, P., & Hamid, A. A. (2014). A review of the substrates used in microbial electrolysis cells (MECs) for producing sustainable and clean hydrogen gas. *Renewable Energy*, *71*, 466-472.
- Khila, Z., Hajjaji, N., Pons, M.-N., Renaudin, V., & Houas, A. (2013). A comparative study on energetic and exergetic assessment of hydrogen production from bioethanol via steam reforming, partial oxidation and auto-thermal reforming processes. *Fuel Processing Technology*, *112*, 19-27.
- Koroneos, C. (2004). Life cycle assessment of hydrogen fuel production processes. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, *29*(14), 1443-1450.
- LeValley, T. L., Richard, A. R., & Fan, M. H. (2014). The progress in water gas shift and steam reforming hydrogen production technologies - A review. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, *39*(30), 16983-17000.
- Li, B.-H., Zhang, N., & Smith, R. (2016). Simulation and analysis of CO₂ capture process with aqueous monoethanolamine solution. *Applied Energy*, *161*, 707-717.
- Liguras, D. K., Kondarides, D. I., & Verykios, X. E. (2003). Production of hydrogen for fuel cells by steam reforming of ethanol over supported noble metal catalysts. *Applied Catalysis B: Environmental*, *43*(4), 345-354.
- Ling-Chin, J., Heidrich, O., & Roskilly, A. P. (2016). Life cycle assessment (LCA) – from analysing methodology development to introducing an LCA framework for marine photovoltaic (PV) systems. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *59*, 352-378.
- Llera, I., Mas, V., Bergamini, M. L., Laborde, M., & Amadeo, N. (2012). Bio-ethanol steam reforming on Ni based catalyst. Kinetic study. *Chemical Engineering Science*, *71*, 356-366.
- Marbán, G., & Valdés-Solís, T. (2007). Towards the hydrogen economy? *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, *32*(12), 1625-1637.
- Mas, V., Bergamini, M. L., Baronetti, G., Amadeo, N., & Laborde, M. (2008). A Kinetic Study of Ethanol Steam Reforming Using a Nickel Based Catalyst. *Topics in Catalysis*, *51*(1-4), 39-48.

- Mathure, P. V., Ganguly, S., Patwardhan, A. V., & Saha, R. K. (2007). Steam reforming of ethanol using a commercial nickel-based catalyst. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, 46(25), 8471-8479.
- Mendes, D., Chibante, V., Mendes, A., & Madeira, L. M. (2010). Determination of the Low-Temperature Water-Gas Shift Reaction Kinetics Using a Cu-Based Catalyst. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, 49(22), 11269-11279.
- Migliardini, F., Veneri, O., & Corbo, P. (2011). Hydrogen and proton exchange membrane fuel cells for clean road transportation. *Journal of Industrial and Engineering Chemistry*, 17(3), 633-641.
- Montané, D., Bolshak, E., & Abelló, S. (2011). Thermodynamic analysis of fuel processors based on catalytic-wall reactors and membrane systems for ethanol steam reforming. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 175, 519-533.
- Morero, B., Rodriguez, M. B., & Campanella, E. A. (2015). Environmental impact assessment as a complement of life cycle assessment. Case study: Upgrading of biogas. *Bioresour Technol*, 190, 402-407.
- Muellerlanger, F., Tzimas, E., Kaltschmitt, M., & Peteves, S. (2007). Techno-economic assessment of hydrogen production processes for the hydrogen economy for the short and medium term. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 32(16), 3797-3810.
- Oliveira, E. L. G., Grande, C. A., & Rodrigues, A. E. (2010). Methane steam reforming in large pore catalyst. *Chemical Engineering Science*, 65(5), 1539-1550.
- Oshima, K., Shinagawa, T., Haraguchi, M., & Sekine, Y. (2013). Low temperature hydrogen production by catalytic steam reforming of methane in an electric field. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 38(7), 3003-3011.
- Othman, M. R., Hady, L., Repke, J. U., & Wozny, G. (2012). Introducing sustainability assessment and selection (SAS) into chemical engineering education. *Education for Chemical Engineers*, 7(3), e118-e124.
- Petrescu, L., & Cormos, C.-C. (2015). Waste reduction algorithm applied for environmental impact assessment of coal gasification with carbon capture and storage. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 104, 220-235.
- raynolds, M., Fraser, r., & Checkel, D. (2000). The Relative Mass-Energy-Economic (RMEE) Method for System Boundary Selection *Int. J. LCA*, 5(1), 37-46.

- Rebitzer, G., Ekvall, T., Frischknecht, R., Hunkeler, D., Norris, G., Rydberg, T., . . . Pennington, D. W. (2004). Life cycle assessment part 1: framework, goal and scope definition, inventory analysis, and applications. *Environ Int*, 30(5), 701-720.
- Richard Turton, Richard C. Bailie, Wallace B. Whiting, Joseph A. Shaeiwitz, & Debangsu Bhattacharyya. (2013). *Analysis, Synthesis, and Design of Chemical Processes* (Vol. Fourth Edition): Pearson Education Inc.
- Roldan, R. (2015). Technical and economic feasibility of adapting an industrial steam reforming unit for production of hydrogen from renewable ethanol. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 40(4), 2035-2046.
- Rossetti, I., Compagnoni, M., & Torli, M. (2015a). Process simulation and optimisation of H₂ production from ethanol steam reforming and its use in fuel cells. 1. Thermodynamic and kinetic analysis. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 281, 1024-1035.
- Rossetti, I., Compagnoni, M., & Torli, M. (2015b). Process simulation and optimization of H₂ production from ethanol steam reforming and its use in fuel cells. 2. Process analysis and optimization. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 281, 1036-1044.
- Rui, Z. B., Zhang, K., Li, Y. D., & Lin, Y. S. (2008). Simulation of methane conversion to syngas in a membrane reactor: Part I A model including product oxidation. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 33(9), 2246-2253.
- Saxena, R. C., Seal, D., Kumar, S., & Goyal, H. B. (2008). Thermo-chemical routes for hydrogen rich gas from biomass: A review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 12(7), 1909-1927.
- Simpson, A., & Lutz, A. (2007). Exergy analysis of hydrogen production via steam methane reforming. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 32(18), 4811-4820.
- Singh, A. P., Singh, S., Ganguly, S., & Patwardhan, A. V. (2014). Steam reforming of methane and methanol in simulated macro & micro-scale membrane reactors: Selective separation of hydrogen for optimum conversion. *Journal of Natural Gas Science and Engineering*, 18, 286-295.
- Sobrino, F. H., Monroy, C. R., & Pérez, J. L. H. (2010). Critical analysis on hydrogen as an alternative to fossil fuels and biofuels for vehicles in Europe. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 14(2), 772-780.

- Suh, S., Lenzen, M., Treloar, G. J., Hondo, H., Horvath, A., Huppes, G., . . . Norris, G. (2004). System Boundary Selection in Life-Cycle Inventories Using Hybrid Approaches. *Environ Sci Technol*, 38(3), 657-664.
- Susmozas, A., Iribarren, D., Zapp, P., Linßen, J., & Dufour, J. (2016). Life-cycle performance of hydrogen production via indirect biomass gasification with CO₂ capture. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*.
- Verma, A., & Kumar, A. (2015). Life cycle assessment of hydrogen production from underground coal gasification. *Applied Energy*, 147, 556-568.
- Vicente, J., Erena, J., Olazar, M., Benito, P. L., Bilbao, J., & Gayubo, A. G. (2014). Kinetic behaviour of commercial catalysts for methane reforming in ethanol steam reforming process. *Journal of Energy Chemistry*, 23(5), 639-644.
- West, A. H., Posarac, D., & Ellis, N. (2008). Assessment of four biodiesel production processes using HYSYS.Plant. *Bioresour Technol*, 99(14), 6587-6601.
- World, C. E. (June 2017). Chemical Engineering World *CEW*, 52.
- Wurzler, G. T., Rabelo-Neto, R. C., Mattos, L. V., Fraga, M. A., & Noronha, F. B. (2016). Steam reforming of ethanol for hydrogen production over MgO—supported Ni-based catalysts. *Applied Catalysis A: General*, 518, 115-128.
- Ye, C., Mu, D., Horowitz, N., Xue, Z., Chen, J., Xue, M., . . . Zhou, W. (2018). Life cycle assessment of industrial scale production of spirulina tablets. *Algal Research*, 34, 154-163.
- Young, D. M., & Cabezas, H. (1999). Designing sustainable processes with simulation the waste reduction WAR algorithm. *computers and chemical engineering*, 23.