

Energy Imports and Infrastructure in a Carbon-Neutral European Energy System

Fabian Neumann^a, Johannes Hampp^b, Tom Brown^a

^aDepartment of Digital Transformation in Energy Systems, Institute of Energy Technology,
Technische Universität Berlin, Fakultät III, Einsteinufer 25 (TA 8), 10587 Berlin, Germany

^bPotsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK), Member of the Leibniz Association, P.O. Box 60 12 03, 14412 Potsdam, Germany

Abstract

Importing renewable energy to Europe offers many potential benefits, including reduced energy costs, lower pressure on infrastructure development, and less land-use within Europe. However, there remain many open questions: on the achievable cost reductions, how much should be imported, whether the energy vector should be electricity, hydrogen or hydrogen derivatives like ammonia or steel, and their impact on Europe's domestic energy infrastructure needs. This study integrates the TRACE global energy supply chain model with the sector-coupled energy system model for Europe PyPSA-Eur to explore scenarios with varying import volumes, costs, and vectors. We find system cost reductions of 1-14%, depending on assumed import costs, with diminishing returns for larger import volumes and a preference for methanol, steel and hydrogen imports. Keeping some domestic power-to-X production is beneficial for integrating variable renewables, utilising waste heat from fuel synthesis and leveraging local sustainable carbon sources. Our findings highlight the need for coordinating import strategies with infrastructure policy and reveal maneuvering space for incorporating non-cost decision factors.

Importing renewable energy to Europe promises several advantages for achieving a swift energy transition. It could lower costs, help circumvent the slow domestic deployment of renewable energy infrastructure and reduce pressure on land usage in Europe. Many parts of the world have cheap and abundant renewable energy supply potentials that they could offer to existing or emerging global energy markets.¹⁻⁸ Partnering with these regions could help Europe reach its carbon neutrality goals while stimulating economic development in exporting countries.

However, even if energy imports are economically attractive for Europe, a strong reliance may not be desirable because of energy security concerns. Awareness of energy security has risen since Russia throttled fossil gas supplies to Europe in 2022,⁹ at a time when the EU27 imported around two-thirds of its fossil energy needs.¹⁰ Europe must take care to avoid repeating the mistakes of previous decades when it became dependent on a small number of exporters with market power and reliant on rigid pipeline infrastructure.

Europe's strategy for clean energy imports will also strongly affect the requirements for domestic energy infrastructure. Previous research found many ways to develop a self-sufficient energy system.¹¹⁻¹³ To support such scenarios without energy imports into Europe, reinforcing the European power grid or building a hydrogen network was often identified as beneficial.^{14,15} However, depending on the volumes of imports and the energy vectors (electricity, hydrogen or hydrogen derivatives), Europe might not need to expand its hydrogen transport infrastructure. Most hydrogen is used to make derivative products (e.g., ammonia for fertilisers or Fischer-Tropsch fuels for aviation and shipping).¹⁴ If Europe imported these products at scale, much of the hydrogen demand would fall away. In consequence, this would reduce the need for hydrogen transport. However, if hydrogen itself is imported, this would require a pipeline topology tailored to accommodate hydrogen arriving from North Africa or shipping routes to Northern Europe.

Policy has reflected these different visions for imports in various ways. In particular, hydrogen imports have recently attracted considerable interest, with plans of the European Commission¹⁶ to import 10 Mt (333 TWh¹) hydrogen and derivatives by 2030. Desire to import hydrogen and derivative products is also present in various national strategies.¹⁷ In particular, Germany seeks to cover up to 70% of its hydrogen consumption through imports by 2030 and pursues bilateral partnerships to accomplish this.¹⁸ Conversely, hydrogen roadmaps of Denmark,¹⁹ Ireland,²⁰ Spain,²¹ and the United Kingdom,²² recognise these countries' potential to become major exporters of renewable energy, whereas France's strategy focuses on local hydrogen production to meet domestic needs.²³ Additionally, in recent plans by transmission system operators,²⁴ European grid development plans reveal renewed enthusiasm for electricity imports via ultra-long HVDC cables, evolving from early DESERTEC²⁵ ideas to contemporary proposals like the Morocco-UK Xlinks project.²⁶

While many previous academic studies have evaluated the cost of 'green' renewable energy and material imports in the form of electricity,^{5,27-31} hydrogen,^{2,6,32-37} ammonia,^{7,38,39} methane,^{2,40} steel,⁴¹⁻⁴³ carbon-based fuels,^{4,44} or a broader variety of power-to-X fuels,^{1,3,45-49} these do not address the interactions of imports with European energy infrastructure requirements. On the other hand, among studies dealing with the detailed planning of net-zero energy systems in Europe, some do not consider energy imports,^{11,13,15} while others only consider hydrogen imports or a limited set of alternative import vectors.^{14,50-53} Only a few consider at least elementary cost uncertainties,^{37,54} and none investigate a larger range of potential import volumes across subsets of available import vectors.

In this study, we explore the full range between the two poles of complete self-sufficiency and wide-ranging renewable energy imports into Europe in scenarios with high shares of wind and solar electricity and net-zero carbon emissions. We investigate how the infrastructure requirements of a self-

¹All mass-energy conversion is based on the lower heating value (LHV). Steel is included in energy terms applying 2.1 kWh/kg as released by the oxidation of iron.

Email address: f.neumann@tu-berlin.de (Fabian Neumann)

sufficient European energy system that exclusively leverages domestic resources from the continent may differ from a system that relies on energy imports from outside of Europe. For our analysis, we integrate an open model of global energy supply chains, TRACE,⁴⁷ with a spatially and temporally resolved sector-coupled open-source energy system model for Europe, PyPSA-Eur,⁵⁵ to investigate the impact of imports on European energy infrastructure needs. We evaluate potential import locations and costs for different supply vectors, by how much system costs can be reduced through imports, and how their inclusion affects deployed transport networks and storage. For this purpose, we perform sensitivity analyses interpolating between very high levels of imports and no imports at all, exploring low and high costs for imports to account for associated uncertainties, and system responses to the exclusion of subsets of import vectors, in order to probe the flatness of the solution space. This allows us to draw robust policy conclusions from our results.

As possible import options, we consider electricity by transmission line, hydrogen as gas by pipeline and liquid by ship, methane as liquid by ship, liquid ammonia, steel, methanol and Fischer-Tropsch fuels by ship. Each energy vector has unique characteristics with regards to its production, transport and consumption (Figs. C.14 and C.15). Electricity offers the most flexible usage but is challenging to store and requires variability management if sourced from wind or solar energy. Hydrogen is easier to store and transport in large quantities but at the expense of conversion losses and less versatile applications. Large quantities could be used for backup power and heat, steel production, and the domestic synthesis of shipping and aviation fuels. On the other hand, imported synthetic carbonaceous fuels like methane, methanol and Fischer-Tropsch fuels could largely substitute the need for domestic synthesis. There is much more experience with storing and transporting these fuels and part of the existing infrastructure could potentially be reused or repurposed. However, they require a sustainable carbon source and, particularly for methane, effective carbon management and leakage prevention.⁵⁶ Ammonia is similarly easier to handle than hydrogen but does not require a carbon source. However, it faces safety and acceptance concerns due to its toxicity and potentially adverse effects on the global nitrogen cycle.^{57,58} Its demand in Europe is mostly driven by fertiliser usage. Steel represents the import of energy-intensive materials and offers low transport costs.

Further conversion of imported fuels is also possible once they have arrived in Europe, e.g. hydrogen could be used to synthesise carbon-based fuels, ammonia could be cracked to hydrogen, methane and methanol could be reformed to hydrogen or combusted for power generation with or without carbon capture. However, conversion losses can make it less attractive economically to use a high-value hydrogen derivative merely as a transport and storage vessel only to reconvert it back to hydrogen or electricity.

The PyPSA-Eur⁵⁵ model co-optimises the investment and operation of generation, storage, conversion and transmission infrastructures in a single linear optimisation problem. The model is further given the opportunity to relocate some energy-intensive industries within Europe capturing a potential renewables pull effect.^{59,60} We resolve 110 regions comprising the European Union without Cyprus and Malta as well as the United Kingdom, Norway, Switzerland, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia, and Kosovo. In combination with a 4-hourly equivalent time resolution for one year, grid bottlenecks, renewable variability,

and seasonal storage requirements are efficiently captured. Weather variations between years are not considered for computational reasons. The model includes regional demands from the electricity, industry, buildings, agriculture and transport sectors, international shipping and aviation, and non-energy feedstock demands in the chemicals industry. Transmission infrastructure for electricity, gas and hydrogen, and candidate entry points like existing and prospective LNG terminals and cross-continental pipelines are also represented. We utilize techno-economic assumptions for 2030⁶¹, reflecting that infrastructure required for achieving carbon neutrality must be built well in advance of reaching this goal. While enforcing net-zero emissions for carbon dioxide, we also limit the annual carbon sequestration potential to 200 Mt_{CO₂}/a. This suffices to offset unabatable industrial process emissions of around 140 Mt_{CO₂}/a and limited use of fossil fuels beyond that, whose emissions are compensated either through capturing emissions at source with a capture rate of 90% or via carbon dioxide removal.

More details are included in the [Methods](#) section.

Cost assessment of energy and material import vectors

Green fuel and steel import costs seen by the model are based on an extension of recent research by Hampp et al.,⁴⁷ who assessed the levelised cost of energy exports for different green energy and material supply chains in various world regions (Fig. 1a). Our selection of exporting countries comprises Australia, Argentina, Chile, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Turkey, Ukraine, the Eastern United States and Canada, mainland China, and the MENA region. Regional supply cost curves for these countries are developed based on renewable resources, land availability and prioritised domestic demand. Unlike domestic electrofuel synthesis in Europe, which could use captured CO₂ from point sources, direct air capture is assumed to be the only carbon source of imported fuels. Concepts involving the shipment of captured CO₂ from Europe to exporting countries for carbonaceous fuel synthesis are not considered.^{62,63}

We use these supply curves to determine the region-specific lowest import cost for each carrier, thus incorporating the potential trade-off between import cost and import location (Fig. 1b). For hydrogen derivatives, the lowest-cost suppliers are Argentina and Chile for all entry points into Europe. Electricity imports are endogenously optimised, meaning that the capacities and operation of wind and solar generation as well as storage in the respective exporting countries and the HVDC transmission lines, are co-planned with the rest of the system. Hydrogen and methane can be imported where there are existing or planned LNG terminals or pipeline entry-points (excluding connections through Russia). This results in lower hydrogen import costs, where it can be imported by pipeline. Ammonia, carbonaceous fuels and steel are not spatially resolved in the model, assuming they can be transported within Europe at negligible additional cost.

Cost savings for fuel and material import combinations

In Fig. 2, we first explore the cost reduction potential of various energy and material import options. In the absence of energy imports, total energy system costs add up to 815 bn€/a². By enabling imports from outside of Europe and considering

²All currency values are given in €₂₀₂₀.




Figure 1: **Overview of considered import options.** Panel (a) shows the regional differences in the cost to deliver green methanol to Europe (choropleth layer), the cost composition of different import vectors (bar charts), an illustration of the wind and solar availability in Morocco, and an illustration of the land eligibility analysis for wind turbine placement in the region of Buenos Aires in Argentina. Panel (b) depicts considered potential entry points for energy imports into Europe like the location of existing and planned LNG terminals and gas pipeline entry points, the lowest costs of hydrogen imports in different European regions (choropleth layer), and the considered connections for long-distance HVDC import links and hydrogen pipelines from the MENA region, Kazakhstan, Turkey and Ukraine. Panel (c) displays the distribution and range of import costs for different energy carriers and entry points with indications for selected countries of origin from the TRACE model (violin charts), i.e. differences in identically coloured markers are due to regional differences in the transport costs to entrypoints.




Figure 2: **Potential for cost reductions with reduced sets of import options.** Subsets of available import options are sorted by ascending cost reduction potential. Top panel shows profile of total cost savings. Bottom panel shows composition and extent of imports in relation to total energy system costs. Percentage numbers in bar plot indicate the share of total system costs spent on domestic energy infrastructure. Alternative scenarios of this figure with higher and lower import cost assumptions are included in the supplementary material.

all import vectors, we find a potential reduction of total energy system costs by up to 39 bn€/a. This corresponds to a relative reduction of 4.9%. For cost-optimal imports, around 71% of these costs are used to develop domestic energy infrastructure. The remaining 29% are spent on importing a volume of 52 Mt of green steel and around 2700 TWh of green energy, which is almost a quarter of the system’s total energy supply (Fig. 3).

Next, we investigate the impact of restricting the available import options to subsets of import vectors. We find that if only hydrogen can be imported, cost savings are reduced to 22 bn€/a (2.8%). This is because by using hydrogen as an intermediary carrier, low-cost renewable electricity from abroad can still be leveraged for the synthesis of derivative products in Europe. For this purpose, pipeline-based hydrogen imports are preferred to ship-based imports as liquid. When direct hydrogen imports are excluded from the available import options, cost savings are similar with 24 bn€/a (3%). Focusing imports exclusively on liquid carbonaceous fuels derived from hydrogen, i.e. methanol or Fischer-Tropsch fuels, consistently achieves cost savings of 13-20 bn€/a (1.7-2.5%).

On the contrary, restricting options to only ammonia or methane imports yields negligible cost savings. Small savings below 5 bn€/a (0.6%) can be reached if only electricity or steel can be imported. This is due to the lower volume and variety of usage options for ammonia, methane and steel compared to hydrogen, methanol and Fischer-Tropsch fuels. Furthermore, the direct import of electricity poses more challenges for system integration. Generally, our results indicate a preference for methanol, hydrogen and steel imports over electricity imports, with a mix emerging as the most cost-effective approach. Fig. C.9 show additional insights into how varying import costs affect these findings.

Import dynamics for different energy carriers

Fig. 3 outlines which carriers are imported in which quantities in relation to their total supply under default assumptions when the vector and volume can be flexibly chosen (“all imports allowed” in Fig. 2). In energy terms, cost-optimal imports




Figure 3: **Shares of imports and domestic production by carrier and optimised import carrier mix for import scenario with flexible carrier choice.** The figure also shows total supply for each carrier. Import shares for further import scenarios are included in the supplementary material. Steel is included in energy terms applying 2.1 kWh/kg as released by the oxidation of iron.




Figure 4: **Comparison of domestic synthetic production costs and import costs for varying import scenarios.** The three panels (a), (b), and (c) refer to different import scenarios. In each panel, the *bar charts* show the production-weighted average prices of domestic production of steel, hydrogen and its derivatives split into its cost and revenue components. These have been computed using the marginal prices of the respective inputs and outputs for the production volume of each region and snapshot. Capital expenditures are distributed to hours in proportion to the production volume. Missing bars indicate that no domestic production occurred in the scenario, e.g. for the case of methane where all demand is met by biogenic and fossil methane and no synthetic production occurred (cf. energy balances in supplementary material). All hydrogen is produced from electrolysis; i.e. the model did not choose to produce hydrogen via steam methane reforming with or without carbon capture. For each bar, the yellow errorbars show the range of time-averaged domestic production costs across all regions. The black error bars show the range of import costs across all regions. The *maps* relate the hydrogen production volume to the weighted cost of domestic hydrogen production (left colorbar). The *time series* indicate the variance of the domestic production cost over time for hydrogen and Fischer-Tropsch fuel (FTF) including the regional spectrum as shaded area.

comprise around 50% hydrogen, more than 20% electricity, and around 20% of carbonaceous fuels. Noticeably, all crude steel and methanol for shipping and industry is imported. Also, around three-quarters of the total hydrogen supply is imported. Hydrogen is imported so that it can be processed into derivative products domestically rather than direct applications for hydrogen. Smaller import shares are observed for electricity, Fischer-Tropsch fuels, and ammonia, which are mostly domestically produced.

To explain the import shares in Fig. 3 in more detail, we compare import costs with average domestic production cost split by cost and revenue components in Fig. 4. First, for the scenario without imports, imported fuel appear to be substantially cheaper than domestic production. The high demand for hydrogen and derivative products (Figs. C.14 and C.15) means that the most attractive domestic potentials for renewable electricity and carbon dioxide have been exhausted. Power from wind and solar needs to be produced in regions with worse capacity factors and direct air capture becomes the price-setting technology for CO₂ as biogenic and industrial sources ($\approx 600 \text{ Mt}_{\text{CO}_2}$) are depleted.

Part of this gap is closed when hydrogen imports are allowed. By sourcing cheaper hydrogen from outside Europe, the domestic costs of derivative fuel synthesis are reduced. This hybrid approach has the largest effect on Fischer-Tropsch production due to its higher hydrogen demand compared to methanolisation and the Haber-Bosch process. Hydrogen imports also decouple the synthesis from the seasonal variation of domestic hydrogen production costs.

The potential for waste heat utilisation from fuel synthesis within Europe adds further appeal to this hybrid approach. By importing hydrogen rather than the derivative product, heat supply into district heating networks from synthesis processes can create an additional revenue stream of up to 10 €/MWh, depending on the process.

The waste heat integration is also the reason why in Fig. 3, with all import vectors allowed, all methanol is imported, whereas Fischer-Tropsch fuels and ammonia are produced mainly domestically using high shares of imported hydrogen. Because the thermal discharge from the methanol synthesis is primarily used for the distillation of the methanol-water output mix, its waste heat potential is considered much lower compared to Fischer-Tropsch, Haber-Bosch and Sabatier processes. Therefore, it is less attractive to retain this part of the value chain within Europe.

With all import vectors allowed, we see minimal cost differences between domestic production and imports as the supply curves reach equilibrium. This is because imports of hydrogen and derivative products lower the strain on the domestic supply chain. Thereby, domestic production would only be ramped up where it competes with imports and associated infrastructure costs. Such regions exist in Southern Europe or the British Isles and, therefore, not all hydrogen is imported (Fig. C.13).

Sensitivity of potential cost savings to import costs

It should be noted, however, that the cost-optimal import mix also strongly depends on the assumed import costs. This uncertainty is addressed in Fig. 5. Fig. 5a highlights the extensive range in potential cost reductions if higher or lower import costs could be attained and underlines the resulting variance in cost-effective import mixes. Within $\pm 20\%$ of the default import costs applied to all carriers but electricity, total cost savings vary between 13 bn€/a (1.6%) and 83 bn€/a (10.2%). Within

this range, import volumes vary between 1700 and 3800 TWh. Across most scenarios, there is a stable role for methanol, steel, electricity and hydrogen imports. One significant difference, however, are Fischer-Tropsch fuel imports starting from cost reductions of 10% and their absence at cost increases beyond 10%.

A breakdown of potential causes for such cost variations such as cost of capital, cost of carbon dioxide and investment costs are presented in Table A.1. Some of these only affect the cost of carbonaceous fuels. One central assumption for carbon-based fuels is that imported fuels rely exclusively on direct air capture (DAC) as a carbon source. Arguments for this assumption relate to the potential remoteness of the ideal locations for renewable fuel production or the absence of industrial point sources in the exporting country. On the other hand, domestic electrofuels can mostly use less expensive captured carbon dioxide from industrial point sources or biogenic origin. Therefore, the higher cost for DAC partially cancels out the savings from utilising better renewable resources abroad. This is one of the reasons why there is substantial power-to-X production in Europe, even with corresponding import options. The availability of cheaper biogenic CO₂ in the exporting country, for instance, would make importing carbonaceous fuels more attractive (Table A.1).

When the relative cost variation of $\pm 20\%$ is only applied to carbon-based fuels (Fig. 5b), hydrogen imports are increasingly displaced by methane and Fischer-Tropsch imports with falling costs. However, it takes a cost increase of more than 10% for domestic methanol production to become more cost-effective than methanol imports. This underlines the robust benefit of importing methanol.

Attainable cost savings for varying import volumes

What is consistent across all import cost variations is the flat solution space around the respective cost-optimal import volumes. Increasing or decreasing the total amount of imports barely affects system costs within $\pm 1000 \text{ TWh}$. This is illustrated in Fig. 6, which shows the system cost as a function of enforced import volumes and different import costs. A wide range scenarios with import volumes below 5600 TWh (4000 TWh with +20% and 7500 TWh with -20% import costs) have lower total energy system costs than the scenario without any imports. These import volumes are roughly twice the cost-optimal import volumes, which are indicated by the black markers in Fig. 6 and correspond to the bars previously shown in Fig. 5a. Naturally, the cost-optimal volume of imports increases as their costs decrease, but the response weakens with lower import costs.

As we explore the effect of increasing import volumes on system costs, we find that already 43% (36-61% within $\pm 20\%$ import costs) of the 4.9% (1.6-10.2%) total cost benefit (17 bn€/a) can be achieved with the first 500 TWh of imports. This corresponds to only 18% (15-29%) of the cost-optimal import volumes, highlighting the diminishing return of large amounts of energy imports in Europe. While importing 1000 TWh already realises 70% of the maximum cost savings with our default assumptions, this maximum is only obtained for 2800 TWh of imports. For these initial 1000 TWh, primary crude steel and methanol imports are prioritised, followed by hydrogen and, subsequently, electricity beyond 2000 TWh. Once more than 5000 TWh are imported, less than half the total system cost would be spent on domestic energy infrastructure.




Figure 5: **Effect of import cost variations on cost savings and import shares with all vectors allowed.** In panel (a), indicated relative cost changes are applied uniformly to all vectors but electricity imports. In panel (b), cost changes are only applied to carbonaceous fuels (methane, methanol and Fischer-Tropsch). Top subpanels show potential cost savings compared to the scenario without imports. Bottom subpanels show the share and composition of different import vectors in relation to total energy system costs. The information is shown both in absolute terms and relative terms compared to the scenario without imports.




Figure 6: **Sensitivity of import volume on total system cost and composition.** The dashed line splits total system cost into domestic and foreign cost. Dotted lines represent import cost variations, indicating the respective altered profile of total system cost for given prescribed import volumes. The black markers denote the maximum cost reductions and cost-optimal import volume for a given import cost level (extreme points of the profiles). Steel is included in energy terms applying 2.1 kWh/kg as released by the oxidation of iron. Cost alterations are uniformly applied to all imports options but direct electricity imports.

As imports increase, there is a corresponding decrease in the need for domestic power-to-X (PtX) production and renewable capacities. A large share of the hydrogen, methanol and raw steel production is outsourced from Europe, reducing the need for domestic wind and solar capacities. This trend is further characterised by the displacement of biogas usage in favour of hydrogen imports around the 2000 TWh mark as demand for domestic CO₂ utilisation drops. An increase in the amount of hydrogen imported coincides with an increasing use of hydrogen fuel cells for electricity and central heat supply in district heating networks, partially displacing the use of methane. Regarding electricity imports from the MENA region, Fig. 6 reveals a mix of wind and solar power to establish favourable feed-in profiles for the European system integration and higher utilisation rates for the long-distance HVDC links with a capacity-weighted average of 72%. Utilisation rates are high because a considerable share of the import costs of electricity can be attributed to power transmission.

As import costs are varied, the composition of the domestic system and import mix is primarily similar (Fig. C.10). The main differences are a more prominent role for Fischer-Tropsch fuel imports with lower import costs and green methane for high import volumes. It should also be noted that the windows for cost savings are much smaller if only subsets of import options are available (Fig. C.11). However, up to an import volume of 2000 TWh, excluding electricity imports would not diminish the cost-saving potential substantially.

Interactions of import strategy & domestic infrastructure

Across the range of import scenarios analysed, we find that the decision which import vectors are used strongly affects domestic energy infrastructure needs (Fig. 7).

In the fully self-sufficient European energy supply scenario, we see large power-to-X production within Europe to cover the demand for hydrogen and hydrogen derivatives in steelmaking, high-value chemicals, green shipping and aviation fuels. Production sites are concentrated in Southern Europe for solar-based electrolysis and the broader North Sea region for wind-based electrolysis. The steel and ammonia industries relocate to the periphery of Europe in Spain and Scotland, where hydrogen is cheap and abundant. Electricity grid reinforcements are focused in Northwestern Europe and long-distance HVDC connections but are broadly distributed overall. Hydrogen pipeline build-out is strongest in Spain and France to transport hydrogen from the Southern production hubs to fuel synthesis sites. Most of these pipelines are used unidirectionally, with bidirectional usage where pipelines link hydrogen production and low-cost geological storage sites (for instance, between Greece and Italy and Southern Spain).

Considering imports of renewable electricity, green hydrogen, and electrofuels substantially alters the infrastructure buildout in Europe. Imports displace much of the European power-to-X production capacities and, particularly, domestic solar energy generation in Southern Europe. In contrast, the British Isles retain some domestic electrolyser capacities to produce synthetic methane locally, also leveraging the Sabatier process's waste heat. The electricity imports are distributed evenly between the North African countries Algeria, Libya, and Tunisia and across multiple entry points in Spain, France, Italy and Greece. This facilitates grid integration without strong reinforcement needs. Electricity imports are also optimised to achieve higher utilisation rates above 70% for the HVDC

import connections. This is realised by mixing wind and solar generation for seasonal balancing and using some batteries for short-term storage (Fig. C.19).

While the amount and locations of domestic power grid reinforcements are not significantly affected by the import of electricity and other fuels, the extent of the hydrogen network is halved and its routing is significantly altered. Compared to the self-sufficiency scenario, the cost-benefit of the hydrogen network shrinks from 11 bn€/a (1.3%) to 3 bn€/a (0.4%). This is caused by substantial amounts of methanol imports that diminish the demand for hydrogen in Europe and, hence, the need to transport it. In combination with the steel and ammonia industry relocation, longer hydrogen pipeline connections are then predominantly built to meet hydrogen CHP demands to bring electricity and heat to renewables-poor and grid-poor regions in Eastern Europe and Germany. Moreover, the hydrogen network helps absorb inbound hydrogen in South and Southeast Europe, transporting some hydrogen, which is not directly used for fuel synthesis at the entry points, to neighbouring regions.

A further observation is the high value of power-to-X production for system integration and the role of waste heat in the siting of fuel synthesis plants (Fig. C.16). Using the process waste heat in district heating networks with seasonal thermal storage generates notable cost savings of 11-21 bn€/a (1.3-2.6%). Consequently, savings are lower when imports displace domestic PtX infrastructure. To realise these benefits, PtX facilities tend to be located in densely populated areas (e.g. Paris or Hamburg), which drives part of the the hydrogen network. Notably, because of the waste heat produced in Fischer-Tropsch and Sabatier plants, these tend to locate where space heating demand is high. This is not the case for methanolisation plants, which have lower waste heat potential. Alongside the flexible operation of electrolysis to integrate variable wind and solar feed-in and the broad availability of industrial and biogenic carbon sources in Europe, waste heat usage is a key factor that makes electricity and hydrogen imports with subsequent domestic conversion more attractive relative to the direct import of derivative products. Infrastructure layouts for further import scenarios are presented in Fig. C.16 to Fig. C.18.

Discussion and conclusions

Our analysis offers insights into how renewable energy imports might reduce overall systems costs and interact with European energy infrastructure. Our results show that imports of green energy reduce costs of a carbon-neutral European energy system by 39 bn€/a (5%), noting, however, that the uncertainty range is considerable. While we find that some imports are robustly beneficial, system cost savings range between 1% and 14% depending on the import costs. What is consistent, however, are the diminishing return of energy imports for larger quantities, with peak cost savings below imports of 4000 TWh/a. We also find that there is value in pursuing some power-to-X production in Europe as a source of flexibility for wind and solar integration and as a source of waste heat for district heating networks. Another location factor in favour of European power-to-X is the wide availability of sustainable biogenic and industrial carbon sources, which helps to reduce reliance on costly direct air capture.

Overall, we find that the import vectors used strongly affect domestic infrastructure needs. For example, only a smaller hydrogen network would be required if hydrogen derivatives were largely imported. This underscores the importance of




Figure 7: **Layout of European energy infrastructure for different import scenarios.** Left column shows the regional electricity supply mix (pies), added HVDC and HVAC transmission capacity (lines), and the siting of battery storage (choropleth). Right column shows the hydrogen supply (top half of pies) and consumption (bottom half of pies), net flow and direction of hydrogen in newly built pipelines (lines), and the siting of hydrogen storage subject to geological potentials (choropleth). Total volumes of transmission expansion are given in TWkm, which is the sum product of the capacity and length of individual connections. The half circle in the Bay of Biscay indicates the imports of carriers that are not spatially resolved: ammonia, steel, methanol, Fischer-Tropsch fuels. Hydrogen imports are shown at the entry points. Hydrogen imports in Bulgaria and Romania originate from Algeria and Egypt. Maps for more scenarios are included in the supplementary material.

coordination between energy import strategies and infrastructure policy decisions. Our results present a quantitative basis for further discussions about the trade-offs between system cost, carbon neutrality, public acceptance, energy security, infrastructure buildout and imports.

The small differences in cost between some scenarios is particularly relevant because factors other than pure costs might then drive the designs of import strategies. The relatively limited cost benefit of imports and value chain reordering, may speak against pursuing this avenue. A desire for energy sovereignty would motivate more domestic supply and diversified imports. For instance, focusing on ship-borne imports would reduce pipeline lock-in and mitigate the risks of sudden supply disruptions and abuse of market power. Focussing on carriers that are already a globally traded commodity may also be more appealing. Producing renewable energy locally would bring value creation and jobs to Europe that are currently outsourced to fossil fuel producers abroad. For similar reasons, the import of intermediary raw products like sponge iron, which represents the most energy-intensive part of the steel value chain, could also be a relevant option.

There is also a social dimension to the import strategy and the question of how fast the associated infrastructure can get built. Policymaking in Europe might prefer easy-to-implement systems featuring, for instance, lower domestic infrastructure requirements, reuse of existing infrastructure, lower technology risk, and reduced land usage for broader public support than the most cost-effective solution. However, in outsourcing potential land use and infrastructure conflicts to abroad, potential exporting countries must weigh the prospect of economic development against internal social and environmental issues. Ultimately, Europe's energy strategy must balance cost savings from green energy and material imports with broader concerns like geopolitics, economic development, public opinion and the willingness of potential exporting countries in order to ensure a swift, secure and sustainable energy future. Our research shows that there is maneuvering space to accommodate such non-cost concerns.

Methods

Modelling of the European energy system

For our analysis, we use the European sector-coupled high-resolution energy system model PyPSA-Eur⁶⁴ based on the open-source modelling framework PyPSA⁶⁵ (Python for Power System Analysis) in a setup similar to Neumann et al.¹⁴, covering the energy demands of all sectors including electricity, heat, transport, industry, agriculture, as well as international shipping and aviation.

The model simultaneously optimises spatially explicit investments and the operation of generation, storage, conversion and transmission assets to minimise total system costs in a linear optimisation problem, which is solved with *Gurobi*.⁶⁶ The capacity expansion is based on technology cost and efficiency projections for the year 2030, many of which are taken from the technology catalogue of the Danish Energy Agency.⁶⁷ Choosing projections for the year 2030 for a net-zero carbon emission scenarios more likely to be reached by mid-century acknowledges that much of the required infrastructure must be constructed well in advance of reaching this goal. Spatially, the model resolves 110 regions in Europe,⁶⁸ covering the European Union, the United Kingdom, Norway, Switzerland and the Balkan countries without Malta and Cyprus. Temporally, the

model is solved with an uninterrupted 4-hourly equivalent resolution for the weather year 2013, using a segmentation clustering approach implemented in the *tsam* toolbox.⁶⁹ In terms of investment periods, no pathway optimisation is conducted, but a greenfield approach is pursued except for existing hydroelectricity and transmission infrastructure targeting net-zero CO₂ emissions.

Networks are considered for electricity, methane and hydrogen transport.^{70,71} However, different to Neumann et al.,¹⁴ pipeline retrofitting to hydrogen is disabled for computational reasons such that all hydrogen pipelines are assumed to be newly built. Data on the gas transmission system is further supplemented by the locations of fossil gas extraction sites and gas storage facilities based on SciGRID_gas,⁷¹ as well as investment costs and capacities of existing and planned LNG terminals⁷² Moreover, a carbon dioxide network is not explicitly co-optimised since CO₂ is not spatially resolved in this model version.⁷³

The overall annual sequestration of CO₂ is limited to 200 MtCO₂/a. This number allows for sequestering the industry's unabated fossil emissions (e.g. in the cement industry) while minimising reliance on carbon removal technologies. The carbon management features of the model trace the carbon cycles through various conversion stages: industrial emissions, biomass and gas combustion, carbon capture, storage or long-term sequestration, direct air capture, electrofuels, recycling, and waste-to-energy plants.

Renewable potentials and time series for wind and solar electricity generation are calculated with *atlite*,⁷⁴ considering land eligibility constraints like nature reserves or distance criteria to settlements. Given low onshore wind expansion in many European countries in recent years,⁷⁵ restrictive onshore wind expansion potentials are applied, using a 1.5 MW/km² factor for the eligible land area. Geological potentials for hydrogen storage are taken from Caglayan et al.⁷⁶ Biomass potentials are restricted to residues from agriculture and forestry, as well as waste and manure, based on the medium potentials specified for 2030 in the JRC-ENSPRESO database.⁷⁷ The finite biomass resource can be employed for low-temperature heat provision in industrial applications, biomass boilers and CHPs, and bio-fuel production for use in aviation, shipping and the chemicals industry. Additionally, we allow biogas upgrading, including the capture of the CO₂ contained in biogas. The total assumed bioenergy potentials are 1569 TWh with a carbon content corresponding to 546 MtCO₂/a, which is not fully available as a feedstock for fuel synthesis due to imperfect capture rates of up to 90%.

Heating supply technologies like heat pumps, electric boilers, gas boilers, and combined heat and power (CHP) plants are endogenously optimised separately for decentral use and central district heating. District heating networks can further be supplemented with waste heat from various power-to-X processes (electrolysis, methanation, methanolisation, ammonia synthesis, Fischer-Tropsch fuel synthesis).

While the shipping sector is assumed to use methanol as fuel, land-based transport, including heavy-duty vehicles, is deemed fully electrified in the presented scenarios. Aviation can decide to use green kerosene derived from Fischer-Tropsch fuels or methanol. Besides methanol-to-kerosene, further usage options for methanol have been added. These include methanol-to-olefins/aromatics for the production of green plastics, methanol-to-power⁷⁸ in open-cycle gas turbines or Allam cycle turbines, and steam reforming of methanol with or without carbon capture. For the synthesis of electrofuels,

we also account for potential operational restrictions by considering a minimum part load of 30% for methanolisation and methanation compared to 70% for Fischer-Tropsch synthesis, both within Europe and abroad.

A further core improvement of the model regards the physical representation of energy transport over long distances. For gas and hydrogen pipelines, we incorporate electricity demands for compression of 1% and 2% per 1000km of the transported energy, respectively.⁷⁹ For HVDC transmission lines, we assume 2% static losses at the substations and additional losses of 3% per 1000km. The losses of high-voltage AC transmission lines are estimated using a piecewise linear approximation as proposed in Neumann et al.,⁸⁰ in addition to the linearised power flow equations.⁸¹ Up to a maximum capacity increase of 30%, we consider dynamic line rating (DLR), leveraging the cooling effect of wind and low ambient temperatures to exploit existing transmission assets fully.⁸² To approximate N-1 resilience, transmission lines may only be used up to 70% of their rated dynamic capacity. To prevent excessive expansion of single connections, the expansion of power transmission lines between two regions is limited to 15 GW for HVAC and 25 GW for HVDC lines, while a similar constraint of 50.7 GW is placed on hydrogen pipelines, which corresponds to three parallel 48-inch pipelines.⁷⁹

Finally, we also developed the possibility for the model to relocate the steel and ammonia industry within Europe, mainly to level the playing field between non-European green steel imports and domestic production. This is achieved by explicitly modelling the cost, efficiency and operation of hydrogen direct iron reduction (H₂-DRI) and electric arc furnaces (EAF), which can be sited all over Europe, and the cost to procure iron ore. We further allow the oversizing of steelmaking plants to allow flexible production in response to the renewables supply conditions.

Modelling of import supply chains and costs

The European energy system model is extended with data from the TRACE model⁴⁷ to assess the costs of different vectors for importing green energy and material into Europe from various world regions. For each vector, we identify locations with existing or planned import infrastructure where the respective carrier may enter the European energy system.

Starting from the methodology by Hampp et al.⁴⁷, some adjustments were made to the original TRACE model. Namely, land availability and wind and solar time-series are determined using *atlite*⁷⁴ instead of *GEGIS*.⁸³ Techno-economic assumptions were aligned with those used in the European model, and steel was included as an energy-intensive material import vector. The exporting countries comprise Australia, Argentina, Chile, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Turkey, Ukraine, the Eastern United States and Canada, mainland China, and counties in the MENA region.

To determine the levelised cost of energy for exports, the methodology first assesses the regional potentials for wind and solar energy. A regional electricity cost supply curve is determined, from which projected future local energy demand is subtracted. Thereby, domestic consumption is prioritised and supplied by the countries' best renewable resources even though we do not model the energy transition in exporting countries in detail. The remaining wind and solar electricity supply can then be used to produce the specific energy or material vector using water electrolysis for H₂, direct air capture (DAC) for CO₂, air separation units (ASU) for N₂, synthesis of methane, methanol, ammonia or Fischer-Tropsch fuels from

H₂ with CO₂ or N₂, and H₂ direct iron reduction (DRI) with subsequent processing in electric arc furnaces (EAF) for the processing of iron ore (103.7 €/t) into green steel. Other CO₂ sources than DAC are not considered in the exporting countries, a notable difference from the European model. Liquid organic hydrogen carriers (LOHC) are not considered as export vector due to their lower technology readiness level (TRL) compared to other vectors.¹ Further details on the energy and feedstock flow and process efficiencies are outlined in Fig. 8.

For each vector, an annual reference export demand of 500 TWh (lower heating value, LHV) or 100 Mt of steel is assumed, mirroring large-scale energy and material infrastructures and export volumes, corresponding to approximately 40% of current LNG imports⁷² and 66% of European steel production.⁸⁴

Based on these supply chain definitions, a capacity expansion optimisation is performed to determine the cost-optimal combination of infrastructure and process capacities for all intermediary products and delivering the final carrier either through pipelines (H₂(g), CH₄(g)) or by ship (H₂(l), CH₄(l), NH₃(l), MeOH, Fischer-Tropsch fuel, and steel). Exports from each of the regions shown in Fig. 1a are modelled to each of twelve European import locations based on large port locations, determining the levelised costs of energy or steel the European entry point will see for each supply chain. All energy supply chains are assumed to consume their energy vector as fuel for transport to Europe, except for steel, which uses externally bought methanol as shipping fuel.

The resulting levelised cost of exported energy specific to the respective importing regions is added as a constant marginal import cost for all chemical energy carriers and steel. For the import of hydrogen and methane, candidate entry points are identified based on where existing and prospective LNG terminals and cross-continental pipelines are located. This includes new LNG import terminals in Europe in response to ambitions to phase out Russian gas supply in 2022.⁷² To achieve regional diversity in potential gas and hydrogen imports and avoid vulnerable singular import locations, we allow the expansion beyond the reported capacities only up to a factor of 2.5, taking the median value of reported investment costs for LNG terminals.⁸⁵ A surcharge of 20% is added for hydrogen import terminals due to the lack of practical experience. Carbonaceous fuels, ammonia, and steel imports are not spatially resolved due to their low transport costs and, therefore, are not constrained by the availability of suitable entry points. To present energy and material imports in a common unit, the embodied energy in steel is approximated with the 2.1 kWh/kg released in iron oxide reduction, i.e. energy released by combustion.⁸⁶

Owing to the variability of wind and solar electricity, the supply chain of electricity imports is endogenously optimised with the rest of the European system rather than using a constant levelised cost of exported electricity. This comprises the optimisation of wind and solar capacities, batteries and hydrogen storage in steel tanks, and the size and operation of HVDC link connection into Europe based on the availability time series in neighbouring countries as illustrated in Fig. 1b. Underground hydrogen storage options are not considered due to the limited availability of salt caverns in many of the best renewable resource regions in the countries that are considered exporting.⁸⁷ We also assume that the energy supply chains dedicated to exports will be islanded from the rest of the local energy system. Europe's connection options with exporting countries are confined to the 5% nearest regions, with additional ultra-long distance connection options




Figure 8: **Schematic overview of the import supply chains.** The illustration includes key input-output ratios of the different conversion processes and the transport efficiencies for the different import vectors.

to Ireland, Cornwall and Brittany following the vision of the Xlinks project between Morocco and the United Kingdom.²⁶ Connections through Russia or Belarus are excluded, and thus, some connections are affected by additional detours beyond the regularly applied detour factor of 125% of the as-the-crow-flies distance. Similar to intra-European HVDC transmission, a 3% loss per 1000km and a 2% converter station loss are assumed.

As illustrated in Fig. 1, for imports of hydrogen by pipeline, nearby countries like Algeria and Egypt emerged as lowest cost exporters (ca. 57 €/MWh). Importing hydrogen by ship is substantially more expensive due to liquefaction and evaporation losses. Algeria could offer supply through this vector at 84 €/MWh. For all other hydrogen derivatives, Argentina and Chile offer the lowest cost imports between 88 and 110 €/MWh or 501 €/t for steel. Methanol is found to be cheaper than the Fischer-Tropsch route because it is assumed to be more flexible (30% minimum part load compared to 70% for Fischer-Tropsch).⁷ The lower process flexibility shifts the energy mix towards solar electricity and causes higher levels of curtailment, increasing costs. The transport costs of CH₄(l) are lower than for H₂(l) since the liquefaction consumes less energy and individual ships can carry more energy with CH₄(l). Pipeline imports of CH₄(g) were also considered, but costs were higher than for CH₄(l) shipping under the assumption that new pipelines would have to be built. Consequently, the model preferred LNG imports over pipeline imports.

Acknowledgements

J.H. gratefully acknowledges funding from the Kopernikus-Ariadne project (FKZ 03SFK5A and 03SFK5A0-2) by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (*Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, BMBF*).

Author contributions

F.N.: Conceptualization – Data curation – Formal Analysis – Investigation – Methodology – Software – Validation – Visualization – Writing - original draft – **J.H.:** Conceptualization – Data curation – Formal Analysis – Investigation – Methodology – Software – Validation – Visualization – Writing - review & editing **T.B.:** Conceptualization – Formal Analysis – Funding acquisition – Investigation – Methodology – Project administration – Software – Supervision – Validation – Writing - review & editing

Declaration of interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Data and code availability

A dataset of the model results will be made available on [zenodo](https://zenodo.org) after peer-review. The code to reproduce the experiments is available at <https://github.com/fneum/import-benefits>.

References

- [1] IRENA, *Global hydrogen trade to meet the 1.5°C climate goal*, Tech. rep. (2022). URL https://www.irena.org/-/media/Files/IRENA/Agency/Publication/2022/Apr/IRENA_Global_Trade_Hydrogen_2022.pdf
- [2] B. Lux, J. Gegenheimer, K. Franke, F. Sensfuß, B. Pfluger, Supply curves of electricity-based gaseous fuels in the MENA region, *Computers & Industrial Engineering* 162 (2021) 107647. doi:10.1016/j.cie.2021.107647.
- [3] B. van der Zwaan, S. Lamboo, F. Dalla Longa, Timmermans' dream: An electricity and hydrogen partnership between Europe and North Africa, *Energy Policy* 159 (2021) 112613. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2021.112613.

- [4] M. Fasihi, D. Bogdanov, C. Breyer, Long-Term Hydrocarbon Trade Options for the Maghreb Region and Europe—Renewable Energy Based Synthetic Fuels for a Net Zero Emissions World, *Sustainability* 9 (2) (2017) 306. doi:10.3390/su9020306.
- [5] L. Reichenberg, F. Hedenus, N. Mattsson, V. Verendel, Deep decarbonization and the supergrid – Prospects for electricity transmission between Europe and China, *Energy* 239 (2022) 122335. doi:10.1016/j.energy.2021.122335.
- [6] A. Galván, J. Haas, S. Moreno-Leiva, J. C. Osorio-Aravena, W. Nowak, R. Palma-Benke, C. Breyer, Exporting sunshine: Planning South America's electricity transition with green hydrogen, *Applied Energy* 325 (2022) 119569. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2022.119569.
- [7] J. Armijo, C. Philibert, Flexible production of green hydrogen and ammonia from variable solar and wind energy: Case study of Chile and Argentina, *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 45 (3) (2020) 1541–1558. doi:10.1016/j.ijhydene.2019.11.028.
- [8] M. Pfennig, D. Böttger, B. Hückner, D. Geiger, C. Zink, A. Bisevic, L. Jansen, Global GIS-based potential analysis and cost assessment of Power-to-X fuels in 2050, *Applied Energy* 347 (2023) 121289. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2023.121289.
- [9] T. T. Pedersen, E. K. Gøtske, A. Dvorak, G. B. Andresen, M. Victoria, Long-term implications of reduced gas imports on the decarbonization of the European energy system, *Joule* 6 (7) (2022) 1566–1580. doi:10.1016/j.joule.2022.06.023.
- [10] eurostat, **Complete energy balances European Union (27 countries) - 2021 - Total - main fuel families**, Tech. rep. (2023). URL https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cache/infographs/energy_balances/enbal.html
- [11] B. Pickering, F. Lombardi, S. Pfenninger, Diversity of options to eliminate fossil fuels and reach carbon neutrality across the entire European energy system, *Joule* 6 (6) (2022) 1253–1276. doi:10.1016/j.joule.2022.05.009.
- [12] T. Tröndle, S. Pfenninger, J. Lilliestam, Home-made or imported: On the possibility for renewable electricity autarky on all scales in Europe, *Energy Strategy Reviews* 26 (2019) 100388. doi:10/gf69s7.
- [13] T. Brown, D. Schlachtberger, A. Kies, S. Schramm, M. Greiner, Synergies of sector coupling and transmission extension in a cost-optimised, highly renewable European energy system, *Energy* 160 (2018) 720–739. doi:10.1016/j.energy.2018.06.222.
- [14] F. Neumann, E. Zeyen, M. Victoria, T. Brown, The potential role of a hydrogen network in Europe, *Joule* (2023) S2542435123002660doi:10.1016/j.joule.2023.06.016.
- [15] M. Victoria, E. Zeyen, T. Brown, Speed of technological transformations required in Europe to achieve different climate goals, *Joule* 6 (5) (2022) 1066–1086. doi:10.1016/j.joule.2022.04.016.
- [16] European Commission, **RepowerEU Plan** (2022). URL https://energy.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2022-05/COM_2022_230_1_EN_ACT_part1_v5.pdf
- [17] A.-S. Corbeau, R. Kaswiyanto, **National Hydrogen Strategies and Roadmap Tracker** (2024). URL <https://www.energypolicy.columbia.edu/publications/national-hydrogen-strategies-and-roadmap-tracker/>
- [18] Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Klimaschutz, **Fortschreibung der Nationalen Wasserstoffstrategie** (2023). URL <https://www.bmwk.de/Redaktion/DE/Wasserstoff/Downloads/Fortschreibung.html>
- [19] Danish Ministry of Climate, Energy and Utilities, **Regeringens strategi for Power-to-X** (2021). URL https://ens.dk/sites/ens.dk/files/ptx/strategy_ptx.pdf
- [20] Department of the Environment, Climate and Communications, Government of Ireland, **National Hydrogen Strategy** (2023). URL <https://www.gov.ie/pdf/?file=https://assets.gov.ie/263248/f982c10f-eca6-4092-a305-90000e5213ed.pdf#page=null>
- [21] Marco Estratégico de Energía y Clima, **De Ruta del Hidrogeno: Una Apuesta por el Hidrogeno RenHojaovable** (2020). URL https://www.miteco.gob.es/content/dam/mitco/es/ministerio/planes-estrategias/hidrogeno/hojarutahidrogenorenovable_tcm30-525000.PDF
- [22] UK Department for Energy Security & Net Zero, **Hydrogen Strategy Update to the Market: August 2023** (2023). URL https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1179651/hydrogen-strategy-update-to-the-market-august-2023.pdf
- [23] French Government, **Stratégie nationale pour le développement de l'hydrogène décarboné en France** (2023). URL https://www.ecologie.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/SNH2_VF.pdf
- [24] ENTSO-E, **TYNDP 2024 Project Sheets** (2024). URL <https://tyndp2024.entsoe.eu/projects-map>
- [25] DESERTEC Foundation, **DESERTEC: Sustainable Wealth for Every Human on Earth** (2024). URL <https://desertec.org/en/>
- [26] Xlinks, **Morocco-UK Power Project** (2023). URL <https://xlinks.co/morocco-uk-power-project/>
- [27] J. Lilliestam, S. Ellenbeck, Energy security and renewable electricity trade—Will Desertec make Europe vulnerable to the “energy weapon”?, *Energy Policy* 39 (6) (2011) 3380–3391. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2011.03.035.
- [28] F. Trieb, C. Schillings, T. Pregar, M. O'Sullivan, Solar electricity imports from the Middle East and North Africa to Europe, *Energy Policy* 42 (2012) 341–353. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2011.11.091.
- [29] J. Lilliestam, Vulnerability to terrorist attacks in European electricity decarbonisation scenarios: Comparing renewable electricity imports to gas imports, *Energy Policy* 66 (2014) 234–248. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2013.10.078.
- [30] D. Bogdanov, C. Breyer, North-East Asian Super Grid for 100% renewable energy supply: Optimal mix of energy technologies for electricity, gas and heat supply options, *Energy Conversion and Management* 112 (2016) 176–190. doi:10.1016/j.enconman.2016.01.019.
- [31] M. Benasla, D. Hess, T. Allaoui, M. Brahami, M. Denai, The transition towards a sustainable energy system in Europe: What role can North Africa's solar resources play?, *Energy Strategy Reviews* 24 (2019) 1–13. doi:10.1016/j.esr.2019.01.007.
- [32] S. Timmerberg, M. Kaltschmitt, Hydrogen from renewables: Supply from North Africa to Central Europe as blend in existing pipelines – Potentials and costs, *Applied Energy* 237 (2019) 795–809. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.01.030.
- [33] Y. Ishimoto, M. Voldsund, P. Nekså, S. Roussanaly, D. Berstad, S. O. Gardarsdottir, 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* 45 (58) (2020) 32865–32883. doi:10.1016/j.ijhydene.2020.09.017.
- [34] G. Brändle, M. Schönfisch, S. Schulte, Estimating long-term global supply costs for low-carbon hydrogen, *Applied Energy* 302 (2021) 117481. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2021.117481.
- [35] J. Collis, R. Schomäcker, Determining the Production and Transport Cost for H2 on a Global Scale, *Frontiers in Energy Research* 10 (2022) 909298. doi:10.3389/fenrg.2022.909298.
- [36] T. Galimova, M. Fasihi, D. Bogdanov, C. Breyer, Impact of international transportation chains on cost of green e-hydrogen: Global cost of hydrogen and consequences for Germany and Finland, *Applied Energy* 347 (2023) 121369. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2023.121369.
- [37] R. Schmitz, J. Brandes, H. Nolte, C. Kost, B. Lux, M. Haendel, A. Held, Implications of hydrogen import prices for the German energy system in a model-comparison experiment, *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 63 (2024) 566–579. doi:10.1016/j.ijhydene.2024.03.210.
- [38] R. M. Nayak-Luke, R. Bañares-Alcántara, Techno-economic viability of islanded green ammonia as a carbon-free energy vector and as a substitute for conventional production, *Energy & Environmental Science* 13 (9) (2020) 2957–2966. doi:10.1039/D0EE01707H.
- [39] T. Galimova, M. Fasihi, D. Bogdanov, C. Breyer, Feasibility of green ammonia trading via pipelines and shipping: Cases of Europe, North Africa, and South America, *Journal of Cleaner Production* 427 (2023) 139212. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.139212.
- [40] Agora Energiewende, **Hydrogen import options for Germany**, Tech. rep. (2022). URL https://www.agora-industry.org/fileadmin/Projekte/2022/2022-10-H2_SNG_imports/A-EW_312_SNG_Imports_EN_Summary_WEB.pdf
- [41] H. Trollip, B. McCall, C. Bataille, How green primary iron production in South Africa could help global decarbonization, *Climate Policy* 22 (2) (2022) 236–247. doi:10.1080/14693062.2021.2024123.
- [42] A. Devlin, A. Yang, Regional supply chains for decarbonising steel: Energy efficiency and green premium mitigation, *Energy Conversion and Management* 254 (2022) 115268. doi:10.1016/j.enconman.2022.115268.
- [43] G. Lopez, T. Galimova, M. Fasihi, D. Bogdanov, C. Breyer, Towards defossilised steel: Supply chain options for a green European steel industry, *Energy* 273 (2023) 127236. doi:10.1016/j.energy.2023.127236.
- [44] E. D. Sherwin, Electrofuel Synthesis from Variable Renewable Electricity: An Optimization-Based Techno-Economic Analysis, *Environmental Science & Technology* 55 (11) (2021) 7583–7594. doi:10.1021/acs.est.0c07955.
- [45] M. Pfennig, D. Böttger, B. Hückner, D. Geiger, C. Zink, A. Bisevic, L. Jansen, **Global GIS-based potential analysis and cost assessment of Power-to-X fuels in 2050** (Aug. 2022). arXiv:2208.14887. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2208.14887>
- [46] A. Soler, V. Gordillo, W. Lilley, P. Schmidt, W. Werner, T. Houghton, S. Dell'Orco, **E-Fuels: A techno-economic assessment of European domestic production and imports towards 2050**, Tech. rep. (2022). URL <https://www.concawe.eu/publication/e-fuels-a-techno-economic-assessment-of-european-domestic-production-and->
- [47] J. Hampf, M. Düren, T. Brown, Import options for chemical energy carriers from renewable sources to Germany, *PLOS ONE* 18 (2) (2023) e0262340. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0281380.
- [48] L. Genge, F. Scheller, F. Müsgens, Supply costs of green chemical energy carriers at the European border: A meta-analysis, *International Journal*

- of Hydrogen Energy (Jul. 2023). doi:10.1016/j.ijhydene.2023.06.180.
- [49] T. Galimova, M. Ram, D. Bogdanov, M. Fasihi, A. Gulagi, S. Khalili, C. Breyer, Global trading of renewable electricity-based fuels and chemicals to enhance the energy transition across all sectors towards sustainability, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 183 (2023) 113420. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2023.113420.
- [50] H. C. Gils, H. Gardian, J. Schmutge, Interaction of hydrogen infrastructures with other sector coupling options towards a zero-emission energy system in Germany, *Renewable Energy* 180 (2021) 140–156. doi:10.1016/j.renene.2021.08.016.
- [51] G. S. Seck, E. Hache, J. Sabathier, F. Guedes, G. A. Reigstad, J. Straus, O. Wolfgang, J. A. Ouassou, M. Askeland, I. Hjorth, H. I. Skjelbred, L. E. Andersson, S. Douguet, M. Villavicencio, J. Trüby, J. Brauer, C. Cabot, Hydrogen and the decarbonization of the energy system in Europe in 2050: A detailed model-based analysis, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 167 (2022) 112779. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2022.112779.
- [52] M. Wetzel, H. C. Gils, V. Bertsch, Green energy carriers and energy sovereignty in a climate neutral European energy system, *Renewable Energy* (2023) S0960148123004639 doi:10.1016/j.renene.2023.04.015.
- [53] I. Kountouris, R. Bramstoft, T. Madsen, J. Gea-Bermúdez, M. Münster, D. Keles, A unified European hydrogen infrastructure planning to support the rapid scale-up of hydrogen production, Preprint, In Review (Aug. 2023). doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-3185467/v1.
- [54] F. Frischmuth, P. Härtel, Hydrogen sourcing strategies and cross-sectoral flexibility trade-offs in net-neutral energy scenarios for Europe, *Energy* 238 (2022) 121598. doi:10.1016/j.energy.2021.121598.
- [55] PyPSA-Eur-Sec: A Sector-Coupled Open Optimisation Model of the European Energy System. URL <https://github.com/pypsa/pypsa-eur-sec>
- [56] B. Shirizadeh, M. Villavicencio, S. Douguet, J. Trüby, C. Bou Issa, G. S. Seck, V. D'herbemont, E. Hache, L.-M. Malbec, J. Sabathier, M. Venugopal, F. Lagrange, S. Saunier, J. Straus, G. A. Reigstad, The impact of methane leakage on the role of natural gas in the European energy transition, *Nature Communications* 14 (1) (2023) 5756. doi:10.1038/s41467-023-41527-9.
- [57] M. B. Bertagni, R. H. Socolow, J. M. P. Martinez, E. A. Carter, C. Greig, Y. Ju, T. Lieuwen, M. E. Mueller, S. Sundaresan, R. Wang, M. A. Zondlo, A. Porporato, Minimizing the impacts of the ammonia economy on the nitrogen cycle and climate, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 120 (46) (2023) e2311728120. doi:10.1073/pnas.2311728120.
- [58] P. Wolfram, P. Kyle, X. Zhang, S. Gkantonas, S. Smith, Using ammonia as a shipping fuel could disturb the nitrogen cycle, *Nature Energy* 7 (12) (2022) 1112–1114. doi:10.1038/s41560-022-01124-4.
- [59] P. C. Verpoort, L. Gast, A. Hofmann, F. Ueckerdt, Estimating the renewables pull in future global green value chains (2023). doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-2743794/v1.
- [60] S. Samadi, A. Fischer, S. Lechtenböhmer, The renewables pull effect: How regional differences in renewable energy costs could influence where industrial production is located in the future, *Energy Research & Social Science* 104 (2023) 103257. doi:10.1016/j.erss.2023.103257.
- [61] Danish Energy Agency, *Technology data for generation of electricity and district heating*, Tech. rep., Danish Energy Agency (2019). URL <https://ens.dk/en/our-services/projections-and-models/technology-data/>
- [62] Tree Energy Solutions, *The Green Cycle* (2024). URL <https://tes-h2.com/green-cycle>
- [63] M. Fonder, P. Counotte, V. Datchet, J. De Séjournet, D. Ernst, Synthetic methane for closing the carbon loop: Comparative study of three carbon sources for remote carbon-neutral fuel synthetization, *Applied Energy* 358 (2024) 122606. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2023.122606.
- [64] J. Hörsch, F. Hofmann, D. Schlachtberger, T. Brown, PyPSA-Eur: An open optimisation model of the European transmission system, *Energy Strategy Reviews* 22 (2018) 207–215. doi:10.1016/j.esr.2018.08.012.
- [65] T. Brown, J. Hörsch, D. Schlachtberger, PyPSA: Python for Power System Analysis, *Journal of Open Research Software* 6 (2018) 4. doi:10.5334/jors.188.
- [66] Gurobi, *Gurobi optimization* (2022). URL <https://www.gurobi.com/>
- [67] Danish Energy Agency, *Technology data* (2024). URL <https://ens.dk/en/our-services/projections-and-models/technology-data>
- [68] M. M. Frysztacki, J. Hörsch, V. Hagenmeyer, T. Brown, The strong effect of network resolution on electricity system models with high shares of wind and solar, *Applied Energy* 291 (2021) 116726. arXiv:2101.10859, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2021.116726.
- [69] M. Hoffmann, L. Kotzur, D. Stolten, The Pareto-optimal temporal aggregation of energy system models, *Applied Energy* 315 (2022) 119029. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2022.119029.
- [70] ENTSO-E, *ENTSO-E transmission system map* (2022). URL <https://www.entsoe.eu/data/map/>
- [71] A. Pluta, W. Medjroubi, J. C. Diettrich, J. Dasenbrock, H.-P. Tetens, J. E. Sandoval, O. Lunsdorf, SciGRID_gas: Data model of the European gas transport network, in: *2022 Open Source Modelling and Simulation of Energy Systems (OSMSES)*, IEEE, Aachen, Germany, 2022, pp. 1–7. doi:10.1109/OSMSES54027.2022.9769122.
- [72] Institute for Energy Economics and Financial Analysis, *European LNG Tracker* (2023). URL <https://ieefa.org/european-lng-tracker>
- [73] F. Hofmann, C. Tries, F. Neumann, L. Zeyen, T. Brown, Designing a CO₂ Network for a Carbon-Neutral European Economy, in: *2023 19th International Conference on the European Energy Market (EEM)*, 2023, pp. 1–7. doi:10.1109/EEM58374.2023.10161887.
- [74] F. Hofmann, J. Hampp, F. Neumann, T. Brown, J. Hörsch, Atlite: A lightweight Python package for calculating renewable power potentials and time series, *Journal of Open Source Software* 6 (62) (2021) 3294. doi:10.21105/joss.03294.
- [75] Our World in Data, *Installed wind energy capacity* (2023). URL <https://ourworldindata.org/grapher/cumulative-installed-wind-energy-capacity-gigawatts>
- [76] D. G. Caglayan, N. Weber, H. U. Heinrichs, J. Linßen, M. Robinius, P. A. Kukla, D. Stolten, Technical potential of salt caverns for hydrogen storage in Europe, *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 45 (11) (2020) 6793–6805. doi:10.1016/j.ijhydene.2019.12.161.
- [77] P. Ruiz, W. Nijs, D. Tarvydas, A. Sgobbi, A. Zucker, R. Pilli, R. Jonsson, A. Camia, C. Thiel, C. Hoyer-Klick, F. Dalla Longa, T. Kober, J. Badger, P. Volker, B. Elbersen, A. Brosowski, D. Thrän, ENSPRESO - an open, EU-28 wide, transparent and coherent database of wind, solar and biomass energy potentials, *Energy Strategy Reviews* 26 (2019) 100379. doi:10.1016/j.esr.2019.100379.
- [78] T. Brown, J. Hampp, Ultra-long-duration energy storage anywhere: Methanol with carbon cycling, *Joule* 7 (11) (2023) 2414–2420. doi:10.1016/j.joule.2023.10.001.
- [79] Gas for Climate, *European Hydrogen Backbone - Analysing future demand, supply, and transport of hydrogen*, Tech. rep. (Jun. 2021). URL https://gasforclimate2050.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/EHB_Analysing-the-future-demand-supply-and-transport-of-hydrogen_June-2021.pdf
- [80] F. Neumann, V. Hagenmeyer, T. Brown, Assessments of linear power flow and transmission loss approximations in coordinated capacity expansion problems, *Applied Energy* 314 (2022) 118859. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2022.118859.
- [81] J. Hörsch, H. Ronellenfitsch, D. Witthaut, T. Brown, Linear optimal power flow using cycle flows, *Electric Power Systems Research* 158 (2018) 126–135. doi:10.1016/j.epr.2017.12.034.
- [82] P. Glaum, F. Hofmann, Leveraging the existing German transmission grid with dynamic line rating, *Applied Energy* 343 (2023) 121199. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2023.121199.
- [83] N. Mattsson, V. Verendel, F. Hedenus, L. Reichenberg, An autopilot for energy models – Automatic generation of renewable supply curves, hourly capacity factors and hourly synthetic electricity demand for arbitrary world regions, *Energy Strategy Reviews* 33 (2021) 100606. doi:10.1016/j.esr.2020.100606.
- [84] EUROFER - The European Steel Association, *European Steel in Figures 2023* (2023). URL https://www.eurofer.eu/assets/publications/brochures-booklets-and-factsheets/european-steel-in-figures-2023/FINAL_EUROFER_Steel-in-Figures.2023.pdf
- [85] *Global Gas Infrastructure Tracker* (Oct. 2022). URL <https://globalenergymonitor.org/projects/global-gas-infrastructure-tracker/>
- [86] C. Kuhn, A. Düll, P. Rohlf, S. Tischer, M. Börnhorst, O. Deutschmann, Iron as recyclable energy carrier: Feasibility study and kinetic analysis of iron oxide reduction, *Applications in Energy and Combustion Science* 12 (2022) 100096. doi:10.1016/j.jaeacs.2022.100096.
- [87] G. Hévin, *Underground storage of hydrogen in salt caverns* (2019). URL <https://energnet.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/3-Hevin-Underground-Storage-H2-in-Salt.pdf>

Appendix A. Causes and severity of import cost uncertainty

Factor	Change	Unit	Change	Unit
higher WACC of 12% (e.g. high project risk)	+43.1	€/MWh	+39.3	%
higher WACC of 10% (e.g. high project risk)	+25.3	€/MWh	+23.0	%
higher WACC of 8% (e.g. high project risk)	+8.2	€/MWh	+7.4	%
higher direct air capture investment cost (+200%)	+55.8	€/MWh	+50.8	%
higher direct air capture investment cost (+100%)	+28.1	€/MWh	+25.6	%
higher direct air capture investment cost (+50%)	+14.1	€/MWh	+12.9	%
higher direct air capture investment cost (+25%)	+7.1	€/MWh	+6.5	%
higher electrolysis investment cost (+200%)	+29.2	€/MWh	+26.6	%
higher electrolysis investment cost (+100%)	+16.7	€/MWh	+15.2	%
higher electrolysis investment cost (+50%)	+9.0	€/MWh	+8.2	%
higher electrolysis investment cost (+25%)	+4.7	€/MWh	+4.3	%
Argentina and Chile not available for export	+10.1	€/MWh	+9.2	%
lower WACC of 3% (e.g. government guarantees)	-29.5	€/MWh	-26.8	%
lower WACC of 5% (e.g. government guarantees)	-15.5	€/MWh	-14.1	%
lower WACC of 6% (e.g. government guarantees)	-8.0	€/MWh	-7.2	%
sell excess curtailed electricity at 40 €/MWh	-24.7	€/MWh	-22.6	%
sell excess curtailed electricity at 30 €/MWh	-15.6	€/MWh	-14.2	%
sell excess curtailed electricity at 20 €/MWh	-8.0	€/MWh	-7.2	%
option to use available biogenic or cycled CO ₂ for 60 €/t	-21.7	€/MWh	-19.7	%
option to use available biogenic or cycled CO ₂ for 80 €/t	-16.1	€/MWh	-14.7	%
option to use available biogenic or cycled CO ₂ for 100 €/t	-10.6	€/MWh	-9.7	%
option to build geological hydrogen storage at 2.4 €/kWh (reduction by 95%)	-8.2	€/MWh	-7.4	%
option to use power-to-X waste heat streams for direct air capture	-3.8	€/MWh	-3.4	%
highly flexible operation of fuel synthesis plant (20% minimum part-load instead of 70%)	-5.4	€/MWh	-4.9	%

Table A.1: **Examples for potential import cost increases or decreases.** The table presents cost sensitivities in absolute and relative terms based on the supply chain for producing Fischer-Tropsch fuels in Argentina for export to Europe. The reference fuel import cost for this case is 109.8 €/MWh. Responses to changes in the input assumptions are not additive.

In [Table A.1](#), we vary some of the techno-economic assumptions for evaluating green fuel supply chains in the exporting countries to justify the range of import cost deviations from the defaults. These relate to technology costs, financing costs, excess power and heat handling, fuel synthesis flexibility, and the availability of geological hydrogen storage and alternative sources of CO₂. For all the following sensitivities, it should be noted that they are not additive.

A higher weighted average cost of capital (WACC) than the uniformly applied 7%, e.g. due to higher project risks, and lower WACC, e.g. due to the government-backing of a project, have a substantial effect on the import cost calculations; an increase or decrease by just one percentage point already alters the costs per unit of energy by more than 7%.

Likewise, a failure to achieve the anticipated cost reductions for electrolyzers and DAC systems would also result in far-reaching cost increases for green energy imports, especially if the fuel contains carbon. The availability of biogenic CO₂ (or fossil CO₂ from industrial processes that is largely cycled between use and synthesis and, hence, not emitted to the atmosphere) can reduce the green fuel cost by 20% if it can be provided for 60 €/t and by 10% if made available for 100 €/t.

The default assumptions for export supply chains assume islanded fuel synthesis sites that are not connected to the local electricity system. The isolation drives the system into high curtailment rates of 8%. If surplus electricity production could be sold and absorbed by the local power grid, considerable cost reductions could be achieved (refer to [Table A.1](#)).

Besides integration with the local energy system, process integration using waste heat streams from power-to-X plants for direct air capture and flexible Fischer-Tropsch synthesis similar to methanolisation can also reduce fuel cost by 3-5% each. Conditions that would allow for geological hydrogen storage reduce the need for flexible synthesis plant operation and could reduce import costs by more than 7%. However, even though many potential export countries possess geological hydrogen storage potential, suitable storage sites are not always co-located with the countries' best renewable potentials.

Finally, cost rises can also be expected if the most competitive exporting countries are not offering to export green energy. Argentina and Chile have a margin of 10 €/MWh over the next cheapest exporting country (i.e. Australia, Algeria and Libya with 120 €/MWh). If these countries were unavailable for import, costs would rise by almost 10%.


Appendix B. Limitations

Several limitations of the study should be noted. The model is a simplified representation of the energy system and does not capture all aspects of the real-world transition. First of all, the optimization results represent a long-term equilibrium that does not account for the transition process from the mostly fossil-based energy system to a carbon-neutral one. This means that the model does not capture constraints regards neither the mid-term ramp-up of green energy export capacities nor the speed at which supporting infrastructure could scale up. Furthermore, global competition between potential exporting countries, as well as between importing countries, make import volumes and prices more difficult to predict than our purely cost-based analysis can provide. Besides unclear market developments, local issues in exporting regions such as potential water scarcity to produce large amounts of hydrogen in renewable-rich but arid countries is not addressed. Moreover, the fact that we assume that import costs are not time-dependent and available on demand may underestimate some intermediate storage requirements for imports at entry-points, especially for hydrogen.


In terms of industry relocation within Europe, our modelling is constrained to the migration of steel, ammonia and chemicals. Other sectors like concrete and alumina production is not considered for relocation. We make this choice so that relocation within Europe can compete with imports from abroad, which equates a migration of the industry branch out of the European value chain. Potential repercussions on local jobs and relocation costs are not captured by the model. Finally, it should be acknowledged that our assumptions about the broad availability of district heating networks across Europe to absorb power-to-X waste heat are relatively progressive as it is not certain that central heating will become available in regions which have not based their heating supply on district heating so far.

Appendix C. Supplementary Figures

(a) 10% higher import costs



(b) 10% lower import costs



(c) 20% lower import costs






Figure C.9: Potential for cost reductions with reduced sets of import options for varying import costs.


(a) import costs +20%




(b) import costs +10%



(c) import costs -10%



(d) import costs -20%



(e) import costs -30%




Figure C.10: Sensitivity of import volume on total system cost and composition for varying import costs.




Figure C.11: Sensitivity of import volume on total system cost with subsets of import vectors available.




Figure C.12: Import shares and mix for different import scenarios.




Figure C.13: **Domestic cost supply curves for different import scenarios and carriers.** The cost supply curves are built using sorted spatio-temporal market values with corresponding production volumes per region and snapshot. If the domestic supply curve is missing, no domestic production occurred in the scenario. Shaded areas or dotted lines show import cost ranges of the respective carriers as reference.







Figure C.14: Energy balances for three import scenarios for the carriers electricity, heat, hydrogen and gas.




Figure C.15: Energy balances for three import scenarios for the carriers ammonia, methanol, and oil, as well as stored and atmospheric carbon dioxide.




Figure C.16: **Layout of European energy infrastructure for different import scenarios.** Role of PtX waste heat, hydrogen network, and electricity imports. Left column shows the regional electricity supply mix (pies), added HVDC and HVAC transmission capacity (lines), and the siting of battery storage (choropleth). Right column shows the hydrogen supply (top half of pies) and consumption (bottom half of pies), net flow and direction of hydrogen in newly built pipelines (lines), and the siting of hydrogen storage subject to geological potentials (choropleth). Total volumes of transmission expansion are given in TWkm, which is the sum product of the capacity and length of individual connections.




Figure C.17: **Layout of European energy infrastructure for different import scenarios.** Sensitivities of infrastructure to import costs. Left column shows the regional electricity supply mix (pies), added HVDC and HVAC transmission capacity (lines), and the siting of battery storage (choropleth). Right column shows the hydrogen supply (top half of pies) and consumption (bottom half of pies), net flow and direction of hydrogen in newly built pipelines (lines), and the siting of hydrogen storage subject to geological potentials (choropleth). Total volumes of transmission expansion are given in TWkm, which is the sum product of the capacity and length of individual connections.





Figure C.18: **Layout of European energy infrastructure for different import scenarios.** Role of industry relocation and focus on carbonaceous fuel imports. Left column shows the regional electricity supply mix (pies), added HVDC and HVAC transmission capacity (lines), and the siting of battery storage (choropleth). Right column shows the hydrogen supply (top half of pies) and consumption (bottom half of pies), net flow and direction of hydrogen in newly built pipelines (lines), and the siting of hydrogen storage subject to geological potentials (choropleth). Total volumes of transmission expansion are given in TWkm, which is the sum product of the capacity and length of individual connections.

(a) average utilisation rate of import HVDC links



(b) average utilisation rate of import hydrogen pipelines





Figure C.19: **Temporal usage pattern of electricity and hydrogen storage.** The capacity-weighted average utilisation rate is 72% for import HVDC links and 45% for hydrogen pipelines. For hydrogen import pipelines, a clear seasonal pattern with higher utilisation in winter is visible, demonstrated by an average utilisation rate of 56% from November to April and 35% from May to October. For other energy or material imports than hydrogen and electricity, the timing of imports is not informatively captured due to problem degeneracy caused by negligible storage costs of carbonaceous fuels and steel.

(a) without imports



(b) with imports




Figure C.20: **Energy balance time series for electricity with and without imports.** Resampled to daily averages. Positive numbers indicate supply, negative numbers indicate consumption.




Figure C.21: **Energy balance time series for heat with and without imports.** Resampled to daily averages. Positive numbers indicate supply, negative numbers indicate consumption.




Figure C.22: **Energy balance time series for hydrogen with and without imports.** Resampled to daily averages. Positive numbers indicate supply, negative numbers indicate consumption.




Figure C.23: **Gas and electricity transmission network data.** For gas transmission, the map shows pipelines sized and colored by rated capacity, fossil gas extraction sites, storage locations, pipeline entrypoints, and LNG terminals. The data comes from SciGRID_gas and is supplemented with data from Global Energy Monitor. For power transmission, the map shows existing transmission lines at and above 220 kV taken from the ENTSO-E Transmission System Map (<https://www.entsoe.eu/data/map/>), supplemented with planned TYNDP projects (<https://tyndp.entsoe.eu/>).