

H₂ and CO₂ Network Strategies for the European Energy System

Fabian Hofmann, Christoph Tries, Fabian Neumann, Elisabeth Zeyen, Tom Brown

Institute of Energy Technology

Technical University of Berlin

Berlin, Germany

m.hofmann@tu-berlin.de

September 17, 2024

Abstract

Hydrogen and carbon dioxide transport can both play an essential role in climate-neutral energy systems. Hydrogen networks help serve regions with high energy demand, while excess emissions are transported away in carbon dioxide networks. For the synthesis of carbonaceous fuels, it is less clear which input should be transported: hydrogen to carbon point sources or carbon to low-cost hydrogen. We explore both networks' potential synergies and competition in a cost-optimal carbon-neutral European energy system. In a direct comparison, a hydrogen network is more cost-effective than a carbon network, as it serves to transport hydrogen to demand and to point source of carbon for utilization. However, in a hybrid scenario where both networks are present, the carbon network effectively complements the hydrogen network, promoting carbon capture from distributed biomass and reducing reliance on direct air capture. The layouts of the hydrogen and carbon dioxide networks are robust if the climate target is tightened to be net-negative.

1 Introduction

The transition to a climate-neutral European economy is a pressing challenge that demands coordinated action across various energy sectors. While management of both carbon dioxide (CO₂) and hydrogen (H₂) is considered a critical component of this tran-

sition, a gap exists in understanding how new hydrogen infrastructure effectively interacts with carbon management technologies, including carbon capture, transport, storage, utilization, and sequestration. Hydrogen is being considered in several industries that are not eligible for electrification. It offers an efficient way to transport and store energy over long distances and periods and can be produced from electrolysis or steam methane reforming (SMR), for example. Captured carbon can be stored in geological formations permanently, a process known as carbon sequestration (CS). Additionally, carbon can be combined with hydrogen to produce carbonaceous fuels, such as synthetic kerosene for aviation, synthetic methanol for shipping or synthetic methane for industrial feedstock or synthetic naphtha as a feedstock for high value chemicals. The production of these carbonaceous fuels is jointly referred to as Carbon Utilization (CU). Carbon can be effectively captured from industrial processes and the combustion of biomass, fossil fuels, or synthetic carbonaceous fuels through point-source carbon capture (CC) techniques, or harvested from the atmosphere using direct air capture (DAC). Both CO₂ and H₂ networks are likely to play a crucial role in the cost-effective integration of these carbon management technologies to enable net-zero economies.

In line with the climate neutrality target by 2050 of the European Union (EU) under the European Green Deal [1], numerous programs, financial models, and initiatives have been launched to support the ramp-

up of the hydrogen and carbon economy. The Renewable Energy Directive III [2] aims to produce 10 Mt hydrogen from renewable energy sources domestically in the EU. The Net-Zero Industry Act [3] proposes a CO₂ injection target of 50 Mt/a by 2030, which will be sequestered within the European Union. The European Commission’s 2024 industrial carbon management strategy [4] plans for capture of 450 Mt/a by 2050 in the EU, of which almost 250 Mt/a is sequestered. The European Innovation Fund [5] supports carbon management technologies to enhance the global competitiveness of European industries.

At the same time, collaborative industry initiatives like the European Hydrogen Backbone [6] or the Hydrogen Infrastructure Map [7] showcase the potential of hydrogen as a fuel and energy carrier. Business models from companies like Tree Energy Solutions [8], Carbfix [9], and Equinor [10] advertise carbon management hubs that provide green hydrogen, methane, and synthetic fuels on the one hand and offer to purchase CO₂ on the other hand. The Northern Lights project in Norway [11] is planning a transport and sequestration capacity of 1.5 Mt/a CO₂ to be operative in 2024, expanding to a targeted scale of 5 Mt/a of sequestration by 2030. The market potential for carbon capture and sequestration in Europe is underscored by the Capture Map’s estimated potential of 1.7 Gt carbon annually from point sources [12], accounting for about half of the continent’s emissions, as well as estimated sequestration capacity potentials of up to 3 Gt/a [13]. However, it is important to note that carbon sequestration technology, unlike carbon capture, is not yet fully mature and its full potential and implications remain to be explored in depth. To advance the carbon economy, the Clean Air Task Force emphasizes the importance of developing a carbon transport system in Europe alongside a hydrogen network [14]. Carbon pipelines, considered a mature technology, have seen widespread installations in the United States and Canada, primarily to supply CO₂ to enhanced oil recovery [15], [16].

Despite the abundance of policies and initiatives, up to this point, it remains unclear how the two transport systems of hydrogen and carbon may complement or even compete with each other. Both can bridge the misalignment of sources and sinks for car-

bon and hydrogen. A hydrogen network can supply regions with geographically fixed hydrogen demand, such as for steel production, with hydrogen from regions with the best renewable resources as well as enable CU at the site of point-source CC. On the other hand, the carbon transport system allows transporting captured carbon to regions with sequestration potentials or high-quality renewable resources, the latter enabling cost-effective CU.

In the literature, the two network approaches and underlying technologies have been discussed in several publications [17]–[28]. Such techno-economic models, in contrast for example to integrated Assessment Models, can account for the spatial distribution of carbon sources and sinks, which are crucial to provide a holistic view of the energy system and its technological interactions. However, all the techno-economic studies have only dealt with isolated aspects of hydrogen and carbon networks. Neumann et al. [28] demonstrated the extent to which hydrogen and electricity grid expansion is interchangeable in a climate-neutral European energy system at the expense of higher investments. The underlying, highly-resolved model encompasses the most relevant sectors, however it neglects the infrastructure required to transport carbon across regions. Morbee et al. [18] optimizes the topology and capacity of a CO₂ network in Europe, but only considers the power sector without co-optimizing renewable deployment. This limited sectoral scope cannot capture important dynamics of carbon management, since it neglects sectors like industry that will need to handle most CO₂ in the future. The European Commission’s Joint Research Center analyzed the possible topology of a CO₂ network in 2024 [29], but did not include the interaction of CO₂ sources and sinks with the rest of the energy system. Becattini et al. [27] present a mixed-integer model to optimize the time-evolution of a CO₂ transport system in Switzerland, connected to a remote sequestration site in Norway. However, this limited spatial scope fails to consider other sequestration sites and the co-benefits from connecting the CO₂ network to neighboring countries. Other high-resolution energy system models do not feature detailed CU technologies and CO₂ transport. In Pickering et al. [30], the Euro-Calliope model, for example,

features neither carbon nor hydrogen transport, and thus forces generic synthetic fuel production to rely on locale electrolysis and DAC in the same region.

No study has yet considered the co-optimization and comprehensive assessment of both CO₂ and H₂ networks in a fully sector-coupled energy system. Such an assessment is strongly needed to identify realms of competition and synergy between hydrogen and carbon management technologies. In this paper, we present a detailed study of the European energy system for 2050, which includes high geographical resolution and a comprehensive representation of carbon management technologies. The study is conducted using the PyPSA-Eur energy system model [31] which optimizes operations and investments in all relevant energy sectors to supply projected energy demands for 2050 (see Fig. 1). It is assumed that Europe is self-sufficient in energy and does not import any fuels. This drives carbonaceous fuel production to be located at sites where both CO₂ and H₂ can be provided at low cost.

To investigate the competing transport dynamics between CO₂ and H₂ networks, we contrast the following four scenarios with different sets of networks present:

Scenario	CO ₂ Network	H ₂ Network
Baseline	–	–
CO ₂ -Grid	✓	–
H ₂ -Grid	–	✓
Hybrid	✓	✓

Table 1: Set of transportation networks in the developed scenarios.

We analyze how the option to deploy carbon and hydrogen networks affects different decarbonization strategies in the scenarios and how investments in none or only one of the transport technologies lead to inefficient infrastructure layouts. Initially, we focus on a net-zero carbon emissions target, limiting carbon sequestration to 200 Mt/a. This constraint ensures that carbon sequestration is reserved for the hardest-to-abate emissions, while avoiding reliance on sequestration where other mitigation options are




Figure 1: Assumptions on exogenous demand, derived from [32]–[37]. The figure shows total annual energy demands for each energy source, which determine the model’s endogenous investments and operation. Endogenous processes can lead to higher total production volumes of some energy carriers, e.g., the demand for methanol requires more hydrogen and carbon as secondary (energy) inputs, which are not considered here. In the model, demands are defined per region and time stamp.

feasible. We give a detailed description of the different technological and geographical impacts of the transportation systems. Subsequently, our analysis demonstrates the extent to which different deployment strategies remain robust under a tightened target with net CO₂ removal.

2 Results

All scenarios share key characteristics but differ in system costs and technology use (Fig. 2). Costs in the Baseline scenario are the highest at 764 bn€/a. Scenarios with carbon and hydrogen networks are

more cost-effective, reducing costs by 3.1% in the CO₂-Grid, 4.7% in the H₂-Grid, and 5.3% in the Hybrid scenario.




Figure 2: Total annual system cost, subdivided into groups of technologies for the different models of the European energy system with a net-zero emission target. While in the Baseline scenario, the model has neither a carbon nor a hydrogen network, it can expand both in the Hybrid scenario. “Gas Infrastructure” combines gas facilities for transport, power and heat production, “CO₂ Infrastructure” and “H₂ Infrastructure” combine transport and storage for each carrier. “Carbon Capture at Point Sources” combines all technologies with integrated carbon capture, including the cost of the main facility (e.g., Combined Heat and Power units) and the carbon capture application.

System cost differences between the scenarios are driven by investments in wind and solar, as well as carbon capture technologies. In scenarios with carbon and hydrogen networks, the model primarily reduces the reliance on costly DAC, from 365 Mt/a carbon capture in the Baseline scenario to 113 Mt/a in the Hybrid scenario (see Fig. 3). At the same time, carbon capture from biomass combustion, gas-based industry processes and biogas upgrading increase.

The latter lowers the need for synthetic methane production.




Figure 3: Balance of captured carbon for all scenarios assuming net CO₂ neutrality. Positive values indicate carbon capture and negative values indicate carbon consumption. By integrating hydrogen and carbon networks, the predominant method for carbon removal shifts from Direct Air Capture (DAC) to bio-energetic processes with capture. At the same time, the reliance on methanation decreases.

In the Baseline scenario, where there is no carbon and hydrogen transport, hydrogen must be produced where it is consumed. For CU, either hydrogen must be produced where carbon is cheap at point sources, or DAC must be used at sites with low-cost hydrogen. Where fossil carbon from point sources cannot be sequestered, it has to be compensated elsewhere by negative emissions from DAC or biomass capture with sequestration. To provide hydrogen in some regions with poor renewable resources the model resorts to SMR with either green or fossil methane transported in the gas grid. All of these options are suboptimal from a cost perspective.

Networks unlock low-cost H₂ and CO₂

Both a carbon network and a hydrogen network can help alleviate these inefficiencies. On the one hand, a carbon network allows carbon from point sources to be transported to low-cost hydrogen as well as to sequestration sites. On the other hand, a hydrogen network allows low-cost hydrogen to be transported from regions with good renewable resources to point sources for CU. This results in fundamentally different network flows in each scenario (see Fig. 4).

In the CO₂-Grid scenario, there are three main transport purposes of the low-cost carbon captured in Central and Eastern Europe (see Fig. 4, top left). A large part of the carbon is transported to the Iberian Peninsula (avg. 9.8 kt/h) and the British Isles (avg. 11.8 kt/h), where it is used along with low-cost electrolytic hydrogen to produce Fischer-Tropsch fuels and methanol. In Italy and Greece, a portion of the carbon (avg. 3.3 kt/h) is directed to methanation facilities where the synthetic methane is fed into the gas grid at key terminals that also receive fossil gas imports. Finally, a third part of captured carbon is transported directly to sites in the North Sea, Baltic Sea and Mediterranean Sea where it is sequestered. Almost none of the captured carbon is used locally at the point source. In addition to electrolysis in regions with good renewable resources to supply CU ($\sim 125 \text{ GW}_{\text{el}}$), the model places smaller amounts of electrolyzers where hydrogen is needed for industrial processes across Central Europe ($\sim 8 \text{ GW}_{\text{el}}$) (see bottom left). Hydrogen prices vary widely across the continent, with low price “valleys” at around 60 €/MWh, where the CU is located, and high price “peaks” in Central Europe at around 95 €/MWh. Despite the transport system, marginal cost of carbon capture still vary from 105 €/t in Central Europe to 160 €/t at sequestration sites.

In the H₂-Grid scenario, the main hydrogen transportation route goes from Spain (66 GW) to Central Europe to supply local carbonaceous fuel production with captured carbon from point sources, since CO₂ can no longer be transported (see Fig 4, bottom right). Also, the hydrogen network supplies spatially fixed hydrogen demand for industry in Central Europe (2.5 GW in total) at much lower costs than lo-

cal electrolysis or SMR. Carbon sequestration takes place at several coastal sites with local DAC facilities. The largest carbon sink is located in Portugal (3.5 kt/h, see Fig 4, top right). Marginal costs of carbon capture are low in Central Europe (110-120 €/t) and highest in sequestration regions (160 €/t). Hydrogen prices have flattened out at a relatively low level of 60 €/MWh in all regions.

In both scenarios, CU is placed where material inputs, CO₂ and H₂, are provided at minimal cost, i.e., in price valleys of hydrogen and carbon in the CO₂-Grid and H₂-Grid scenario respectively. In the CO₂-Grid scenario, CU co-locates with low-cost hydrogen production and uses transported carbon from the inland. In the H₂-Grid scenario, CU co-locates with carbon point sources and uses transported low-cost hydrogen.

We conclude, there are individual cost-benefits of the transport networks. On the one hand, the carbon network enables the transport of low-cost captured carbon to sequestration sites, reducing the dependence on high-cost DAC near the coast which is present in the H₂-Grid scenario. On the other hand, the H₂-Grid is able to supply the spatially-fixed hydrogen demands in Central Europe with low-cost hydrogen imports, while the model in the CO₂-Grid scenario is forced to deploy electrolysis in regions with poor renewable resources. The latter aspect finally leads to lower system costs in the H₂-Grid scenario than in the CO₂-Grid scenario.

Hybrid configuration combines advantages

The Hybrid scenario combines the advantages of hydrogen and carbon networks, resulting in the highest system cost reduction of 5.3% (41 bn€/a) compared to the Baseline scenario. Again, the model transports low-cost hydrogen to the point sources in Central Europe to supply CU, but also transports low-cost carbon from point sources close to the shore to sequestration sites (see Fig. 5). This provides low-cost hydrogen across the regions and reduces reliance on more expensive DAC.

For the carbon network, the model employs short and direct pipeline routes to transport carbon from




Figure 4: Average production, consumption, flows and prices of the carbon (top line) and hydrogen (bottom line) sectors in the CO₂-Grid (left) and the H₂-Grid scenario (right). For each region, upper semicircles show the average production per technology, lower semicircles the consumption, and colors the average marginal prices. Lines and arrows show the interregional transportation. Carbon sequestration offshore is drawn in full circles.

inland point sources to nearby sequestration sites, for example in Northern Germany, Italy and Greece (see Fig. 5, left). In addition, pipelines transport rather

small amounts of carbon from spatially fixed point sources to CU facilities. A notable outlier is the route from the Netherlands via the UK and France to large




Figure 5: Average operation, flows and prices of the carbon (left) and hydrogen (right) sectors in the Hybrid scenario assuming net CO₂ neutrality. For each region, upper semicircles show the average production per technology, lower semicircles the consumption, and colors the average marginal prices. Carbon Sequestration offshore is drawn in full circles. Lines and arrows show interregional transportation volume. Carbon from point-source in the inland either supplies local CU with imported hydrogen or facilitates sequestration in nearby offshore regions.

methanolization and Fischer-Tropsch plants in northern Spain. The hydrogen routes are similar to those in the H₂-Grid scenario with transports from Western regions (the Iberian Peninsula and the British Isles) to distributed CU production sites across the continent (see Fig. 5, right). While the topology of the hydrogen network (1.2 bn€/a) roughly corresponds to that of the H₂-Grid scenario and is primarily driven by CU, the carbon network (0.6 bn€/a) plays a sec-

ondary role and is driven by CS (compare Fig. A.17a).

In this setup, the networks enable all carbon-emitting technologies that operate at a high average capacity factor, i.e., above 70%, to capture most of their carbon (see Fig. 6). More than 90% of emissions are captured for most technologies. The exceptions are SMR and gas-fired CHP plants, which operate only a few weeks annually, making carbon capture units economically unfeasible for these applications.




Figure 6: Proportion of plants with integrated carbon capture for scenarios. The size of the dots corresponds to the average capacity factor of the respective technology. While peak load technologies such as gas-fired combined heat and power (CHP) plants, which are only in operation a few weeks a year, are not expanded for carbon capture, point sources with base load characteristics such as biomass CHP and process emissions from industry are fully (partially) developed as soon as the transport of carbon (hydrogen) is permitted.

Due to the better integration of point sources, only a few DAC facilities are installed, such as those used for methanolization in Spain. This, in turn, leads to reduced power consumption and less wind and solar power deployment than in the other scenarios.

Network layouts are robust against tighter emission targets

In a further set of scenarios, we apply a stricter CO₂ emissions target and force the model to remove 460 Mt of CO₂ in one year (equivalent to 10% of 1990 CO₂ emissions) while sequestering a maximum of 660 Mt. There are additional system costs of 78–82 bn€/a in all scenarios, of which the largest proportion is the investment in DAC and associated solar and wind power and heat supply (see Fig. 7). In the Hybrid scenario, this share is 78%, while new carbon capture at point sources accounts for only 4% of in-




Figure 7: Net change in system cost when tightening the CO₂ emission target from net-zero to net-negative 10% of 1990s emissions. Each cost bar is split into contributions of the same technology groups as used in Fig. 2, except for carbon sequestration costs, which are now displayed separately. For all models, Direct Air Capture (DAC) contributes the most to additional CO₂ removal, requiring further solar, wind and heat pump capacities for electricity and heat input.

cremental system costs. This shows that point source carbon capture is already almost exhausted in the net-zero case. The additional sequestration is mainly provided by large DAC facilities near the coast. To a much lesser extent, carbon captured from inland bioenergy sources, which would provide CU under a net-zero assumption, is instead transported and sequestered (see Fig. A.21). Some of the CU located in Central Europe in net-zero scenarios is instead diverted to Spain, where it uses carbon from new DAC facilities.

These changes have little effect on the layout of the CO₂ and H₂ networks (see Fig. A.18 and Fig. A.21). The slight shift in CU deployment results in less hydrogen pipeline construction in some parts of the system. Nevertheless, 80% of the hydrogen topology built under the net-zero emissions assumption is also built under the net-negative target. The CO₂

network partially extends routes from Central and Eastern Europe to the coasts. The relative benefits of CO₂ transport and sequestration with tighter emissions targets are evident when compared with the other scenarios. The carbon network in the net-negative CO₂-Grid scenario is larger than in the net-zero CO₂-Grid scenario and transports more carbon from point sources to sequestration sites than to CU facilities. In the H₂-Grid scenario, where all carbon for CU and CS must come from DAC, the hydrogen transport topology remains almost identical to the net-zero scenarios (for detailed cost contributions see sections A.5 and A.6 in the Appendix).

Overall, this leads to the net cost increases of 78 bn€/a in the CO₂-Grid scenario, by 80 bn€/a in the H₂-Grid scenario, and by 78 bn€/a in the Hybrid scenario. The resulting cost-benefit of the Hybrid scenario in comparison to the other scenarios is 6 bn€/a.

3 Discussion

Our study assesses the roles of hydrogen (H₂) and carbon dioxide (CO₂) networks in Europe’s future energy system under net carbon neutrality and net-removal targets. We show that both networks strongly impact the optimal deployment of carbon capture, carbon utilization and sequestration. A CO₂ network reduces costs by transporting low-cost carbon from distributed point sources to sequestration sites and sites with low-cost hydrogen production to produce carbonaceous fuels. A hydrogen network provides greater cost savings as low-cost hydrogen can be transported to regions with high demand, allowing carbon utilization at point sources. A combination of both networks emphasizes the strengths of each infrastructure. In the hybrid configuration, the H₂ network supplies low-cost hydrogen to spatially fixed hydrogen demand and carbon utilization at point sources across regions. At the same time, the CO₂ network transports low-cost carbon captured from point sources near the coast to sequestration sites, reducing the reliance on direct air capture. This results not only in the lowest system cost but also in a system robust to tightening the target to net-negative

emissions.

Limitations of the study, such as the neglect of synthetic fuel imports and assumptions on biomass potentials, are discussed in the Appendix in Section A.1. The Appendix in Section A.3 provides an analysis of the model’s sensitivities. Notably, relaxing the limit from 200 to 800 Mt/a reduces system costs by 9.1% in the hybrid scenario. This reduction is achieved by replacing the production of synthetic e-fuels with fossil fuels that are either captured and sequestered, or left unabated and compensated by carbon dioxide removal. Investments in renewable power assets and hydrogen infrastructure which serve the synthetic fuel production for the aviation, shipping and industry sectors drop by roughly a third. A similar effect on synthetic fuel production in Europe would be expected if synthetic fuels were instead imported from outside Europe. Smaller effects can be seen from reducing capital costs for CO₂ pipelines and costs of electrolyzers.

For policymakers these results show the need for coordinated planning across sectors like carbon, hydrogen and synthetic fuels since they are strongly interacting, as well as across borders because of the localized nature of good renewable resources and sequestration potentials. Deploying multiple networks offers some robustness should unforeseen problems arise with one of them, and our results show that the system can even cope with neither a CO₂ nor H₂ network for a cost penalty. Many of the technologies have not yet been deployed at scale before and will need support for financing, regulation and gaining the acceptance of local populations.

In summary, our study highlights the benefits of strategic planning and integration of both CO₂ and H₂ networks in the European energy landscape. The flexibility and cost-efficiency offered by these networks can make a significant contribution to achieving the EU’s climate targets, in particular by reducing dependence on technologies that are still in the early market phase, such as Direct Air Capture. Leveraging the synergies between H₂ and CO₂ transportation and management, Europe can effectively reduce system costs while ensuring a robust and sustainable energy system.

Methods

The study is conducted based on the open-source, capacity expansion model PyPSA-Eur [38]–[40]. The model uses the open-source software tools PyPSA [41] and Linopy [42] for modeling and cost optimization. The model optimizes the design and operation of the European energy system, encompassing the power, heat, industry, agriculture, and transport sectors, including international aviation and shipping. All technology cost assumptions are taken for the year 2040 and sourced from an open-source database [43]. The database applies a discount rate of 7% for all major technologies, accounting for the weighted average costs of capital (WACC) of investments. Many of the assumptions contained therein are based on the technology catalogs published by the Danish Energy Agency [44], [45]. Endogenous model results include expansion of renewable energy sources, storage technologies, Power-To-X conversion and transmission capacities, heating technologies, peaking power plants, and the deployment of gray, blue or green hydrogen production facilitates, among others. The model considers various energy carriers like electricity, heat, hydrogen, methane, methanol, liquid hydrocarbons, and biomass, together with the corresponding conversion technologies.

In our configuration, the model’s time horizon spans one year, with a 3-hourly temporal resolution and a spatial resolution of 90 regions. Each of the regions consists of a complex subsystem with technologies for supplying, converting, storing and transporting energy. Exogenous assumptions on energy demand and non-abatable emissions are taken from various sources [32]–[37] (see Fig. 1). The energy demand for electricity, transport, biomass, heat and gas is defined per region and time-step. Land transport demand is exogenously assumed to be fully electrified, including heavy-duty vehicles. Demands for kerosene for aviation, methanol for shipping, and naphtha for industry are not spatially resolved and assumed to be constant throughout all time steps. Heat demand is regionally subdivided into shares of urban, rural and industrial sites. The system exogenously produces 633 Mt/a CO₂ from industry, aviation, shipping and agriculture, 153 Mt of which are fossil-based process

emissions. Locations for industrial clusters are taken from [46]. Energy demand for industries is calculated from [34].

Low-carbon electricity is provided by wind, solar, biomass, hydroelectricity and nuclear power plants. Hydroelectric and nuclear plants cannot be extended beyond their currently installed capacities. Weather-dependent power potentials for solar, wind and hydro-electricity are calculated from the reanalysis and satellite data sets, ERA5 and SARA-2, [47], [48] per region and time-stamp, using the open-source tool Atlite [49]. Solar and wind power can be expanded in alignment with land-use restrictions calculated, taking into account land usage classes and natural protection areas [50], [51]. We restrict the total volume of power transmission expansion to 20% of its current capacity, acknowledging the challenges in inaugurating new transmission projects. For the use of biomass, we consider only residual biomass products and no energy crops. We limit regional biomass use to the medium-level potentials from the JRC-ENSPRESO database [52], [53]. Interregional biomass transport is permitted, with transport costs of ~ 0.1 €/MWh/km considered.

The topology and capacities of the electricity transmission system are taken from the ENTSO-E transparency map [54] and selected Ten Year Network Development Plan (TYNDP) projects. The power flow is based on the linearized power flow approximation assuming a linear transport efficiency of 95.75% per 1000 km accounting for resistive losses on the power lines. The topology of the H₂, CO₂ and gas network is identical to the topology of the electricity network, connecting all neighboring regions. For hydrogen pipelines an average loss of 1.2% per 1000 km, aligning with industry estimates that account for hydrogen’s high permeability and small molecular size, which can lead to higher losses compared to other gases. The electrical demand for compression stations is assumed to be 1.8% per 1000 km of the transported energy. For CO₂ pipelines an average loss rate of 0.8% per 1000 km is reflecting a generally low leakage rate observed in supercritical or dense phase CO₂ transport [55], [56]. The compression energy needed is set to 250 kWh per 1000 km and tonne CO₂ to maintain a supercritical state for efficient transport.

For natural gas pipelines, the model assumes a 1% loss rate per 1000 km, accounting for typical leakage and operational losses in well-maintained natural gas infrastructure as reported in [57]. The electrical demand for compression is set at 1% per 1000 km of the transported energy, which falls within the common range for natural gas pipeline operations [58]. Liquid fuels like oil, methanol and Fischer-Tropsch (FT) fuels are not spatially resolved, since transport costs per unit of energy are negligible due to their high energy density. Throughout this study, we focus on CO₂ and H₂ networks because of their high relevance to infrastructure investments and thus public policy decisions. The electricity network and gas network are both included in the model with full geographical detail, but are not further analyzed. Electricity networks are already in place, and we restrict further extension to 25% due to concerns about public acceptance. Gas networks also already exist, and will most likely experience decreased use in the future, removing any bottlenecks or constraints on the optimal system buildout or operation. If enabled, hydrogen can be transported via pipelines between regions which can be expanded without limits, considering costs for pipeline segments and compressors. Pipeline flows are modeled using net transfer capacities and without flow dynamics, pressure valves, or energy demand for compression. No retrofitting of gas pipelines is considered.

In our model, we consider green, blue and gray hydrogen from electrolysis and steam methane reforming (SMR), the latter of which may be equipped with CC technology. The geographical distribution of underground hydrogen storage potentials in salt caverns is derived from Caglayan et al. [59]. Re-electrification of hydrogen is possible via fuel cells.

We argue that it is crucial for proper modeling to consider CC, CU and CS as separate technologies, rather than grouping them under the often-used but misleading umbrella term “carbon capture, utilization and storage” (CCUS), to allow for independent optimization and adequate representation of each function in the carbon management system. Our model features three drop-in fuel production technologies for CU: methanation, methanolization, and Fischer-Tropsch synthesis. The processed fuels are

not limited in their total quantity of use or production. Methane is transported through the gas network, while methanol and FT fuel can be transported between regions without additional costs or capacity constraints. Synthetic methane substitutes natural gas or upgraded biogas, serving combined heat and power plants, residential heating gas boilers, or industrial process heat. Synthetic methanol decarbonizes marine industry fuel demands, and FT fuels replace fossil oil for naphtha production for high-value chemicals, aviation kerosene, or agricultural machinery oil.

To supply carbon needed for CS and CU, the system can choose to deploy carbon capture (CC) technologies at various point sources of fossil or biogenic origin (see below), or through DAC facilities. The concept of a merit order for capturing carbon plays a pivotal role in optimizing the deployment of carbon capture technologies based on their economic feasibility. This merit order ranks all CC technologies according to their relative costs to capture an additional marginal ton. The cost value for a technology depends on the exact system configuration and operation and may vary by scenario and even by region since many technologies produce other (primary) outputs such as electricity and heat. The costs to capture an additional marginal ton of carbon may also be different from the average cost of capture. At the lower end of the cost spectrum, CC technologies applied to process emissions, such as those from cement, offer a cost-effective starting point. Following this, biomass combined heat and power (CHP) systems provide the dual benefit of energy production and carbon capture. Moving up the scale, gas used in industrial applications and biomass employed in industrial processes represent more costly yet viable options to capture carbon. DAC, an emerging technology capable of extracting CO₂ directly from the atmosphere, stands at a high-cost level due to its current high capital costs and energy demand. Finally, based on our model results, biogas upgrading, a process that refines biogas to natural gas quality, incurs the highest costs in the merit order per marginal ton of captured CO₂. Biogas input is a high-cost fuel that based on endogenous modeling decisions is not used in large quantities. To the extent that biogas-to-gas facilities are used by the model to supply additional

(carbon-neutral) gas as fuel, adding CC infrastructure incurs low costs (and thus ranges on the left-hand side of the merit order curve). However, the price of capturing additional CO₂ from biogas-to-gas upgrading is high because a substantial amount of the biogas fuel costs factors into the marginal cost of captured CO₂. This merit order framework is crucial for strategically deploying necessary carbon capture solutions while balancing economic considerations. If we consider the spatial aspect of distributed carbon capture potentials, the CO₂ network can exploit comparative cost advantages between CO₂ bidding zones to utilize the lowest-cost CC facilities across the continent. We assume a capture rate of 90% for CC on process emissions, SMR, biogas-to-gas, as well as gas and biomass used in industry, and 95% for CC on biomass and gas CHPs.




Figure 8: Maximal sequestration potential per offshore region used as input for all models. Note that in most model runs the regional sequestration potentials are not exploited due to the global limit on sequestration.

To store carbon, we differentiate between short-term storage in steel tanks without permanent containment and long-term, irreversible sequestration in underground sequestration sites such as porous rock formations or depleted gas reservoirs. Costs for both options are included in the model. For carbon sequestration, we only consider offshore sites as poten-

tial sinks (see Fig. 8). We make this choice because offshore sequestration sites typically have a larger capacity compared to onshore sequestration sites in saline aquifers and due to concerns over public safety for infrastructure near populated areas. Our estimates for carbon sequestration potentials are restrictive, limiting the annual sequestration potential to 25 Mt per region and constraining it further such that it provides enough volume to allow for 25 years of sequestration. Furthermore, we decided to limit the total amount of sequestered CO₂ to 200 Mt/a for our net-zero CO₂ emission target and 660 Mt/a for our net-negative emission target. This constraint is deliberately implemented to avoid over-reliance on carbon capture and sequestration as a backstop technology, which could otherwise offset fossil emissions instead of prioritizing the reduction of fossil fuel use where technologically feasible. By capping the sequestration at 200 Mt/a, we aim to promote a balanced energy transition, where sequestration is used to offset hard-to-abate fossil process emissions (e.g., calcination of limestone in cement manufacturing) but does not become a substitute for more sustainable mitigation measures. The implications of this choice are discussed in the Appendix in Section A.3.

Data availability

All input, processed and resulting data is available or can be generated via the workflow github.com/FabianHofmann/carbon-networks and the underlying workflow github.com/pypsa/PyPSA-Eur. Data on the optimized energy system models analyzed throughout the study was made publicly available under [10.6084/m9.figshare.24923028](https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.24923028).

Code availability

The code to reproduce all figures and numbers is available at github.com/FabianHofmann/carbon-networks.

Acknowledgements

Fabian Hofmann and Christoph Tries are funded by the Breakthrough Energy Initiative (breakthrough-energy.org).

References

- [1] European Commission, *The European Green Deal*, European Commission - Communication, 2019. [Online]. Available: https://ec.europa.eu/info/strategy/priorities-2019-2024/european-green-deal%5C_en.
- [2] *Directive (EU) 2023/2413 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 October 2023 amending Directive (EU) 2018/2001, Regulation (EU) 2018/1999 and Directive 98/70/EC as regards the promotion of energy from renewable sources, and repealing Council Directive (EU) 2015/652*, Oct. 2023. [Online]. Available: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/2023/2413/oj/eng> (visited on 12/21/2023).
- [3] European Commission, *Net-zero industry act*, European Commission - Press release, Mar. 2023. [Online]. Available: https://single-market-economy.ec.europa.eu/industry/sustainability/net-zero-industry-act%5C_en.
- [4] European Commission, *Towards an ambitious industrial carbon management for the EU*, European Commission - Communication, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=COM:2024:62:FIN>.
- [5] European Commission, *European innovation fund*, European Commission - Funding Program, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/innovation-fund%5C_en.
- [6] Gas for Climate, *European Hydrogen Backbone - A European Hydrogen Infrastructure Vision Covering 28 Countries*, Apr. 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://gasforclimate2050.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/EHB-A-European-hydrogen-infrastructure-vision-covering-28-countries.pdf>.
- [7] *H2 Infrastructure Map Europe*. [Online]. Available: <https://www.h2inframap.eu/> (visited on 11/17/2023).
- [8] *TES Hydrogen for life — Green Cycle*, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://experience.tes-h2.com/> (visited on 02/01/2023).
- [9] *We turn CO2 into stone - Carbfix*. [Online]. Available: <https://www.carbfix.com/> (visited on 03/20/2023).
- [10] N. Adomaitis and C. Steitz, “Equinor and RWE to build hydrogen supply chain for German power plants,” *Reuters*, Jan. 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.reuters.com/business/energy/equinor-rwe-build-hydrogen-supply-chain-german-power-plants-2023-01-05/> (visited on 02/01/2023).
- [11] *Northern Lights - What we do*. [Online]. Available: <https://norlights.com/what-we-do/> (visited on 11/09/2023).
- [12] *Tools for the green transition*. [Online]. Available: <https://www.endrava.no/?lang=en> (visited on 11/29/2022).
- [13] European Commission, *European CO2 storage database*. [Online]. Available: https://setis.ec.europa.eu/european-co2-storage-database%5C_en (visited on 12/12/2023).
- [14] T. Lockwood and T. Bertels, “A European Strategy for Carbon Capture and Storage,”
- [15] T. K. Righetti, “Siting Carbon Dioxide Pipelines,” *ONE J: Oil and Gas, Natural Resources, and Energy Journal*, vol. 3, p. 907, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/onej3%5C&id=927%5C&div=%5C&collection=>.
- [16] J. Friedmann, A. Zapantis, B. Page, C. Consoli, Z. Fan, I. Havercroft, H. Liu, E. Ochu, N. Raji, D. Rassool, *et al.*, “Net-zero and geospheric return: Actions today for 2030 and beyond,” *Center on Global Energy Policy*, 2020.
- [17] B. H. Bakken and I. von Streng Velken, “Linear Models for Optimization of Infrastructure for CO2 Capture and Storage,” *IEEE Transactions on Energy Conversion*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 824–833, Sep. 2008, ISSN: 1558-0059. DOI: [10.1109/TEC.2008.921474](https://doi.org/10.1109/TEC.2008.921474).

- [18] J. Morbee, J. Serpa, and E. Tzimas, “Optimised deployment of a European CO₂ transport network,” *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, vol. 7, pp. 48–61, Mar. 2012, ISSN: 1750-5836. DOI: [10.1016/j.ijggc.2011.11.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2011.11.011). [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1750583611002210> (visited on 03/13/2023).
- [19] R. J. Stewart, V. Scott, R. S. Haszeldine, D. Ainger, and S. Argent, “The feasibility of a European-wide integrated CO₂ transport network,” *Greenhouse Gases: Science and Technology*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 481–494, 2014, ISSN: 2152-3878. DOI: [10.1002/ghg.1410](https://doi.org/10.1002/ghg.1410). [Online]. Available: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/ghg.1410> (visited on 11/13/2023).
- [20] P.-Y. Oei, J. Herold, and R. Mendelevitch, “Modeling a Carbon Capture, Transport, and Storage Infrastructure for Europe,” *Environmental Modeling & Assessment*, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 515–531, Dec. 2014, ISSN: 1573-2967. DOI: [10.1007/s10666-014-9409-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10666-014-9409-3). [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10666-014-9409-3> (visited on 03/13/2023).
- [21] N. Elahi, N. Shah, A. Korre, and S. Durucan, “Multi-period Least Cost Optimisation Model of an Integrated Carbon Dioxide Capture Transportation and Storage Infrastructure in the UK,” *Energy Procedia*, 12th International Conference on Greenhouse Gas Control Technologies, GHGT-12, vol. 63, pp. 2655–2662, Jan. 2014, ISSN: 1876-6102. DOI: [10.1016/j.egypro.2014.11.288](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2014.11.288). [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1876610214021031> (visited on 03/13/2023).
- [22] T. Burandt, B. Xiong, K. Löffler, and P.-Y. Oei, “Decarbonizing China’s energy system – Modeling the transformation of the electricity, transportation, heat, and industrial sectors,” *Applied Energy*, vol. 255, p. 113 820, Dec. 2019, ISSN: 0306-2619. DOI: [10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.113820](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.113820). [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0306261919315077> (visited on 02/01/2023).
- [23] R. S. Middleton, S. P. Yaw, B. A. Hoover, and K. M. Ellett, “SimCCS: An open-source tool for optimizing CO₂ capture, transport, and storage infrastructure,” *Environmental Modelling & Software*, vol. 124, p. 104 560, Feb. 2020, ISSN: 1364-8152. DOI: [10.1016/j.envsoft.2019.104560](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2019.104560). [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364815218300185> (visited on 11/29/2022).
- [24] V. S. Bjerketvedt, A. Tomasgard, and S. Rousanally, “Optimal design and cost of ship-based CO₂ transport under uncertainties and fluctuations,” *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, vol. 103, p. 103 190, Dec. 2020, ISSN: 1750-5836. DOI: [10.1016/j.ijggc.2020.103190](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2020.103190). [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1750583620306150> (visited on 03/13/2023).
- [25] Y.-M. Wei, J.-N. Kang, L.-C. Liu, Q. Li, P.-T. Wang, J.-J. Hou, Q.-M. Liang, H. Liao, S.-F. Huang, and B. Yu, “A proposed global layout of carbon capture and storage in line with a 2 °C climate target,” *Nature Climate Change*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 112–118, Feb. 2021, ISSN: 1758-6798. DOI: [10.1038/s41558-020-00960-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-00960-0). [Online]. Available: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41558-020-00960-0> (visited on 11/29/2022).
- [26] F. d’Amore, M. C. Romano, and F. Bezzo, “Optimal design of European supply chains for carbon capture and storage from industrial emission sources including pipe and ship transport,” *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, vol. 109, p. 103 372, Jan. 2021, ISSN: 1750-5836. DOI: [10.1016/j.ijggc.2021.103372](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2021.103372). [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1750583621001249>.
- [27] V. Becattini, P. Gabrielli, C. Antonini, J. Campos, A. Acquilino, G. Sansavini, and M. Mazzotti, “Carbon dioxide capture, transport and

- storage supply chains: Optimal economic and environmental performance of infrastructure rollout,” *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, vol. 117, p. 103635, Jun. 2022, ISSN: 1750-5836. DOI: [10.1016/j.ijggc.2022.103635](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2022.103635). [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1750583622000548> (visited on 11/29/2022).
- [28] F. Neumann, E. Zeyen, M. Victoria, and T. Brown, *Benefits of a Hydrogen Network in Europe*, Jul. 2022. arXiv: [2207.05816 \[physics\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.05816). [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2207.05816> (visited on 11/29/2022).
- [29] D. Tumara, A. Uihlein, and I. Hidalgo Gonzalez, “Shaping the future CO₂ transport network for Europe,” European Commission, Joint Research Center, Tech. Rep., 2024, p. 89. [Online]. Available: <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2760/582433>.
- [30] B. Pickering, F. Lombardi, and S. Pfenninger, “Diversity of options to eliminate fossil fuels and reach carbon neutrality across the entire European energy system,” *Joule*, vol. 6, no. 6, pp. 1253–1276, Jun. 2022, ISSN: 2542-4785, 2542-4351. DOI: [10.1016/j.joule.2022.05.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joule.2022.05.009). [Online]. Available: [https://www.cell.com/joule/abstract/S2542-4351\(22\)00236-7](https://www.cell.com/joule/abstract/S2542-4351(22)00236-7) (visited on 12/11/2023).
- [31] T. Brown, M. Victoria, E. Zeyen, F. Hofmann, F. Neumann, M. Frysztacki, J. Hampp, D. Schlachtberger, and J. Hörsch, *PyPSA-Eur: An open sector-coupled optimisation model of the European energy system*, Zenodo, Jul. 2023. DOI: [10.5281/ZENODO.8189026](https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.8189026). [Online]. Available: <https://zenodo.org/record/8189026> (visited on 12/21/2023).
- [32] T. F. Pia Manz, *Georeferenced industrial sites with fuel demand and excess heat potential*, Mar. 2018. DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.4687147](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4687147). [Online]. Available: <https://zenodo.org/record/4687147> (visited on 03/03/2023).
- [33] J. Muehlenpfordt, *Time series*, Jun. 2019. DOI: [10.25832/TIME_SERIES/2019-06-05](https://doi.org/10.25832/TIME_SERIES/2019-06-05). [Online]. Available: https://data.open-power-system-data.org/time%5C_series/2019-06-05 (visited on 11/14/2023).
- [34] L. Mantzos, N. A. Matei, E. Mulholland, M. Rózsai, M. Tamba, and T. Wiesenthal, “JRC-IDEES 2015,” Jun. 2018. DOI: [10.2905/JRC-10110-10001](https://doi.org/10.2905/JRC-10110-10001). [Online]. Available: <http://data.europa.eu/89h/jrc-10110-10001> (visited on 11/14/2023).
- [35] *National emissions reported to the UNFCCC and to the EU greenhouse gas monitoring mechanism, october 2023*, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://sdi.eea.europa.eu/catalogue/srv/api/records/e2e7dd1e-0d67-4b20-a0d4-b22c53a59d24>.
- [36] Eurostat, *Complete energy balance*, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/nrg%5C_bal%5C_/default/table?lang=en.
- [37] Uwe Krien, Patrick Schönfeldt, and et al., *Demandlib*, oemof community, Sep. 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/oemof/demandlib> (visited on 11/14/2023).
- [38] J. Hörsch, F. Hofmann, D. Schlachtberger, and T. Brown, “PyPSA-Eur: An open optimisation model of the European transmission system,” *Energy Strategy Reviews*, vol. 22, pp. 207–215, Nov. 2018, ISSN: 2211467X. DOI: [10.1016/j.esr.2018.08.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esr.2018.08.012). [Online]. Available: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2211467X18300804> (visited on 04/01/2019).
- [39] T. Brown, D. Schlachtberger, A. Kies, S. Schramm, and M. Greiner, “Synergies of sector coupling and transmission reinforcement in a cost-optimised, highly renewable European energy system,” *Energy*, vol. 160, pp. 720–739, Oct. 2018, ISSN: 0360-5442. DOI: [10.1016/j.energy.2018.06.222](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2018.06.222). [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S036054421831288X> (visited on 03/13/2023).

- [40] *PyPSA-Eur-Sec: A Sector-Coupled Open Optimisation Model of the European Energy System*. 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/pypsa/pypsa-eur-sec>.
- [41] T. Brown, J. Hörsch, and D. Schlachtberger, “PyPSA: Python for Power System Analysis,” *Journal of Open Research Software*, vol. 6, p. 4, Jan. 2018, ISSN: 2049-9647. DOI: 10.5334/jors.188. arXiv: 1707.09913. [Online]. Available: <http://openresearchsoftware.metajnl.com/articles/10.5334/jors.188/> (visited on 07/19/2020).
- [42] F. Hofmann, “Linopy: Linear optimization with n-dimensional labeled variables,” *Journal of Open Source Software*, vol. 8, no. 84, p. 4823, Apr. 2023, ISSN: 2475-9066. DOI: 10.21105/joss.04823. [Online]. Available: <https://joss.theoj.org/papers/10.21105/joss.04823> (visited on 05/15/2023).
- [43] L. Zeyen, J. Hampf, M. Millinger, F. Neumann, T. Brown, Martavp, M. Parzen, and Lukasnackn, *PyPSA/technology-data: Technology Data v0.5.0*, Zenodo, Feb. 2023. DOI: 10.5281/ZENODO.7622914. [Online]. Available: <https://zenodo.org/record/7622914> (visited on 03/01/2023).
- [44] Danish Energy Agency and Energinet.dk, “Technology Data for Generation of Electricity and District Heating,” Danish Energy Agency, Tech. Rep., 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://ens.dk/en/our-services/projections-and-models/technology-data/technology-data-generation-electricity-and> (visited on 08/21/2022).
- [45] The Danish Energy Agency, “Technology Data for Carbon Capture, Transport and Storage,” Tech. Rep., Nov. 2023. [Online]. Available: https://ens.dk/sites/ens.dk/files/Analyser/technology%5C_data%5C_for%5C_carbon%5C_capture%5C_transport%5C_and%5C_storage.pdf (visited on 11/27/2023).
- [46] S. Pezzutto, S. Zambotti, S. Croce, *et al.*, “D2.3 WP2 report – open data set for the EU28,” Hotmaps Project, Tech. Rep., 2018. [Online]. Available: https://gitlab.com/hotmaps/industrial%5C_sites/industrial%5C_sites%5C_Industrial%5C_Database.
- [47] H. Hersbach, B. Bell, P. Berrisford, *et al.*, “The ERA5 global reanalysis,” *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, vol. 146, no. 730, pp. 1999–2049, 2020, ISSN: 1477-870X. DOI: 10.1002/qj.3803. [Online]. Available: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/qj.3803> (visited on 10/30/2023).
- [48] U. Pfeifroth, S. Kothe, R. Müller, J. Trentmann, R. Hollmann, P. Fuchs, and M. Werscheck, *Surface Radiation Data Set - Heliosat (SARAH) - Edition 2*, Jun. 2017. DOI: 10.5676/EUM_SAF_CM/SARAH/V002. [Online]. Available: https://wui.cmsaf.eu/safira/action/viewDoiDetails?acronym=SARAH%5C_V002 (visited on 10/30/2023).
- [49] F. Hofmann, J. Hampf, F. Neumann, T. Brown, and J. Hörsch, “Atlite: A Lightweight Python Package for Calculating Renewable Power Potentials and Time Series,” *Journal of Open Source Software*, vol. 6, no. 62, p. 3294, Jun. 2021, ISSN: 2475-9066. DOI: 10.21105/joss.03294. [Online]. Available: <https://joss.theoj.org/papers/10.21105/joss.03294> (visited on 10/20/2021).
- [50] EEA, “Corine Land Cover (CLC) 2012, version 18.5.1,” 2012. [Online]. Available: <https://land.copernicus.eu/pan-european/corine-land-cover/clc-2012>.
- [51] EEA, “Natura 2000 data - the European network of protected sites,” 2016. [Online]. Available: <http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/natura-7>.
- [52] J. R. C. (European Commission, “ENSPRESO - an open data, EU-28 wide, transparent and coherent database of wind, solar and biomass energy potentials,” European Commission, Joint Research Centre (JRC), Tech. Rep., 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://data.europa.eu/89h/74ed5a04-7d74-4807-9eab-b94774309d9f>.

- [53] Institute for Energy and Transport (Joint Research Centre), B. Elbersen, F. Dalla Longa, P. Ruiz, C. Thiel, A. Sgobbi, G. Hengeveld, T. Kober, and W. N. Nijs, *The JRC-EU-TIMES Model: Bioenergy Potentials for EU and Neighbouring Countries*. LU: Publications Office of the European Union, 2015, ISBN: 978-92-79-53879-7. [Online]. Available: <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2790/39014> (visited on 10/31/2023).
- [54] B. Wiegmanns, *Gridkit Extract Of Entso-E Interactive Map*, Jun. 2016. DOI: [10.5281/ZENODO.55853](https://zenodo.org/record/55853). [Online]. Available: <https://zenodo.org/record/55853> (visited on 07/19/2020).
- [55] Z. Liu, Z. Xiu, Y. Zhao, M. Li, P. Li, P. Cai, and Y. Liang, “Experimental study on the leakage temperature field of buried CO₂ pipelines,” *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, vol. 30, no. 27, pp. 70 288–70 302, Jun. 2023, ISSN: 1614-7499. DOI: [10.1007/s11356-023-27289-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-023-27289-3). [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-023-27289-3> (visited on 07/14/2024).
- [56] M. Vitali, C. Zuliani, F. Corvaro, B. Marchetti, A. Terenzi, and F. Tallone, “Risks and Safety of CO₂ Transport via Pipeline: A Review of Risk Analysis and Modeling Approaches for Accidental Releases,” *Energies*, vol. 14, no. 15, p. 4601, Jan. 2021, ISSN: 1996-1073. DOI: [10.3390/en14154601](https://www.mdpi.com/1996-1073/14/15/4601). [Online]. Available: <https://www.mdpi.com/1996-1073/14/15/4601> (visited on 07/14/2024).
- [57] *Natural gas transmission leakage rates*, Apr. 2021. [Online]. Available: https://www.gem.wiki/Natural%20gas%20transmission%5C_leakage%5C_rates (visited on 08/11/2024).
- [58] McVay, Renee, “Methane Emissions From U.S. Gas Pipeline Leaks,” Environmental Defense Fund, Tech. Rep., Aug. 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.edf.org/sites/default/files/documents/Pipeline%5C%20Methane%5C%20Leaks%5C%20Report.pdf> (visited on 08/11/2024).
- [59] D. G. Caglayan, N. Weber, H. U. Heinrichs, J. Linßen, M. Robinius, P. A. Kukla, and D. Stolten, “Technical potential of salt caverns for hydrogen storage in Europe,” *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, vol. 45, no. 11, pp. 6793–6805, Feb. 2020, ISSN: 0360-3199. DOI: [10.1016/j.ijhydene.2019.12.161](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360319919347299). [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360319919347299> (visited on 10/31/2023).
- [60] M. Lauer, M. Dotzauer, M. Millinger, K. Oehmichen, M. Jordan, J. Kalcher, S. Majer, and D. Thraen, “The Crucial Role of Bioenergy in a Climate-Neutral Energy System in Germany,” *Chemical Engineering & Technology*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 501–510, Mar. 2023, ISSN: 0930-7516, 1521-4125. DOI: [10.1002/ceat.202100263](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/ceat.202100263). [Online]. Available: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/ceat.202100263> (visited on 12/15/2023).
- [61] M. Millinger, F. Hedenus, L. Reichenberg, E. Zeyen, F. Neumann, and G. Berndes, *Diversity of biomass usage pathways to achieve emissions targets in the European energy system*, Jul. 2023. DOI: [10.21203/rs.3.rs-3097648/v1](https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-3097648/v1). [Online]. Available: <https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-3097648/v1> (visited on 09/09/2024).
- [62] F. Neumann, J. Hampp, and T. Brown, *Energy Imports and Infrastructure in a Carbon-Neutral European Energy System*, Apr. 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.03927v1> (visited on 09/06/2024).
- [63] F. Hofmann, C. Tries, F. Neumann, L. Zeyen, and T. Brown, “Designing a CO₂ Network for a Carbon-Neutral European Economy,” in *2023 19th International Conference on the European Energy Market (EEM)*, Jun. 2023, pp. 1–7. DOI: [10.1109/EEM58374.2023.10161887](https://doi.org/10.1109/EEM58374.2023.10161887).

A Appendix

A.1 Limitations

While the model is comprehensive, it has certain limitations that affect the validity of its results. Additionally, there are important aspects of the findings that require further context and discussion. In reality, energy demand and renewable supply can only be estimated for the next few hours/days. The model’s perfect foresight may lead to non-reproducible technology dispatch which neglects uncertainties from long-term predictions and necessary reserve margins. Demand and emissions from industrial clusters heavily drive the modeling results. Allowing the model to relocate these, incorporate flexibility measures or alter underlying processes, may lead to less dependency on CO₂ and H₂ networks than with the static industry locations assumed in this study. The transport of fuel (FT, gas, oil) between the regions is not limited which may overestimate their flexibility. However, the distributed CU systems, as enabled through the hydrogen network, align well with today’s distributed locations for oil refineries, providing kerosene for aviation and naphtha for industry. Our assumption to run Fischer-Tropsch facilities on baseload with at least 90% of their nominal capacity is likely shaping the deployment of CU, underestimating potential important flexibilities. The assumed cost projections on technologies are subject to uncertainties. As shown in A.3.1, the effect of a 50% cost reduction on CO₂ pipelines alters total system costs to a small extent (below 1%). However, a different set of costs on DAC and electrolysis may well impact the model results. Considering different strategies for carbon removal, DAC deployment could be in parts replaced if larger sustainable biomass sources are assumed or imported, as shown in [60] and [61] respectively.

Finally, our energy system model assumes total autarky of the European system and neglects potential imports from elsewhere. Depending on the type of energy carrier and whether it is CO₂ neutral or not, allowing imports can change the optimal design and operation of the system quite significantly, as discussed in [62]. In our model, we see that when higher sequestration rates are allowed, the model imports more fossil oil, which reduces the use of CU in Central Europe and thus the hydrogen transport from South to Central Europe (see Section A.3). While this substitution reduces the need for Fischer-Tropsch fuel production, it also requires significant carbon sequestration within Europe to offset the emissions from fossil oil use. If the imported oil were carbon-neutral or green, there would be no need for dedicated sequestration infrastructure as the emissions would already be accounted for. In such a case, the overall energy infrastructure would remain largely the same, minus the additional carbon sequestration capacity needed to offset the emissions from fossil imports. Thus, both the H₂ and CO₂ networks would be less relevant. In the context of green hydrogen imports, as highlighted by [62], the model is expected to reduce the use of electrolysis and methanolization in southern European countries, as well as hydrogen transport routes from there to central Europe. However, the deployment of CU near point sources of CO₂ would still be as in our scenario. The same applies to the deployment of a carbon network driven by fixed sequestration sites. A disadvantage of importing synthetic fuels would be that the significant CO₂ available in sustainable biomass sources in Europe would be underutilized, and there would be an additional burden of regulating the sourcing of sustainable CO₂ outside of Europe.

A.2 Technologies with Carbon Capture

In the following, we give a more detailed description of technologies that are upgraded to integrate carbon capture. In the Baseline scenario, the capture share is highest for biogas-to-gas facilities, followed by process emissions, biomass for industry, biomass CHPs, gas for industry, SMR and gas CHPs. For models with additional transport systems, we observe a correlation between CC share and capacity factors of the underlying

technologies: Process emissions as well as gas and biomass for industry have high capacity factors (above 80%), and CC shares close to 100%, the only exception being gas for industry in the H₂-Grid scenario. Biomass CHPs have a capacity factor of around 50%, and CC shares of 50% in the H₂-Grid scenario and 97% in the CO₂-Grid scenario. SMR and gas CHPs have capacity factors around 15%, and CC shares at nearly 0% for the Baseline scenario. The capacity factor and CC share of SMR increase to around 20% and 50-65%, respectively, in the other models. Gas CHPs serve as peak load electricity production technology, and with very few operating hours, thus the high investment costs into CC applications are not efficient. Similarly, SMR serves as a “peak-load” hydrogen production technology in regions with poor renewable resources for electrolysis.

A.3 Sensitivities

Higher sequestration limits

Carbon management in the optimized energy system, particularly in the hard-to-abate sectors, is heavily influenced by the model's sequestration potential, which is capped at 200 Mt/a. Lifting the sequestration limit leads to cost benefits and a shift in primary energy supply and its implications (see Fig. A.9a). With higher sequestration rates, more fossil fuels are used in the aviation, heating, and industry sectors in land-locked regions where hydrogen is expensive. This reduces the reliance on carbon utilization (CU) and, therefore, the production and transport of hydrogen. At the same time, the carbon network is expanded to transport more carbon from inland point sources to sequestration sites. Sequestration is further supported by large DAC facilities near coastal areas to offset additional emissions from fossil fuels. These effects lead to significant changes in investments when increasing sequestration from 200 Mt/a to 800 Mt/a. Due to reduced hydrogen production, investments in wind and solar drop by a third. Total system costs are reduced by 9.1%, primarily due to lower renewable energy investments. Regarding transport networks, hydrogen network capacity is halved, while the carbon network quadruples (see Fig. A.9b). These findings are consistent with the effects discussed in [63].




Figure A.9: System costs for the Hybrid scenario as a function of the sequestration limit (a). The transmission system cost for the Hybrid scenario as a function of the sequestration limit (b).

As sequestration capacity increases, the cost savings from additional sequestration begin to plateau. At 200 Mt/a, the shadow price of the sequestration constraint shows that each additional tonne saves 225 €/t, but at 800 Mt/a, this saving drops to 51 €/t. Extrapolating this behavior, saturation of sequestration can be expected around 1200 Mt/a.

While increasing sequestration capacity offers economic benefits, it poses potential risks. Over-reliance on sequestration may delay necessary investments in cleaner technologies and renewable energy. Additionally, the large-scale expansion of carbon storage infrastructure may encounter public opposition due to concerns about the long-term stability of CO₂ storage sites and possible leakage risks. Furthermore, the focus on sequestration could perpetuate the use of fossil fuels in sectors where decarbonization alternatives, such as electrification or green hydrogen, may offer more sustainable solutions. In particular, if sequestration sites are overused for compensating continuing unabated fossil emissions, they become unavailable for net-negative targets necessary to compensate historical emissions. Thus, careful consideration must be given to avoid locking in fossil fuel usage and undermining the broader energy transition goals.

A.3.1 Lower CO₂ pipelines costs

The effect of a 50% cost-reduction on CO₂ pipelines, such as through subsidies, impacts the optimal technology deployment to a small extent. Fig. A.10a shows the corresponding total system cost of all scenarios with a net carbon neutrality target. Fig. A.10b shows the net change in system cost between non-subsidized and subsidized models, showing only the CO₂-Grid and Hybrid scenario where changes occur.




Figure A.10: System costs for all models in the net-zero emission scenario with 50% subsidy of CO₂ pipelines (a) and change in system cost for the CO₂-Grid and Hybrid scenario when subsidizing CO₂ pipelines by 50% (b).

A.3.2 Higher Electrolysis Costs

The effect of a 50% increase in electrolysis investment costs on the optimal technology deployment is shown in Fig. A.11 for the CO₂-Grid scenario, Fig. A.12 for the H₂-Grid scenario, and Fig. A.13 for the Hybrid

scenario. The total system costs increase by 1.7% in the CO₂-Grid scenario, by 1.8% in the H₂-Grid scenario and the Hybrid scenario.




Figure A.11: System costs for the CO₂-Grid scenario when increasing electrolysis investment costs by 50%.




Figure A.12: System costs for the H₂-Grid scenario when increasing electrolysis investment costs by 50%.





Figure A.13: System costs for the Hybrid scenario when increasing electrolysis investment costs by 50%.


A.4 Other sectors in the energy system

The following maps show the optimal supply, demand, transport and prices of energy carriers in the Hybrid scenario not covered in the main text.



(a) Optimal supply, consumption, transport and prices of electricity in the Hybrid scenario.

(b) Optimal supply, consumption, transport and prices of heat in the Hybrid scenario.



(a) Optimal supply, consumption, transport and prices of gas in the Hybrid scenario. (b) Optimal supply, consumption, transport and prices of biogas in the Hybrid scenario.

A.5 Cost comparison across net-zero scenarios

The following figures show further comparisons of total system costs and cost contributions of single technologies across the models and scenarios.




Figure A.16: Total annual system cost for the different network models and CO₂ targets, net-zero (NZ) left, net-negative (NN) right.




Figure A.17: Annual transmission system costs for different models and scenarios for net CO₂ neutrality (a) and net CO₂ negative (NN) scenario (b).




Figure A.18: Difference in regional costs between when tightening the emission target in the Hybrid scenario from CO₂ net-neutrality to net-removal. The left figure shows higher spending per technology and region and transport system net-neutrality case, the right shows higher spending net-negative (NN) case.




Figure A.19: Difference in regional costs between when tightening the emission target in the CO₂-Grid scenario from CO₂ net-neutrality to net-removal. The left figure shows higher spending per technology and region and transport system net-neutrality case, the right shows higher spending net-negative (NN) case.




Figure A.20: Difference in regional costs between when tightening the emission target in the H₂-Grid scenario from CO₂ net-neutrality to net-removal. The left figure shows higher spending per technology and region and transport system net-neutrality case, the right shows higher spending net-negative (NN) case.

A.6 Operation in Net CO₂ Removal Scenarios

The following figures display the optimal operation of the hydrogen and carbon sector for all models in the net CO₂ removal scenario.




Figure A.21: Optimal operation, flows and prices of the carbon (left) and hydrogen (right) sectors for the H₂-Grid scenario in the net CO₂ removal scenario. For each region, upper semicircles show the average production per technology, lower semicircles the consumption, and colors the average marginal prices. Carbon Sequestration offshore is drawn in full circles. Lines and arrows show the interregional transportation. With the tightened emission target, the model decreases the H₂-Grid layout in comparison to the net carbon neutrality scenario and increases CO₂ transport from inland point sources to the sequestration sites.




Figure A.22: Optimal operation, flows and prices of the carbon (left) and hydrogen (right) sectors in the CO₂-Grid scenario for net-negative emission targets. For each region, upper semicircles show the average production per technology, lower semicircles the consumption, and colors the average marginal prices. Carbon Sequestration offshore is drawn in full circles. Lines and arrows show the interregional transportation. The CO₂-Grid reveals a fundamentally different layout than with the net carbon neutrality target.




Figure A.23: Optimal operation, flows and prices of the carbon (left) and hydrogen (right) sectors in the H₂-Grid scenario for net-negative emission targets. For each region, upper semicircles show the average production per technology, lower semicircles the consumption, and colors the average marginal prices. Carbon Sequestration offshore is drawn in full circles. Lines and arrows show the interregional transportation. With the tightened emission target, the H₂-Grid expands the H₂-Grid layout from the net carbon neutrality target results while increasing DAC facilities at the coast.