

Global Shipyard Capacities Limiting the Ramp-Up of Global Hydrogen-Based Transportation

Maximilian Stargardt^{a, b, *}, David Kress^a, Heidi Heinrichs^a, Jörn-Christian Meyer^c, Jochen Linßen^a, Grit Walther^c, Detlef Stolten^{a, b}

a) Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH; Institute of Energy and Climate Research – Techno-economic Systems Analysis (IEK-3), 52425 Jülich, Germany

b) RWTH Aachen University, Chair for Fuel Cells. Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, 52072 Aachen, Germany

c) RWTH Aachen University, Chair of Operations Management, School of Business and Economics, 52062 Aachen, Germany

* Corresponding author: Maximilian Stargardt, m.stargardt@fz-juelich.de, telephone: +49 170 7009938

Abstract

Decarbonizing the global energy system requires significant expansions of renewable energy technologies. Given that cost-effective renewable sources are not necessarily situated in proximity to the world's largest energy demand centers, the maritime transportation of low-carbon energy carriers, such as renewable-based hydrogen or ammonia, will be needed. However, whether existent shipyards possess the required capacity to provide the necessary global fleet has not yet been answered. Therefore, this study estimates global tanker demand based on projections for global hydrogen demand, while comparing these projections with historic shipyard production. Our findings reveal a potential bottleneck until 2033-2039 if relying on liquefied hydrogen exclusively. This bottleneck could be circumvented by increasing local hydrogen production, utilizing pipelines, or liquefied ammonia as an energy carrier for hydrogen. Furthermore, the regional concentration of shipyard's locations raises concerns about diversification. Increasing demand for container vessels could substantially hinder the scale-up of maritime hydrogen transport.

Highlights

- 14 suitable shipyards concentrated in East Asia
- Potential hydrogen transport bottleneck until 2033-2039 (scenario-dependent)
- Up to 53 million cubic meter transport capacity lack in 2035 (scenario-dependent)
- Container vessel demand can hinder maritime hydrogen transport
- Liquefied ammonia could be an alternative overcoming the bottleneck

Abbreviations:

AiP – Approval in Principle; APS - IEA's Announced Pledges Scenario; CGT – Compensated Gross Tonnage; GT – Gross Tonnage; IEA – International Energy Agency; LH₂ – Liquefied hydrogen; LH_{2eq} – Liquefied hydrogen equivalent; LNH₃ – Liquefied ammonia; LNG - Liquefied natural Gas; IMO - International Maritime Organization; NZE – IEA's Net Zero Emission Scenario; OECD - Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development;

Keywords

hydrogen transmission, maritime transport, liquefied hydrogen, liquefied ammonia, infrastructure bottleneck, systems analysis

1 Introduction

The global maritime transport of fossil energy carriers is common nowadays. Over the past few decades, the infrastructure for the maritime transport of coal, natural gas, crude oil and oil products has matured and proven its effectiveness. For example, 13.4% of global natural gas production was traded as liquefied natural gas (LNG) by oceangoing vessels in 2022 [1]. Whereas the share of fossil fuels must be substantially reduced to fight climate change, the global maritime transport of energy carriers is still likely to play an important role in a future greenhouse gas neutral energy system. This is driven by the fact that not all regions can supply themselves with sufficient or cost-effective renewable energies and, hence, will depend on energy imports, which are at least partially being transported over vast distances of several thousand kilometers [2]. As transport via pipelines is limited to an onshore connection or to a specific economically-maximal offshore distance varying from 2,000 km [3] to 3,000 km [4] depending on the specific assumptions with a maximum sea depth of 5 km [5], transport via maritime vessels is a more versatile option that also has more flexibility in contracting as illustrated in the natural gas markets [6], which for instance enabled alternative supplies for Europe after the Russian invasion of Ukraine.

In this context, the question arises of whether enough vessels will be available for trading hydrogen-based energy carriers globally to supply the expected rising demand. However, most studies focus on national hydrogen supply, such as those of Bhandari [7] and Karayel et al. [8], European hydrogen supply like Caglayan et al. [9], stop at the exporting harbor [2], or simply assume the sufficient availability of vessels [10–17]. In addition, further studies investigate the maritime transport costs of different hydrogen-based energy carriers. Johnston et al. [10] compare the transport cost of liquefied hydrogen (LH₂), liquefied ammonia (LNH₃), liquefied organic hydrogen carrier (LOHC), and methanol from Australia to the Netherlands. Meca et al. [18] investigate the differences in the transport cost of liquid hydrogen and methanol. Gallardo et al. [11] analyzed renewable based supply chains of LH₂ and LNH₃, including transport from Chile to Japan. The assumed transport vessels have a capacity of 160,000 m³ for LH₂ and 53,000 m³ for LNH₃, respectively. Ishimoto et al. [12] examine the production of hydrogen and ammonia in Norway and its transport to Rotterdam in Europe and to Tokyo in Japan. The assumed size of the tankers varies from up to 172,000 m³ for LH₂ and up to 85,000 m³ for liquefied ammonia. Song et al. [13] examine the least cost transport options for hydrogen and its derivatives, such as ammonia or methanol, from China to Japan. They assigned a transport capacity of 160,000 m³ to LH₂ vessels and 38,000 m³ to LNH₃ ones. Heuser et al. [14] focus on transporting energy as LH₂ and consider the entire supply chain from Patagonia to the import terminal in Japan. The tanker size is assumed to be 160,000 m³. In contrast, Fúnez Guerra et al. [19] consider a fixed cost of 50 €/t_{LNH₃} for transporting ammonia from Chile to Japan. However, all of these studies assume sufficient availability of vessels. The size limitations per vessel are summarized in Table 1.

Source	LH₂ tanker	LNH₃ tanker
Johnston et al [10]	160,000 m ³	160,000 m ³
Gallardo et al [11]	160,000 m ³	53,000 m ³
Ishimoto et al [12]	172,000 m ³	85,000 m ³
Song et al [13]	160,000 m ³	38,000 m ³
Heuser et al [14]	160,000 m ³	-

Table 1: Applied tanker size for liquefied hydrogen and liquefied ammonia in literature

Similarly, potential limitations in maritime transport capacities are also neglected in global energy system studies. Cronin et al. [15] consider ammonia as a maritime transport option in their global framework, but place no constraints on maritime transport. Nunez-Jimenez et al. [16] allow the maritime transport of liquid hydrogen and liquid ammonia and consider a detailed representation of maritime transport, including loading and unloading times in ports, but apply no ship fleet constraints. Besides considering LNH₃ and LH₂, a study from the Hydrogen Council and related companies [17] includes the transport of so-called green steel, which is a solid cargo. The results show a growing need for up to 1,115 maritime vessels in 2050, with 330 vessels for transporting green steel, 280 for LH₂, 140 for methanol and 80 for liquefied ammonia. However, the study does not consider the potential capacity constraints of global shipyards.

The Energy Technology Perspectives 2023 study from the IEA [20] investigates the historic global LNG and LPG tanker output, identifying Japan, South Korea, and China as producing countries for large, liquefied gas tankers and specifying the need for new tankers in its Net Zero Emission (NZE) scenario, while mentioning that shipyard capacity may not suffice until 2030 but in 2050. The IEA quantifies the requirement for newbuild tankers as 20 LH₂ tankers and 170 LNH₃ tankers by 2030, and 200 ships for LH₂ and 300 for LNH₃ by 2050, following their NZE scenario. They assume that only a few shipyards will be capable of providing the necessary manpower and required steel for the very low temperature of liquid gas transport vessels. However, a quantification of the expected delays and the expected shortage in shipyard capacity as well as potential alternatives is missing. Moreover, the IEA does not provide a quantification of the suitable shipyards and is also lacking a potential outlook on further shipyards that might qualify for the construction of suitable tankers. In addition, the assumptions have not been published, and no constraints or solutions can be derived from the published findings.

Therefore, this paper aims to quantify and assess the spatially resolved global production potential of shipyards for liquid gas tankers based on historical data. Thus, potential gaps in required maritime transport capacities can be revealed and potential

solutions for identified gaps identified. For this, the transportation capacities for LH₂ and LNH₃ are investigated. In contrast, further mentioned carrier options, like methanol and LOHC, are transported in chemical tankers [20], and in oil tankers after minor adaptations [4], are not considered in this study.

2 Methodology

This study aims to determine the potential global maritime transport capacity, which is limited by production capacity of shipyards for large liquefied gas tankers and existing fleets. Figure 1 illustrates the main steps for calculating future maritime hydrogen transport capacity.




Figure 1: Graphical scheme of the main steps to calculate future maritime transport capacity

First, sufficiently large shipyards are identified as being capable of constructing liquefied gas carriers with predefined dimensions. Following identification of these, their output capacity is derived. Then, the effort to construct LNG, LH₂, and LNH₃ vessels is determined. Finally, scenarios are generated to examine the potential future output of the shipyards. Each step of the methodology is explained in the following chapter.

2.1 Identification of suitable shipyards

Shipyards can theoretically produce different types of vessels. To determine the global shipyard capacities for constructing large liquefied gas tankers and their dimensions, the existing fleet of LNG tankers serves as a baseline. Within the scope of this manuscript, the focus is exclusively on large liquefied gas tankers to ensure economies of scale and suitability for long-distance transportation.




Figure 2. Amount and capacity of produced LNG tankers since 2010 [21]

LNG tankers built since 2010 are considered in this study. Therefore, shipyards that closed due to the Financial Crisis are already excluded. The global cargo capacity of LNG tankers built since 2010, as shown in Figure 2, indicates that LNG tankers that exceed a cargo capacity of 140,000 m³ [21], which we apply as a lower limit when selecting suitable shipyards within this analysis. Furthermore, the histogram underlines the frequency of cargo capacity classes of constructed LNG tankers, peaking at 160,000 m³. If a shipyard was capable of constructing large LNG tankers since 2010, it is identified as a potential construction site for large liquefied gas tankers. LNG tankers are used as a reference because the expertise and infrastructure required from shipyards are expected to be similar for LH₂ and LNH₃ vessels due to cargo temperature and safety measures for global transportation. To ensure that all identified shipyards are still operating today, shipyards must have built at least one vessel within the last three years (2020-2022), regardless of its type and its size. Three years as a time period are chosen due to the fact that this is the average production time of a defined LNG tanker [21].

2.2 Calculation of shipyard capacities for the production of large liquefied gas tankers

A suitable method must be developed, to determine a shipyard's capacity available for vessel construction. Various indicators, such as capacity deadweight or displacement, are used to describe vessels sizes [21]. As those indicators are affected by the vessel type, a comparison of different vessels on the basis of these indicators is difficult.

Another indicator is gross tonnage (GT), which is dimensionless and considers the enclosed spaces of a vessel to calculate the volume and further process that to the stated indicator [22]. In order to compare shipyards and their vessel output, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's (OECD) Compensated Gross Tonnage (CGT) concept (see equation (1)) [23] is employed for the GT of the vessels.

$$CGT = A \times GT^B \tag{1}$$

Varying workloads required in the construction phase for different vessel types are considered. The parameters A and B are defined for each vessel type based on historical data. Table 2 shows the selected parameters of this approach.

Vessel type	Parameter A	Parameter B
LNG tanker	32	0.68
LPG tanker	62	0.57
Oil tanker	48	0.57
Chemical tanker	84	0.55

Table 2: Selected vessel types and their parameters in the OECD's CGT approach [23]

By processing the current global fleet and the assignment of the vessels to their corresponding construction shipyard, the annual production capacity of each shipyard is derived. We calculate the shipyard's average capacities against the period from 2015 to 2022. The mean construction time for large liquefied gas tankers takes a duration of three years [21]. Thus, annual output fluctuations are compensated. Furthermore, considering a period of eight years ensures the coverage of a full vessel construction period before COVID-19 pandemic disrupted several global supply chains. All calculations are based on the global fleet database of S&P Global Market Intelligence [21], which contains all vessels that feature for more than 100 GT until 2022 and thus receive a registration number from the International Maritime Organization (IMO)[24]. The available database contains vessels until 2022 limiting the analysis to the respective year. For the sake of simplicity, and as all tankers utilize tank systems to contain their cargos, the construction time for LNG tankers of three years is used for all tankers. Thus, the start of a vessel construction in 2024 would enable the operation of that specific vessel earliest in 2027.

2.3 Calculating the construction efforts of analyzed vessel types

As noted above, the CGT concept is used to compare different vessel types. Therefore, the CGT must be calculated for a typical LNG tanker as well as for LH₂ and LNH₃

vessels to derive the maximum output of each shipyard per vessel type. However, a combination of these tanker types is applicable as well. In the following section, considerations regarding these vessel types are further explained and the cargo capacities of relevant tanker types are derived. To translate this into the required shipyard capacity, a regression analysis for cargo capacity and CGT is performed by utilizing the above-mentioned global fleet database [21].

Liquefied natural gas tankers

Operation of LNG tankers play a significant role in the global natural gas economy, with 660 vessels operating in 2022 [21]. The average current LNG tanker size ranges around 160,000 m³ of cargo capacity per vessel [6,21]. Due to their better cargo space utilization compared to other potential tank systems such as self-supporting independent tanks [25,26], exclusive production of membrane tanks is assumed for new LNG tankers [25,26]. Besides, cargo membrane tanks are the major tank types in lately produced LNG tankers [6]. Nevertheless, the CGT of LNG tankers varies even with similar cargo capacities due to different construction concepts. Hence, the CGT of an average sized LNG tanker is derived by considering only large-sized LNG tankers with a membrane cargo tank system.

Liquefied hydrogen tankers

In 2022, Japanese companies launched the “Suiso Frontier” with a cargo capacity of 1,250 m³ [27] to investigate the transport behavior of LH₂ on the high seas. This vessel is operating the regular shipments between Australia and Japan. As of 2023, it is the only existing prototype of a liquefied hydrogen tanker [28]. Furthermore, Approval in Principle (AiP), which ensures the compliance of construction designs to current regulations for the construction of liquid hydrogen tanks, has been granted by certifying companies, such as DNV and Lloyds Register [29], confirming a loading capacity of 160,000 m³ for LH₂ tankers. These AiPs cover designs with membrane and spherical cargo tanks developed by companies in South Korea and Japan [30,31]. In line with these AiPs a cargo capacity of 160,000 m³ for LH₂ tankers and a membrane tank to maximize cargo space utilization such as that for new LNG tankers is assumed. Compared to LNG tankers, further insulation for LH₂ transport is required [32]. While a sufficient tank thickness of 100 cm is sufficient for handling the LH₂ cargo at -253°C according to Abe et al [33], for LNG tankers a tank thickness of 40 cm is assumed based on current membrane technology [34,35]. The increased insulation thickness is considered when calculating the CGT. Therefore, a simplified membrane tank system of four cubic membrane tanks with a capacity of 40,000 m³ each per LNG tanker is assumed. By adding an additional insulation layer of 60 cm to the inside of the tanks, the available cargo capacity decreases. Thus, a LH₂ tanker with four membrane cargo tanks adding up to a 160,000 m³ cargo capacity in total is equal to an LNG tanker with a cargo capacity of 43.614 m³ per cargo tank and 174,457 m³ total cargo capacity. To derive the CGT from the cargo capacity of LH₂ tankers, the correlation of LNG tankers can be applied. Because LH₂ tankers are perceived to be comparable in their construction to LNG tankers [36], the CGT per LH₂ tanker is derived by following the same parameters A and B as for LNG tankers.

Liquefied ammonia tankers

Due to the physical and chemical similarity of ammonia and liquefied petroleum gas (LPG), ammonia is usually transported in liquid conditions at -33°C , and in tankers that are also suitable to transport LPG [37]. Nevertheless, it is important to mention that ammonia is a highly toxic substance that has to be treated with caution. In case of any hazards within the maritime transport, there might be a risk of environmental pollution and a drastic impact on surrounding human lives and adjacent surroundings. Currently, the transportation of LNH_3 in large tankers is carried out with a transport volume of up to $85,000 \text{ m}^3$ [37]. However, LNH_3 tankers of larger sizes were ordered in May 2022 and possess independent cargo tanks with a cargo capacity of $93,000 \text{ m}^3$ [38]. No technical justification for the comparably smaller sizes compared to LNG or LH_2 vessels can be found, even when considering cargo density and draught. Hence, the most likely reason is economic in nature. Therefore, and for easier comparison, a cargo capacity of LNH_3 tankers of $160,000 \text{ m}^3$ is assumed, the same as for new LNG and LH_2 vessels. The CGT for LNH_3 vessels is calculated by applying the parameters for LPG carriers. Through a regression for the gas capacities of existing LPG carriers [21], the CGT of an $160,000 \text{ m}^3$ sized LNH_3 tanker is derived. In general, constructing a tanker designed to handle cargo at temperatures between -164°C and -253°C as is the case for LNG and LH_2 tankers, respectively, requires higher efforts during the construction phase compared to LNH_3 tankers utilizing a cargo temperature of -33°C .

To compare different production portfolios regarding the available shipyard capacity, the unit “liquefied hydrogen equivalents” ($\text{LH}_{2\text{eq}}$) is introduced by us. $\text{LH}_{2\text{eq}}$ is defined as the amount of energy that is stored in one m^3 LH_2 . Thus, the different energy densities of LH_2 and LNH_3 and their energy content are taken into consideration. Additionally, the hydrogen losses [12] that occur during the reconversion from ammonia to hydrogen are also considered. Thus, an LNH_3 tanker with a cargo capacity of $160,000 \text{ m}^3$ LNH_3 equates to a transport capacity of $190,217 \text{ m}^3$ $\text{LH}_{2\text{eq}}$.

Deriving Compensated Gross Tonnage for vessel types and sizes

A linear regression of LNG tanker cargo capacities and CGT's including 646 data points and revealing a correlation value of 0.87 leads to equation (2), below. This equation enables the translation from a given gas capacity of LNG tankers and LH_2 tankers into CGT. Only LNG tankers with a membrane cargo tank system are considered.

$$CGT = 0.3 \times \text{gas capacity} + 36,087.8 \quad (2)$$

In addition, equation (3) is derived by means of a regression and includes LPG and LNH_3 tankers of the global fleet. Its application yields the CGT from a given cargo capacity of related tankers. The regression reveals a correlation value of 0.98.

$$CGT = 126.97 \times \text{gas capacity}^{0.48} \quad (3)$$

2.4 Scenarios for future maritime transport capacities of hydrogen

To project the future maritime transport capacities for hydrogen, the future production portfolio of the identified shipyards must be estimated. For this, all scenarios assume the annual available shipyard capacity as being constant over time until 2050. Only identified shipyards can construct large tankers for the transport of LNG, LNH₃, and LH₂. Depending on the applied scenario, the shipyard capacity is first applied to meet the production demand for scenario dependent further vessel types, and subsequently for producing LNH₃ and LH₂ tankers. The current fleet is also taken into account to satisfy the transportation demands, whereas the depreciation time of the current fleet and newly-built vessel is assumed to be 25 years, as per the average vessel lifetime between 20 [10] and 30 years [39] cited in the literature.

As different types of tankers, also beyond large liquefied gas tankers, compete for shipyard capacities, a total of six scenarios are considered. The assumptions of the scenarios are summarized in Table 3.

Scenario name	LNG transport demand	Further specifications
<i>LNG-first</i>	NZE from IEA	Meet LNG transport demand
<i>Lower hydrogen demand</i>	APS from IEA	Decreased hydrogen demand
<i>Hydrogen priority</i>	Neglected	Focus on LNH ₃ and LH ₂ tankers
<i>Repurpose shipyards</i>	NZE from IEA	Extension of shipyards capable of producing liquefied gas tankers
<i>Crude oil inclusion</i>	NZE from IEA	Available shipyard capacities of crude oil tankers
<i>Container inclusion</i>	NZE from IEA	Additional capacity demand for container vessel construction

Table 3: Overview of scenario specifications

As a basic requirement in almost all scenarios, global LNG transport capacity demand must be met. The remaining shipyard capacity is then allocated to construct LH₂ and LNH₃ tankers. Since shipyards potentially are free to decide on their production portfolio, an envelope is derived. This envelope stands for all convex combinations of potentially constructed LNH₃ and LH₂ tankers. To compare the potential output of shipyards with the required hydrogen transport capacity demand, this transport capacity demand must be derived. As the evolution of a hydrogen market and its shares of maritime transport is uncertain, the same share as for maritime-transported LNG to total demand of natural gas is applied to global projected hydrogen demand [40,41] derive the share of maritime transport demand for hydrogen. As data on global hydrogen demand is only available for 2030 and 2050, is the demand is linearized and compared to the potential shipyard output with

required maritime transport capacity for hydrogen in 2030 and 2050 to identify potential bottlenecks in transport capacities.

LNG-first scenario

The *LNG-first scenario* considers the LNG and hydrogen demand as projected within the Net Zero Emission (NZE) of the IEA [40,41]. The NZE scenario follows a transformation pathway for global energy supply intended to limit global warming to the 1.5 °C goal by 2050. The global LNG demand is therefore projected to decrease from 486 billion m³ LNG in 2025 to 153 billion m³ annual LNG demand in 2050 [40,41]. The mentioned NZE scenario accounts for global hydrogen demand of 210 Mt hydrogen and 530 Mt hydrogen in 2030 and 2050, respectively. The derived maritime transport capacity demand is depicted in Appendix B1.

Lower hydrogen demand scenario

In contrast, the *lower hydrogen demand scenario* is based on Announced Pledges scenario (APS) from IEA. This considers publicly announced governmental pledges in terms of energy transition and expects a reduction of LNG demand from 510 billion m³ annual LNG demand in 2025 to 324 billion m³ annual LNG demand in 2050. Both LNG demands are shown in Figure 3.




Figure 3. Global LNG demand from 2025 until 2050 according to IEA's NZE and APS scenarios [40]

In contrast to the before-mentioned *LNG-first scenario*, the global hydrogen demand in the APS only leads to 130 Mt and 250 Mt of global hydrogen demand in 2030 and 2050. The derived maritime transport capacity demand is depicted in Appendix B1.

Hydrogen priority scenario

The *hydrogen priority scenario* neglects the required LNG transport capacity and focuses on producing LNH₃ and LH₂ tankers. The *degressive scenario* applies the

LNG and hydrogen demands from the IEA APS scenario consisting of an energy transition that does not match the 1.5°C goal in terms of global warming.

Repurpose shipyards scenario

Furthermore, all shipyards that were able to construct LNG tankers in the past, having the capacity of constructing vessels of sufficient size and that still operate nowadays are considered in the *repurpose shipyards scenario*.

Crude oil inclusion scenario

The identified shipyards do not solely produce liquefied gas tankers but also allocate a portion of their available shipyard capacity to the construction of crude oil tankers and container vessels. Therefore, the global crude oil demand of the IEA's NZE scenario is translated into required crude oil transport capacity analogously to the approach for hydrogen and LNG demand. No further crude oil tankers are required until 2035. From 2035 to 2050, the necessity for the production of new crude oil tankers is derived. The total identified shipyards are assumed to construct the same share of global crude oil transport capacity as they did in the past. The remaining shipyard capacity is then utilized to produce LH₂ and LNH₃ tankers in the *crude oil inclusion scenario*.

Container inclusion scenario

In addition to tankers, the identified shipyards produce container vessels as well. To estimate the requirement for future global container vessel demand, the global GDP is applied, as it shows a significant correlation to global maritime container transport capacity with a correlation factor of 0.97. By deriving the transport capacity of the current container vessel fleet [21,42], future transport demand is derived through the application of a GDP growth of 2.4% per year, following the baseline scenario of the OECD [43]. The additional required shipyard capacity decreases the shipyard capacity that was intended to produce LH₂ and LNH₃ tankers in the *container inclusion scenario*.

3 Results and Discussion

The results provide insights into the construction potential of large LH₂, LNH₃, and LNG tankers. First, the spatial distribution of identified shipyards capable of constructing such vessels is shown. Moreover, their corresponding theoretical output capacity is presented, providing a foundation for the scenarios. The results of the scenarios are illustrated afterwards.

3.1 Global distribution of shipyards and production capacities

Since 2015, a total of fifteen shipyards globally have produced large LNG tankers that meet the definition outlined in this manuscript. Fourteen of those shipyards still exist

today. South Korea has five sites capable of producing LNG tankers, China and Japan have four each and Russia one. Figure 4 represents the spatial distribution of the shipyards and their average annual share of global tanker output considering the global CGT. The five identified South Korean shipyards contribute to 44.2% of global tanker production. The identified Chinese and Japanese shipyards constructed 4.4% and 4.3% of global tanker output, respectively. 0.7% of global tanker production is made up by the one identified Russian shipyard. Hence, South Korea is identified as the main country constructing tankers. Other shipyards that do not meet the selection criteria in the world contribute a the remaining 46.4% of global tanker production including all sizes and types of tankers.




Figure 4: Spatial distribution of global shipyards producing large tankers and their share in overall global tanker production.

Analyzing the output of the 14 identified shipyards, the tanker production portfolio is differentiated into four tanker types. As is shown in Table 4, all identified shipyards together account for an LNG tanker production of 3.3 million CGT per year for the period between 2015 and 2022. Additionally, crude oil and LPG tankers are produced with 2.1 million CGT and 0.7 million CGT in total by those shipyards, respectively. As can be seen, tankers for chemical and oil products do not play a significant role in the tanker production portfolio.

Tanker type	Compensated gross tonnages [-]
LNG	3,330,995
Crude oil	2,120,001
LPG	662,419
Chemical/Oil products	156,793
Oil products	14,1712

Table 4: Identified shipyard’s annual average tanker production between 2015 and 2022

The country-wise potential output of the identified shipyards, illustrated in Figure 5, highlights the dominance of South Korea in the construction of large-sized LNG tankers. 2.8 million CGT of LNG tankers were constructed in South Korea alone, representing 84% of the global average yearly large-sized LNG tanker output. Despite the production of crude oil and chemical tankers is small, their share of production capacity is much higher in South Korea compared to the three other countries as can be seen. China and Japan also have the capacity to construct large-sized LNG and LPG tankers, whereas Russia’s contribution to LNG tankers production is minor.




Figure 5: Average annual tanker output of the identified large-sized shipyards between 2015 and 2022

Although other parts of the world had produced large LNG tankers before 2010, the shipyards in those regions have either closed or focused on constructing other vessel types such as cruise ships. Europe as shipyards that have produced LNG tankers. In total, these turned out 18 LNG tankers between 1994 and 2007. 18 large LNG tankers had been produced between 1994 and 2007, but none since then.

3.2 Ramp-up of global maritime transport capacity

The results of scenarios introduced in Chapter 2.4 are explained in detail below and illustrated in

Figure 7 and Figure 8. The *LNG-first scenario* is explained in detail to enable an understanding of the following results.

LNG-first scenario

Since the *LNG-first scenario* is seen as a comparison scenario that is the starting point for further discussion in the following, it is analyzed first. Combining LPG and LNG shipyard capacity as available annual shipyard capacity for the *LNG-first scenario* results in a total shipbuilding capacity of 4.0 million CGT per year.

Tanker type	CGT per tanker	Total cargo capacity	Maximum number of tankers
LNG tanker	84,087	7.52 million m ³	47
LH ₂ tanker	88,425	7.20 million m ³	45
LNH ₃ tanker	39,965	15.84 million m ³	99

Table 5: Potential annual production and amount of transported cargo per tanker type

Table 5 displays the different CGTs for each tanker type by the application of equations (2) and (3), and the resulting global annual shipyard output potentials of the identified shipyards if just one tanker type would be built. Due to the thicker insulation of LH₂ tankers, resulting in having a higher CGT, a lower total cargo capacity is achieved compared to LNG tankers. However, the potential number of LNG or LH₂ tankers is quite similar, whereas the production capacity of LNH₃ tankers is much smaller resulting from a CGT covering less than half of LNG or LH₂ tankers.




Figure 6: Development of the transport capacity of the current LNG tanker fleet and the required LNG transport capacity demand calculated from the IEA's NZE scenario through 2050

Analyzing the global fleet and global LNG transport capacity derived from the IEA's NZE scenario reveals that no further LNG vessel must be constructed until 2045 (see Figure 6), the depreciation of the current LNG fleet requires additional LNG tanker construction beginning in 2047. In total 171 tankers must be added to the global LNG fleet.

In accordance with the *LNG-first scenario*, the global shipyard capacities are sufficient to meet the hydrogen transport capacity in 2050 independent of the vessel type transporting the hydrogen as displayed in

Figure 7. In general, the lower bound of the production-dependent capacity is determined by the possible production portfolio solely consisting of LH₂ tankers, and the upper bound by a production portfolio consisting of LNH₃ tankers, due to their CGT distinguished per tanker. As described in section 2.4, we derive the required maritime hydrogen transport capacity from the current share of LNG transport in natural gas markets for the given values in 2030 and 2050. A linear interpolation in 5-year timesteps delivers the required maritime hydrogen transport capacity and is depicted as a red line. The derived values for the maritime hydrogen transport capacity demand are included in Appendix B.1. Maritime transport production portfolios that do not exceed the global hydrogen capacity demand lead to a capacity bottleneck that is illustrated as the gray area in the figure. Hence, exclusively using LH₂ tankers leads to a shortage of transport capacity from 2030 that will only be resolved around the year 2039. To satisfy this demand unmet by LH₂ tankers, hydrogen would need to be transported partly as LNH₃, or increasing local hydrogen production is required.




Figure 7: Ramp up of maritime transport capacities for hydrogen in the *LNG-first scenario*

Table 6 presents the underlying numbers of the *LNG-first scenario*. In general, the calculation is performed in five -year steps, accumulating the five years before the mentioned year. Thus, the depicted value of 19.97 million CGT available shipyard capacity for 2035 refers to the period between 2031 and 2035. According to the findings outlined in section 3.2, global demand expected in the IEA NZE scenario will not require any newly-built LNG tankers before 2046. Thus, the derived shipyard capacity of 3.99 million CGT per year leads to a cumulated five-year-capacity of 19.97 million CGT. LH₂ tankers are projected to be commercially-available in 2028, whereas the LNH₃ tankers could already be available in 2027, due to a three-year construction period starting from today. Thus, the available shipyard capacity is differentiated for both tanker types and decreases due to the required LNG transport capacity demand in 2050.

Year	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050
Available shipyard capacity LNH ₂ tanker [million CGT]	11.98	19.97	19.97	19.97	5.605
Available shipyard capacity LNH ₃ tanker [million CGT]	15.97	19.97	19.97	19.97	5.605
Maximum production of LH ₂ tankers capacity [million LH _{2eq} m ³]	21.68	36.13	36.13	36.13	10.14
Maximum production of LNH ₃ tankers capacity [million LH _{2eq} m ³]	75.93	94.91	94.91	94.91	26.65
Maximum number of newbuilt LH ₂ tankers	136	226	226	226	64
Maximum number of newbuilt LNH ₃ tankers	400	500	500	500	141

Table 6: Available shipyard capacities and tanker production capacities in the *LNG-first scenario*

The results of additional scenarios introduced in Chapter 2.4 are explained in detail below and illustrated in Figure 8.

Lower hydrogen demand scenario

Considering LNG and hydrogen demands in the *lower hydrogen demand scenario* following the announced national policies as summarized in the IEA's APS scenario, reveals a lower transport capacity by 2050 compared to the *LNG-first scenario*, as visualized in Figure 8a. It is important to mention that the displayed capacity demand is only valid for the *lower hydrogen demand scenario* and not for other investigated scenarios that have a higher hydrogen transport demand. However, a capacity shortage still exists, but only for global vessel production exclusively focusing on LH₂ tankers until 2035. This is explained by a higher LNG transport capacity demand compared to the *LNG-first scenario* (see Figure 3). reducing the available shipyard capacity for the construction of LH₂ and LNH₃ tankers. Detailed numbers are displayed in Appendix A1.




Figure 8: Development of global hydrogen transport capacity for a) lower hydrogen demand scenario, b) hydrogen priority scenario, c) repurpose shipyards scenario, and d) crude oil inclusion scenario and container inclusion scenario.

Hydrogen priority scenario

The results of the priority scenarios are shown in Figure 8b. Neglecting the global LNG transport capacity demand does not change the potential capacity shortage at the beginning of the 2030s. Nevertheless, as in the *LNG-first scenario*, there is also no capacity shortfall while producing only LH_2 nor LNH_3 tankers from 2039 on. Compared to the *LNG-first scenario*, the results of the *hydrogen priority scenario* do not differ until 2046. From then on, new LNG tankers would need to be built to satisfy the remaining LNG transport capacity demand. As overcapacity within the shipyards exists from 2045 onwards, and the LNG tanker demand can easily be met. To conclude this scenario, the LNG demand and related LNG transport demand will not have a further impact on the hydrogen transport capacity demands under the assumptions made in this study. The derived parameters for this scenario can be seen in Appendix A2.

Repurpose shipyards scenario

In the *repurpose shipyards scenario*, repurposing shipyards that have previously produced LNG tankers and can still construct large vessels, does not change the findings from the *LNG-first scenario*. The results are depicted in Figure 8c. In total, only four additional yards in Asia (two in China, one in Japan, one in South Korea) are identified that match the requirements. These shipyards make up an additional shipyard capacity of 0.7 million CGT or 3.5 million CGT over five years compared to the *LNG-first scenario*. The detailed derived parameters are shown in Appendix A3. Thus, the identified shipyards provide more available shipyard capacity that can then be applied for LH₂ or LNH₃ tanker production. In contrast to the *LNG-first scenario*, a global transport infrastructure relying entirely on LH₂ tankers would already be able to meet the required transport demand in 2036. However, the capacity shortage before 2036 is not resolved by the inclusion of repurposed yards.

Crude oil inclusion scenario

Following the *crude oil inclusion scenario*, a decreasing demand for crude oil tankers will increase the available shipyard capacities for hydrogen transport. Until 2035, no further crude oil tankers must be built, and the maximum yard capacities are available for LH₂ or LNH₃ tanker production. This accounts for an additional 2.1 million CGT shipyard capacity per year or 10.6 million CGT shipyard capacity per cumulated five years capacity. Starting in 2036, 2.2 million CGT must be applied every five years for crude oil tanker production. As described in the *LNG-first scenario*, LNG transport demand starting by 2046 must be fulfilled as well, further reducing the amount of available shipyard capacity. Exact numbers are displayed in Appendix A4. Comparing the scenario results to the *LNG-first scenario* reveals a major increase in constructed maritime transport capacity, leading to excess capacity in 2033 at the latest in. Nevertheless, as depicted in Figure 8d, a production portfolio consisting of only LH₂ tankers will still lead to a transport capacity shortage by 2033.

Container inclusion scenario

Following the assumptions regarding global container vessel demand, the average global container vessel output must drastically increase to match the required global transport demand. It is assumed that identified shipyards will increase their container vessel production equally to the required increase of global container vessel production. The occurring maritime transport capacity in the container scenario is displayed in Figure 8d. According to these findings, rising container transport capacity demand, as described in Section 2.4, could be a crucial factor in the competition for available shipyard capacities. The container transport demand decreases the available shipyard capacity by 2.73 million CGT annually compared to the *LNG-first scenario* (see Appendix A5). If container vessels were prioritized, the transport capacity for hydrogen would never satisfy demand until 2050, leading to a shortage of maritime transport capacity. Moreover, between 2046 and 2050, there would not be any shipyard capacity to produce LH₂ or LNH₃ tankers due to many depreciated container

vessels that must be replaced in this period in addition to further increasing container transport demand. Regarding the circumstances of this scenario, the available maritime hydrogen transport capacity would be strongly decreased by the container demand and competition regarding scarce shipyard capacities that potentially occurs.

3.3 Consequences of maritime transport limitations

Based on the results of the scenarios, meeting the demand for hydrogen transport capacity cannot be achieved by solely focusing on LH₂ tanker production. In order to prevent a capacity shortage, the application of hydrogen pipelines or ammonia as an energy carrier may offer a solution. Furthermore, domestic hydrogen production could contribute. Table 7 lists the minimum number of LNH₃ tankers required to meet the hydrogen transport capacity demand in 2030 and 2035, as well as the resulting gap between hydrogen transport capacity and the demand for each scenario.

Year	Minimum number of LNH ₃ tankers		Hydrogen transport capacity gap in million m ³	
	2030	2035	2030	2035
<i>LNG-first scenario</i>	255	117	30.02	13.58
<i>Lower hydrogen demand scenario</i>	87	1	10.33	0.05
<i>Hydrogen priority scenario</i>	255	117	30.02	13.58
<i>Repurpose shipyards scenario</i>	225	31	26.25	3.51
<i>Crude oil inclusion scenario</i>	160	0	18.51	-
<i>Container inclusion scenario</i>	-	-	44.85	53.11

Table 7: Minimum number of LNH₃ tankers for meeting the required hydrogen transport capacity demand and the resulting hydrogen transport capacity demand of only LH₂ tankers produced per scenario

Both the *LNG-first scenario* and *hydrogen priority scenario* necessitate the highest number of LNH₃ tankers of all scenarios meeting the required hydrogen transport capacity demand, requiring 255 tankers by 2030 and 117 by 2035. In contrast, the *crude oil scenario* does not require any LNH₃ tankers by 2035 because the available LH₂ tankers are able to fulfill the required demand. Insufficient transport capacity in the *container inclusion scenario* leads to capacity gaps of 44.9 and 53.1 million m³. Meanwhile, the *lower hydrogen demand scenario* will fail to meet the transport capacity requirement by 0.1 million m³ in 2035.

Figure 9 illustrates the prospective global maritime transport capacities for the examined scenarios by depicting the scenario outcomes for 2030 and the related capacity demand. The upper limit of each scenario’s solution frame is determined by a shipyard production portfolio solely based on LNH₃ tankers, while the lower limit is determined by a portfolio based solely on LH₂ tankers. Since the *lower hydrogen demand scenario* applies other LNG demands, it is not directly comparable to the other scenarios and, thus, excluded from Figure 9.




Figure 9: Comparison of transport capacities for the analyzed scenarios in 2030

It is evident that hydrogen transport capacities in 2030 and therefore the fulfillment of capacity demand depends on the production portfolios chosen. Although the available shipyard capacities for dedicated crude oil tanker construction and the application of more yards that theoretically may build large, liquefied gas tankers may increase the transport capacity, the utilization of LNH₃ for maritime hydrogen transport and, therefore, the construction of additional LNH₃ tankers is one option besides increasing local production to meet the expected hydrogen demand. Regarding the transport capacity gaps that occur if maritime hydrogen transportation would only focus on LH₂ tankers, the *LNG-first scenario* and the *crude oil inclusion scenario* lead to transport capacity gaps of between 30.2 million LH₂ m³ and 18.5 million LH₂ m³. This equals 189 and 116 LH₂ tankers that must be built to bridge the derived gap. As the identified shipyards do not have additional capacity to extend their production, either other shipyards must start producing the required LH₂ vessels or new shipyards must be built, adding more shipyard capacity globally.

Furthermore, the required amount of maritime container transport capacity potentially increases the shortage of available shipyard capacities and, therefore, fosters the bottleneck in maritime transport capacities. The projected increasing demand for container transport capacity, and, so, the demand for additional vessels, will not allow the hydrogen transport capacity to meet demand regardless of the chosen production portfolio between LNH₃ and LH₂ tankers.

Assuming an average vessel construction time of three years, as described in Section 2.2, a new shipyard must be operational before 2028. In this case, LH₂ vessels would be able to contribute to solving the bottleneck in the early 2030s. Furthermore, shipyards apart from already-identified ones could consider expanding their production of crude oil tankers and container vessels, to offer more shipyard capacities for LH₂ and LNH₃ tanker production. In case that shipyard dimensions are not sufficient, a shipyard extension is required adjusting to the potential vessel's depth, its overall length, and its beam.

The identified shipyards are exclusively located in East Asia. From the perspective of energy supply security, more diversified tanker production may be desirable. Even in the *repurpose shipyards scenario*, the four additional shipyards that are considered, which are located in East Asia as well. No further shipyards are deemed capable of constructing ships of the required dimensions, as no other shipyard has yet constructed an LNG tanker, regardless of its size.

Including existing yards that are capable of building vessels of the required dimensions in terms of length and breadth would increase the number of potential yards by 52, although 45 of them would still be located in Asia, five in Europe, and one each in the US and in Brazil. However, it is questionable whether those shipyards would be able to construct liquefied gas tankers in the future as the complex construction processes arising from cryogenic cargo handling and the required safety measures are demanding. To address the described bottleneck in maritime transport capacity, the integration of this process must be performed within the next three years. Moreover, in terms of the security of energy supply, governments from countries outside of the East Asian shipbuilding countries should consider encouraging domestic or other overseas industries to undertake liquefied gas tanker production, ensuring a certain level of diversification in the future, even when neglecting the described bottleneck.

Moreover, a global trade economy could theoretically rely on smaller liquefied gas tankers that are not considered in this research. A decreasing tanker volume would lead to a smaller economy of scale regarding the cost of transport, which is not further examined in this paper. For this reason, smaller tankers are not considered. The research focuses on the shipyard capacity and does not touch on questions regarding the most economical and energy-efficient transport solutions.

Furthermore, it is important to note that the conducted analysis relies on a transformation path outlined by the IEA and the maritime transport capacities are strongly dependent on national energy systems and vice versa. For instance, the IEA assumes a mix of LNH₃ and LH₂ transport chains combined with the partial conversion of ammonia into hydrogen or power in the destination countries. In contrast, the International Renewable Energy Agency assumes a global ammonia transport chain

with no reconversion in destination countries. In this case, national energy systems must be prepared to process ammonia as an energy carrier. Nevertheless, if combustion processes utilize ammonia, the potential increase in NO_x emissions in exhaust gas streams may be an issue that must be addressed [44].

4 Conclusions

The findings of this paper highlight a gap in tanker production capacity under current conditions. The primary focus of the research is to project available shipyard capacities for large liquefied gas tankers production considering factors such as global LNG demand, available shipyards, and competition among other vessel types in suitable shipyards. The potential increase in global ammonia demand, either by its application as maritime fuel or by increasing global fertilizer demand, may be factors that pull LNH₃ tanker capacity demand and, thus, shipyard capacities in the future.

This study examines the potential scale-up of maritime transport capacity and highlights the necessity of including global capacity constraints in global energy system modeling. The period until the late 2030s is characterized by maritime hydrogen transport bottlenecks. Therefore, a global energy system transition pathway covering those years should consider limitations in maritime transport capacity. This study analyses scenarios and its impact on these bottlenecks. Besides focusing solely on transporting LH₂, a scale-up of LNH₃ transport chains is required to fulfill the maritime transport demand under the assumptions of this study. It is important to mention that the study's results are based on numerous assumptions. Other potential solutions to solve the hydrogen transport capacity gap, such as higher shares of local production of hydrogen close to the demand centers, or the long-distance transport of energy carriers via pipelines, are not further examined. Moreover, as explained above, shipyards and economies could increase their production to overcome a potential bottleneck in maritime transportation capacity regarding hydrogen.

The spatial distribution of shipyard capacity for building large, liquefied gas tankers also raises concerns regarding regional dependencies. The expertise for constructing large liquefied gas tankers is almost found exclusively in East Asia. More specifically, the main share of these tanker constructions is located in South Korea. To mitigate this geo-political risk of dependency, other countries could establish large tanker production sites by either converting existing shipyards that are engaged in the building of other vessel types or by initiating the construction of new shipyards.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interest or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this manuscript.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Helmholtz Association under the program “Energy System Design” and funded by the European Union (ERC, MATERIALIZE, 101076649). Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the authors only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Author Contribution

Conceptualization: MS, DK, HH; methodology and model development: MS, DK, HH; validation: MS; formal analysis: MS; investigations: MS, DK, HH; writing - original draft: MS, HH; writing – review and editing: MS, DK, HH, JM, JL, GW; visualization: MS, supervision: HH, JL, JM, JL. GW, DS.

All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

References

- [1] Energy Institute, KPMG, KEARNEY. Statistical Review of World Energy 2023. Energy Institute; 2023.
- [2] Franzmann D, Heinrichs H, Lippkau F, Addanki T, Winkler C, Buchenberg P, et al. Green hydrogen cost-potentials for global trade. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 2023;48:33062–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2023.05.012>.
- [3] d’Amore-Domenech R, Meca VL, Pollet BG, Leo TJ. On the bulk transport of green hydrogen at sea: Comparison between submarine pipeline and compressed and liquefied transport by ship. *Energy* 2023;267:126621. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2023.126621>.
- [4] Niermann M, Drünert S, Kaltschmitt M, Bonhoff K. Liquid organic hydrogen carriers (LOHCs) – techno-economic analysis of LOHCs in a defined process chain. *Energy Environ Sci* 2019;12:290–307. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C8EE02700E>.
- [5] 1.6. Pipelines - 4. Pipelaying Methods 2021. <https://www.offshoreengineering.com/oil-gas-pipelines/pipelaying/> (accessed October 4, 2023).
- [6] LNG Industry: GIIGNL Annual Report 2022 2022:76.
- [7] Bhandari R. Green hydrogen production potential in West Africa – Case of Niger. *Renewable Energy* 2022;196:800–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2022.07.052>.
- [8] Karayel GK, Javani N, Dincer I. Green hydrogen production potential for Turkey with solar energy. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 2022;47:19354–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2021.10.240>.
- [9] Dilara G. Caglayan. A Robust Design of a Renewable European Energy System Encompassing a Hydrogen Infrastructure. Jülich: Verlag des Forschungszentrums Jülich; 2020.
- [10] Johnston C, Ali Khan MH, Amal R, Daiyan R, MacGill I. Shipping the sunshine: An open-source model for costing renewable hydrogen transport from Australia. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 2022;47:20362–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2022.04.156>.

- [11] Gallardo FI, Monforti Ferrario A, Lamagna M, Bocci E, Astiaso Garcia D, Baeza-Jeria TE. A Techno-Economic Analysis of solar hydrogen production by electrolysis in the north of Chile and the case of exportation from Atacama Desert to Japan. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 2021;46:13709–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2020.07.050>.
- [12] Ishimoto Y, Voldsund M, Neksa P, Roussanaly S, Berstad D, Gardarsdottir SO. Large-scale production and transport of hydrogen from Norway to Europe and Japan: Value chain analysis and comparison of liquid hydrogen and ammonia as energy carriers. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 2020;45:32865–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2020.09.017>.
- [13] Song S, Lin H, Sherman P, Yang X, Nielsen CP, Chen X, et al. Production of hydrogen from offshore wind in China and cost-competitive supply to Japan. *Nat Commun* 2021;12:6953. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-27214-7>.
- [14] Heuser P-M, Ryberg DS, Grube T, Robinius M, Stolten D. Techno-economic analysis of a potential energy trading link between Patagonia and Japan based on CO₂ free hydrogen. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 2019;44:12733–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2018.12.156>.
- [15] Cronin B, Williams J, Ramadan A. The future market for low carbon hydrogen 2022.
- [16] Alejandro Nuñez-Jimenez, Nicola De Blasio. MIGHTY: Model of International Green Hydrogen Trade. Harvard Kennedy School - BELFER Center for Science and International Affairs; 08/22.
- [17] Hydrogen Council, McKinsey&Company. Global Hydrogen Flows: HYdrogen trade as key enabler for efficient decarbonization 2022.
- [18] Meca VL, d'Amore-Domenech R, Crucelaegui A, Leo TJ. Large-Scale Maritime Transport of Hydrogen: Economic Comparison of Liquid Hydrogen and Methanol. *ACS Sustainable Chem Eng* 2022;10:4300–11. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acssuschemeng.2c00694>.
- [19] Fúnez Guerra C, Reyes-Bozo L, Vyhmeister E, Jaén Caparrós M, Salazar JL, Clemente-Jul C. Technical-economic analysis for a green ammonia production plant in Chile and its subsequent transport to Japan. *Renewable Energy* 2020;157:404–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2020.05.041>.
- [20] IEA. Energy Technology Perspectives 2023 2023:459.
- [21] S&P Global Market Intelligence. Global Fleet Database 2022.
- [22] IMO. International Convention on Tonnage Measurement of Ships 1969.
- [23] OECD. A new Compensated Gross Ton (CGT) system. Council Working Party on Shipbuilding; 2006.
- [24] IMO. IMO identification number schemes: (Circular letter No.1886/Rev.6) 2016. [https://wwwcdn.imo.org/localresources/en/OurWork/IIIS/Documents/CL.1886-REV.6%20\(E\)_IMO%20Number%20Scheme.pdf](https://wwwcdn.imo.org/localresources/en/OurWork/IIIS/Documents/CL.1886-REV.6%20(E)_IMO%20Number%20Scheme.pdf).
- [25] Chakraborty S. Understanding The Design of Liquefied Gas Carriers 2019. <https://www.marineinsight.com/naval-architecture/understanding-design-liquefied-gas-carriers/>.
- [26] Mokathab S. LNG Fundamentals. *Handbook of Liquefied Natural Gas* 2014:1–106.
- [27] HySTRA. HySTRA. “Suiso Frontier” Loaded Liquefied Hydrogen Derived from Australian Brown Coal Returns to Kobe. 2022. <https://www.hystra.or.jp/en/gallery/article.html>.
- [28] Ustolin F, Campari A, Taccani R. An Extensive Review of Liquid Hydrogen in Transportation with Focus on the Maritime Sector. *JMSE* 2022;10:1222. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jmse10091222>.

- [29] Class NK. ClassNK issues Approval in Principle (AiP) for Large Liquefied Hydrogen Carrier developed by Kawasaki Heavy Industries “Following AiPs for CCS, CHS, and Dual-fuel Main Boilers” 2022. https://www.classnk.or.jp/hp/en/hp_news.aspx?id=7923&type=press_release&layout=1.
- [30] Lloyd’s Register. LR Approval in Principle for SHI’s liquefied hydrogen carrier 2021. <https://www.lr.org/en/latest-news/approval-in-principle-for-shi-liquefied-hydrogen-carrier/>.
- [31] Kawasaki Heavy Industries. Kawasaki Obtains AIP for Large, 160,000 m³ Liquefied Hydrogen Carrier 2022. https://global.kawasaki.com/en/corp/newsroom/news/detail/?f=20220422_3378.
- [32] van Hoecke L, Laffineur L, Campe R, Perreault P, Verbruggen SW, Lenaerts S. Challenges in the use of hydrogen for maritime applications. *Energy & Environmental Science* 2021;14:815–43. <https://doi.org/10.1039/D0EE01545H>.
- [33] Abe A. Studies of the large-scale sea transportation of liquid hydrogen. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 1998;23:115–21. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0360-3199\(97\)00032-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0360-3199(97)00032-3).
- [34] GTT. Mark III systems | GTT n.d. <https://gtt.fr/technologies/markiii-systems> (accessed September 23, 2023).
- [35] GTT. NO96 system | GTT n.d. <https://gtt.fr/technologies/no96-systems> (accessed September 23, 2023).
- [36] IRENA. Global hydrogen trade to meet the 1.5 °C climate goal: part II - Technology review of hydrogen carriers. Abu Dhabi: 2022.
- [37] Nayak-Luke RM, Forbes C, Cesaro Z, Bañares-Alcántara R, Rouwenhorst KHR. Techno-Economic Aspects of Production, Storage and Distribution of Ammonia. Techno-Economic Challenges of Green Ammonia as an Energy Vector, Elsevier; 2021, p. 191–207. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-820560-0.00008-4>.
- [38] CSSC-Media Source. Jiangnan Shipbuilding and CSSC jointly signed a contract with Eastern Pacific Shipping to build four Very Large Ammonia Carriers. *Maritime Economy Publications* 2023. [http://www.maritimeeconomy.com/post-details.php?post_id=Jiangnan Shipbuilding and CSSC jointly signed a contract with Eastern Pacific Shipping to build four Very Large Ammonia Carriers&post_name=Shipyards Shipbuilding&segment_name=a25saQ==](http://www.maritimeeconomy.com/post-details.php?post_id=Jiangnan+Shipbuilding+and+CSSC+jointly+signed+a+contract+with+Eastern+Pacific+Shipping+to+build+four+Very+Large+Ammonia+Carriers&post_name=Shipyards+Shipbuilding&segment_name=a25saQ==) (accessed July 17, 2023).
- [39] Brändle G, Schönfisch M, Schulte S. Estimating long-term global supply costs for low-carbon hydrogen. *Applied Energy* 2021;302:117481. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2021.117481>.
- [40] IEA. *World Energy Outlook 2022*. Paris: International Energy Agency; 2022.
- [41] IEA. *World Energy Outlook 2021*. Paris: International Energy Agency; 2021.
- [42] Park NK, Suh SC. Tendency toward Mega Containerships and the Constraints of Container Terminals. *JMSE* 2019;7:131. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jmse7050131>.
- [43] OECD. Long-term baseline projections, No. 109 (Edition 2021). *OECD Economic Outlook: Statistics and Projections (Database)* 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1787/cbdb49e6-en>.
- [44] Bertagni MB, Socolow RH, Martirez JMP, Carter EA, Greig C, Ju Y, et al. Minimizing the impacts of the ammonia economy on the nitrogen cycle and climate. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2023;120:e2311728120. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2311728120>.

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Available shipyard capacities and tanker production capacities of conducted scenarios

A1: Available shipyard capacities and tanker production capacities in *lower hydrogen demand scenario*

Year	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050
Available shipyard capacity LH ₂ tankers [million CGT]	11.98	9.76	16.62	19.97	10.32
Available shipyard capacity LNH ₃ tankers [million CGT]	15.97	9.76	16.62	19.97	10.32
Maximum production of LH ₂ tankers capacity [million LH _{2eq} m ³]	21.68	17.66	30.06	36.13	18.67
Maximum production of LNH ₃ tankers capacity [million LH _{2eq} m ³]	75.92	46.38	78.97	94.91	49.04
Maximum number of newbuilt LNH ₂ tankers	136	111	188	226	117
Maximum number of newbuilt LNH ₃ tankers	400	245	416	500	259

A2: Available shipyard capacities and tanker production capacities in *hydrogen priority scenario*

Year	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050
Available shipyard capacity LH ₂ tanker [million CGT]	11.98	19.97	19.97	19.97	19.97
Available shipyard capacity LNH ₃ tanker [million CGT]	15.97	19.97	19.97	19.97	19.97
Maximum production of LH ₂ tankers capacity [million LH _{2eq} m ³]	21.68	36.13	36.13	36.13	36.13
Maximum production of LNH ₃ tankers capacity [million LH _{2eq} m ³]	75.93	94.91	94.91	94.91	94.91
Maximum number of newbuilt LNH ₂ tankers	136	226	226	226	64
Maximum number of newbuilt LNH ₃ tankers	400	500	500	500	500

A3: Available shipyard capacities and tanker production capacities in *repurpose shipyards scenario*

Year	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050
Available shipyard capacity LH ₂ tankers [million CGT]	14.07	23.45	23.45	23.45	9.08
Available shipyard capacity LNH ₃ tankers [million CGT]	18.76	23.45	23.45	23.45	9.08
Maximum production of LH ₂ tankers capacity [million LH _{2eq} m ³]	21.68	36.13	36.13	36.13	10.14
Maximum production of LNH ₃ tankers capacity [million LH _{2eq} m ³]	75.93	94.91	94.91	94.91	26.65
Maximum number of newbuilt LNH ₂ tankers	136	226	226	226	64
Maximum number of newbuilt LNH ₃ tankers	400	500	500	500	141

A4: Available shipyard capacities and tanker production capacities in *crude oil inclusion scenario*

Year	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050
Available shipyard capacity LH ₂ tankers [million CGT]	18.34	30.57	28.82	28.82	14.46
Available shipyard capacity LNH ₃ tankers [million CGT]	24.45	30.57	28.82	28.82	14.46
Maximum production of LH ₂ tankers capacity [million LH _{2eq} m ³]	33.18	55.31	52.15	52.15	26.16
Maximum production of LNH ₃ tankers capacity [million LH _{2eq} m ³]	116.23	145.29	136.98	136.98	68.72
Maximum number of newbuilt LNH ₂ tankers	208	346	326	326	164
Maximum number of newbuilt LNH ₃ tankers	612	765	722	722	362

A5: Available shipyard capacities and tanker production capacities in *container inclusion scenario*

Year	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050
Available shipyard capacity LH ₂ tankers [million CGT]	3.78	6.31	6.31	6.31	-8.05
Available shipyard capacity LNH ₃ tankers [million CGT]	5.05	6.31	6.31	6.31	-8.05
Maximum production of LH ₂ tankers capacity [million LH _{2eq} m ³]	6.85	11.42	11.42	11.42	0
Maximum production of LNH ₃ tankers capacity [million LH _{2eq} m ³]	24.00	30.01	30.01	30.01	0
Maximum number of newbuilt LNH ₂ tankers	43	72	72	72	72
Maximum number of newbuilt LNH ₃ tankers	127	158	158	158	0

Appendix B: Future maritime hydrogen transport capacity demand

B1: Scenario dependent derived maritime hydrogen transport capacity demand for between 2030 and 2050 in million m³ LH_{2eq} cargo capacity

Year	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050
<i>LNG-first scenario</i>	51.69	71.39	91.09	110.78	130.48
<i>Lower hydrogen demand scenario</i>	32.00	39.39	46.78	54.16	61.55
<i>Hydrogen priority scenario</i>	51.69	71.39	91.09	110.78	130.48
<i>Repurpose shipyards scenario</i>	51.69	71.39	91.09	110.78	130.48
<i>Crude oil inclusion scenario</i>	51.69	71.39	91.09	110.78	130.48
<i>Container inclusion scenario</i>	51.69	71.39	91.09	110.78	130.48