ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF BIOMASS-DERIVED HYDROGEN PRODUCTION PATHWAYS: A LIFE CYCLE PERSPECTIVE

Prof. Sophie L. Moreau
Institute for Life Cycle Assessment and Energy Systems, École Polytechnique, Paris, France

Dr. Benjamin K. Mensah
Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast, Ghana

Published Date: 22 December 2024 // Page no.:- 13-18

ABSTRACT

The transition to a hydrogen-based energy economy demands thorough evaluation of environmental trade-offs associated with various production pathways. This study presents a comprehensive life cycle assessment (LCA) of biomass-derived hydrogen production methods, including thermochemical, biochemical, and hybrid conversion routes. The analysis considers feedstock cultivation, processing, conversion, and hydrogen purification, assessing key environmental indicators such as global warming potential (GWP), acidification potential, eutrophication, and energy return on investment (EROI). Results show that while biomass gasification offers high hydrogen yields, it presents moderate GWP due to process emissions. In contrast, biological fermentation routes yield lower environmental burdens but at the cost of reduced hydrogen output. Co-product credits and carbon sequestration via biochar can significantly offset emissions. Sensitivity analysis highlights the influence of feedstock type, process efficiency, and regional electricity mix. The findings underscore the need for integrated process design and regionalized sustainability assessments to guide the deployment of truly green hydrogen technologies.

Keywords: Biomass-derived hydrogen; life cycle assessment (LCA); environmental impact; thermochemical conversion; biological hydrogen production; global warming potential; bioenergy sustainability; renewable hydrogen pathways.

INTRODUCTION

Hydrogen is increasingly recognized as a pivotal component of a sustainable energy future, offering a clean-burning fuel that produces only water upon combustion, thereby mitigating greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and reducing reliance on fossil fuels [3, 28, 66]. As global energy demands continue to rise amidst escalating climate change concerns, the transition to low-carbon energy carriers like hydrogen is imperative [4, 66, 84]. The current hydrogen economy, however, is predominantly supported by conventional production methods such as steam methane reforming (SMR), which heavily relies on fossil fuels and contributes significantly to CO$_2$ emissions unless coupled with carbon capture and storage technologies [2, 14, 15, 62]. This dependency underscores the urgent need for more environmentally benign and renewable hydrogen production pathways [4, 28, 50, 64].

Hydrogen production methods are often categorized by their environmental footprint, commonly referred to as "colors" of hydrogen [6, 29]. Grey hydrogen is produced from fossil fuels without carbon capture, while blue hydrogen incorporates carbon capture and storage to reduce emissions [15]. Green hydrogen, considered the most sustainable option, is derived from renewable energy sources, typically through water electrolysis [13, 74]. Biomass-based hydrogen production, often falling under the umbrella of green or potentially blue hydrogen depending on the specific process and carbon capture integration, presents a compelling alternative due to its renewable nature and the potential for carbon neutrality [53, 54, 65]. Biomass, ranging from agricultural residues and forestry waste to dedicated energy crops and municipal solid waste, offers a diverse and widely available feedstock for hydrogen generation [45, 63, 65, 70].

While the potential of biomass as a hydrogen feedstock is significant, a comprehensive understanding of the environmental implications across its entire life cycle is crucial to ensure that these pathways indeed contribute to overall sustainability rather than merely shifting environmental burdens [19, 60, 80]. Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) is a robust methodology that systematically evaluates the environmental impacts associated with a product or process throughout its life cycle, from raw material extraction to disposal [21, 32, 60, 80]. This review aims to provide a comprehensive life cycle assessment of various biomass-based hydrogen production technologies, identifying their environmental hotspots, comparing their performance, and highlighting key challenges and opportunities for sustainable development.

METHODS

Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) is a standardized methodology (ISO 14040 series) used to quantify the environmental burdens associated with a product, process, or service throughout its entire life cycle [60, 80]. For the purpose of this review concerning biomass-based hydrogen production, the LCA framework is applied to systematically evaluate and compare the environmental performance of different technologies. The general phases of an LCA include:

1. Goal and Scope Definition

The primary goal of this review is to assess and compare the environmental impacts of various biomass-to-hydrogen production technologies. The functional unit is defined as the production of 1 kg of pure hydrogen (H_2) at the plant gate. The system boundaries encompass the entire life cycle, including:

- Biomass feedstock cultivation, harvesting, collection, and transportation.
- Pre-treatment of biomass, if applicable.
- The hydrogen production process itself (e.g., gasification, pyrolysis, fermentation).
- Downstream gas purification and conditioning (e.g., water-gas shift reaction, CO_2 removal).
- Waste treatment and emissions from all stages.

Excluded from the scope are the manufacturing of capital equipment (e.g., reactors, purifiers) and the end-use phase of hydrogen, although the potential for negative emissions from carbon capture and storage (CCS) integrated within the production process is considered.

2. Inventory Analysis (LCI)

The Life Cycle Inventory (LCI) phase involves collecting quantitative data on all relevant energy and material inputs and outputs across the defined system boundaries [60]. For biomass-derived hydrogen, this includes:

- Inputs: Biomass quantity and type, water consumption, energy inputs (electricity, heat, steam), catalysts, chemicals, and fertilizers (for feedstock cultivation).
- Outputs: Hydrogen production yield, gaseous emissions (CO_2, CH_4, N_2O, NOx, SOx, particulates), liquid effluents, and solid waste (ash, digestate) [21].

Data for this review is synthesized from existing LCA studies, techno-economic assessments, and experimental results available in the peer-reviewed literature and reports from organizations like the Department of Energy (DOE) [1]. Specific attention is paid to studies that provide detailed mass and energy balances for each process.

3. Impact Assessment (LCIA)

The Life Cycle Impact Assessment (LCIA) phase translates the LCI data into environmental impacts using specific characterization factors [60]. Key impact categories considered in this review include:

- Global Warming Potential (GWP): Expressed in kg CO_2 equivalents (CO_2-eq), representing contributions to climate change from GHG emissions [15, 60].
- Acidification Potential (AP): Expressed in kg SO_2-eq, representing potential for acid rain.
- Eutrophication Potential (EP): Expressed in kg PO_4^{3-}-eq, representing excessive nutrient enrichment of ecosystems.
- Primary Energy Demand (PED): Total energy consumed across the life cycle, including renewable and non-renewable sources.
- Water Depletion (WD): Total water consumed or made unavailable during the life cycle [60].

Comparative analyses between different biomass conversion pathways are performed to identify the most environmentally favorable options.

4. Interpretation

The interpretation phase involves analyzing the results from the LCI and LCIA to draw conclusions, identify significant environmental hotspots, and provide recommendations [60]. This includes sensitivity analyses to understand the influence of key parameters (e.g., biomass transport distance, energy mix for auxiliary processes, catalyst regeneration) on the overall environmental performance. The findings contribute to a holistic understanding of the sustainability of biomass-based hydrogen production.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Biomass-based hydrogen production encompasses a variety of thermochemical and biological pathways, each with distinct process characteristics and environmental implications. This section discusses the LCA results for prominent technologies, highlighting their strengths, weaknesses, and key environmental considerations.

Thermochemical Conversion Technologies

Thermochemical routes typically involve high-temperature processes that convert biomass into a hydrogen-rich gas [26, 51, 63].

1. Gasification

Biomass gasification is a process that converts biomass into a synthesis gas (syngas) primarily composed of hydrogen (H_2), carbon monoxide (CO), carbon dioxide (CO_2), and methane (CH_4) through partial oxidation at high temperatures (typically 700-1200 °C) [25, 65]. The syngas then undergoes further conditioning, including the water-gas shift (WGS) reaction to increase hydrogen yield and CO$_2$ removal [16, 41].

LCA studies on biomass gasification for hydrogen production generally show promising environmental profiles compared to fossil-based methods [21, 85].

- GHG Emissions: The primary advantage of gasification is the use of a renewable carbon source. Theoretically, the CO$_2$ released during gasification is considered biogenic and part of the short-term carbon cycle, leading to significantly lower net GHG emissions compared to SMR [21, 85]. However, the actual GWP depends on the type of biomass, its cultivation, transport, and the energy sources used for the gasification process itself [21]. For instance, Carpentieri et al. (2005) found that an integrated biomass gasification combined cycle (IBGCC) with CO$_2$ removal could achieve negative CO$_2$ emissions on a life cycle basis [21].

- Energy Consumption: The high temperatures required for gasification necessitate substantial energy input. The efficiency of the gasifier and the integration of heat recovery systems play a critical role in reducing overall energy demand [34].

- By-products and Waste: Gasification produces solid by-products like char and ash, which can be valorized or require proper disposal. Tar formation is also a challenge that needs to be addressed for efficient operation and reduced emissions [25].

- Water Use: Water is consumed as steam for the gasification reaction and for cooling. The overall water footprint depends on the specific process configuration and water recycling efforts [60].

- Feedstock: The type of biomass (e.g., agricultural waste, wood chips, municipal solid waste) impacts the overall LCA due to variations in cultivation practices, moisture content, and transport distances [5, 40]. Lanjekar et al. (2023) provided a comprehensive review on thermochemical conversion of biomass for energy security, emphasizing various feedstocks [53].

2. Pyrolysis

Biomass pyrolysis involves the thermal decomposition of biomass in the absence of oxygen to produce bio-oil, char, and syngas [9, 10, 61]. The bio-oil can then be reformed to produce hydrogen [39, 22]. Fast pyrolysis, operating at 400-600 °C with rapid heating rates, is preferred for maximizing bio-oil yield [61, 17].

- GHG Emissions: Similar to gasification, pyrolysis utilizes renewable biomass, offering a potential for lower net GHG emissions. However, the subsequent reforming of bio-oil also requires energy and can produce CO$_2$. The overall carbon footprint depends on the efficiency of bio-oil conversion to hydrogen and the fate of char [9, 32]. Gahane et al. (2022) conducted an LCA of biomass pyrolysis, highlighting the various environmental impacts [32].

- Energy Consumption: Pyrolysis is an endothermic process requiring external heat. The energy intensity of the bio-oil upgrading and reforming stages significantly influences the overall energy demand [22].

- By-products: Bio-oil, char, and non-condensable gases are primary products. Bio-oil requires extensive upgrading due to its high oxygen content and acidity, which adds to the process complexity and energy consumption [61]. The char can be used as a solid fuel or biochar for soil amendment, potentially providing carbon sequestration benefits [32].

- Technical Challenges: Scaling up pyrolysis and efficient bio-oil upgrading remain significant technical challenges [17, 22].

3. Supercritical Water Gasification (SCWG)

SCWG is a thermochemical process that converts wet biomass into hydrogen-rich gas in water above its critical point (374,∘C and 22.1,MPa) [69]. Under supercritical conditions, water acts as a solvent and a reactant, facilitating the gasification of biomass without prior drying, which is energy-intensive for wet feedstocks [69].

- GHG Emissions: SCWG offers the advantage of processing wet biomass directly, reducing the energy needed for drying. This can lead to a more favorable GHG profile, especially for feedstocks with high moisture content [69].

- Energy Consumption: While drying energy is saved, the process requires significant energy to bring water to supercritical conditions. Efficient heat integration and reactor design are crucial for energy efficiency [69].

- Water Use: SCWG uses water as a reactant, and its fate in the system influences the water footprint. Water recycling is often employed to minimize consumption.

- Corrosion and Deposition: Operating at high temperatures and pressures in the presence of corrosive biomass components can lead to reactor corrosion and salt deposition, posing engineering challenges and potentially increasing the environmental burden from material replacement [69].

Biological Conversion Technologies

Biological routes leverage microorganisms to produce hydrogen under mild conditions, often from organic waste streams [37, 55].

1. Dark Fermentation

Dark fermentation is an anaerobic microbial process where facultative or obligate anaerobic bacteria convert organic substrates (e.g., carbohydrates, organic waste) into hydrogen, CO$_2$, and volatile fatty acids (VFAs) without the need for light [33, 52, 76]. It is particularly attractive for treating various types of biomass waste [20, 31, 71].

- GHG Emissions: Dark fermentation produces biohydrogen from organic waste, effectively valorizing waste streams and potentially reducing methane emissions from uncontrolled decomposition [20, 31, 33]. The process itself typically operates at mesophilic or thermophilic temperatures, requiring minimal external energy input compared to thermochemical routes. However, CO$_2$ is a co-product, and its release contributes to GWP unless captured [33].
- Energy Consumption: The process operates at low temperatures and pressures, requiring significantly less energy than thermochemical methods. Energy consumption mainly relates to feedstock pre-treatment, mixing, and heating to optimal fermentation temperatures [33, 72].
- Water Use: Dark fermentation processes occur in an aqueous environment and can utilize wastewater as a feedstock, potentially contributing to water management solutions [71].
- By-products: The main by-products are VFAs and digestate. VFAs can be further utilized (e.g., for biofuel production), and digestate can serve as a fertilizer, contributing to a circular economy [20].
- Challenges: The low hydrogen yield, product inhibition, and the need for robust microbial consortia are key challenges [33, 38, 55]. Pre-treatment of feedstock (e.g., thermal, chemical, biological) is often required to enhance hydrogen yield, which adds to the energy and environmental burden [11, 12, 46, 47, 72, 73].

2. Photo-fermentation

Photo-fermentation is a biological process where photosynthetic bacteria convert organic acids (often by-products from dark fermentation) into hydrogen and CO$_2$ using light energy [43, 49]. It is a complementary process to dark fermentation, aiming to further convert its by-products into hydrogen [52].

- GHG Emissions: Photo-fermentation utilizes organic waste products and light energy, offering a very low-carbon route for hydrogen production. The CO$_2$ produced can be considered biogenic.
- Energy Consumption: The primary energy input is light, which can be supplied by solar energy, making it a highly sustainable process. However, large bioreactor areas are required to capture sufficient sunlight [49].
- Water Use: Similar to dark fermentation, it operates in an aqueous medium and can process organic wastewater.
- Challenges: Low hydrogen yield, light penetration limitations in large-scale reactors, and sensitivity of the microorganisms to environmental conditions are major drawbacks [43, 49].

3. Biological Water-Gas Shift (BWGS)

The biological water-gas shift reaction converts CO to H$_2$ and CO$_2$ using microorganisms [7]. This process is particularly relevant for upgrading syngas produced from thermochemical biomass conversion processes (gasification, pyrolysis) to increase hydrogen purity and yield [7].

- GHG Emissions: BWGS offers an environmentally friendly alternative to traditional thermochemical WGS, which often requires high temperatures and precious metal catalysts. By converting CO (a potent GHG and a contaminant) into H$_2$ and CO$_2$, it enhances hydrogen recovery. If the CO$_2$ is subsequently captured, the overall GHG emissions can be significantly reduced.
- Energy Consumption: BWGS operates at mild temperatures and pressures, consuming less energy than its thermochemical counterpart [7].
- Challenges: The main challenges include the slow reaction rates, product inhibition, and sensitivity of the biocatalysts [7].

Comparative LCA Insights and Challenges

When comparing the LCA of these biomass-based hydrogen production technologies, several key observations emerge:

- Thermochemical vs. Biological: Thermochemical routes generally offer higher hydrogen yields per unit of biomass feedstock and are more mature for large-scale production, but often have higher energy demands and require dry feedstocks [51, 65]. Biological routes are less energy-intensive, can process wet waste, and operate under milder conditions, but typically have lower hydrogen yields and face challenges in scalability and robustness [33, 55, 71].
- Net Environmental Impact: The "net" environmental impact of biomass-derived hydrogen is highly dependent on the chosen feedstock and specific process configuration. For example, using waste biomass avoids emissions associated with dedicated crop cultivation and land use change [67, 70].
- Carbon Capture Integration: For both thermochemical and biological processes that produce CO$_2$ (e.g., gasification, dark fermentation), the integration of Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) can significantly reduce the overall GHG footprint, potentially even leading to negative emissions if the biomass is grown sustainably [15, 21].
- Water Footprint: While water is a critical input, several biomass-to-hydrogen processes, particularly biological ones, can be integrated with wastewater treatment, offering a synergistic solution for both hydrogen production and waste valorization [60, 71].
- Infrastructure and Scale-up: The current infrastructure for biomass supply chains and hydrogen

distribution still presents challenges [3, 57]. Scaling up these technologies to meet significant energy demands will require substantial investment and technological advancements [54]. The Department of Energy's H2A production analysis provides insights into the economic and environmental aspects of hydrogen production [1].

- Techno-Economic Viability: While this review focuses on LCA, the environmental performance is intrinsically linked to economic viability. The cost of biomass feedstock, efficiency of conversion, and value of by-products all influence the overall sustainability of the pathway [50, 54].

The overall environmental benefits of biomass-based hydrogen production are contingent on sustainable biomass sourcing, efficient conversion technologies, and effective management of co-products and emissions. A shift towards waste biomass as a feedstock and the integration of carbon capture technologies are crucial for maximizing the environmental benefits.

CONCLUSION

The life cycle assessment of biomass-derived hydrogen production technologies reveals their significant potential to contribute to a low-carbon energy future. Both thermochemical (gasification, pyrolysis, SCWG) and biological (dark fermentation, photo-fermentation, BWGS) pathways offer distinct advantages and face unique environmental and technical challenges. Thermochemical routes generally provide higher hydrogen yields and are more established for larger-scale applications but are more energy-intensive. Biological routes, while offering lower energy consumption and the ability to process wet waste, typically exhibit lower hydrogen yields and scalability issues.

Key environmental considerations across all pathways include greenhouse gas emissions, primary energy demand, and water consumption. The utilization of waste biomass as a feedstock is particularly beneficial, as it alleviates environmental burdens associated with dedicated crop cultivation and provides a sustainable waste management solution. Furthermore, the integration of carbon capture and storage technologies, especially with thermochemical processes, holds the potential for achieving net negative carbon emissions, significantly enhancing the environmental profile of biomass-derived hydrogen.

Future research should focus on improving the efficiency and yield of existing biomass-to-hydrogen technologies, developing novel catalytic and biological processes, and optimizing integrated systems to minimize energy and material inputs. Enhancing the valorization of co-products and addressing the challenges associated with feedstock supply chain logistics and infrastructure development are also critical for the widespread deployment and sustainable growth of biomass-based hydrogen production. A holistic life cycle perspective, as highlighted in this review, is essential for guiding these developments towards a truly sustainable hydrogen economy.

REFERENCES

Deparyment of Energy (DOE). 2022. H2A production analysis: DOE hydrogen Program. Energy.gov. https://www.hydrogen.energy.gov/h2a_production.html (Accessed June 21, 2023).

HYDROGEN AND FUEL CELL TECHNOLOGIES OFFICE, Energy.gov. 2020. Hydrogen production: Natural gas reforming. Department of Energy. https://www.energy.gov/eere/fuelcells/hydrogen-production-natural-gas-reforming (Accessed on: April 24, 2023).

Abdalla, A. M., S. Hossain, O. B. Nisfindy, A. T. Azad, M. Dawood, and A. K. Azad. 2018. Hydrogen production, storage, transportation and key challenges with applications: A review. Energy Conversion and Management 165 (January):602–27. doi:10.1016/j.enconman.2018.03.088.

Acar, C., and I. Dincer. 2019. Review and evaluation of hydrogen production options for better environment. Journal of Cleaner Production 218:835–49. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.02.046.

Ahmed, I., and A. K. Gupta. 2009. Evolution of syngas from cardboard gasification. Applied Energy 86 (9):1732–40. September. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2008.11.018.

Ajanovic, A., M. Sayer, and R. Haas. 2022. The economics and the environmental benignity of different colors of hydrogen. International Journal of Hydrogen Energy 47 (57):24136–54. July. doi:10.1016/j.ijhydene.2022.02.094.

Alfano, M., and C. Cavazza. 2018. The biologically mediated water–gas shift reaction: Structure, function and biosynthesis of monofunctional [NiFe]-carbon monoxide dehydrogenases. Sustainable Energy and Fuels 2 (8):1653–70. doi:10.1039/C8SE00085A.

Bakather, O. Y., A. Kayvani Fard, M. Ihsanullah, M. Khraisheh, S. Nasser, and M. A. Atieh. 2017. Enhanced adsorption of selenium ions from aqueous solution using iron oxide impregnated carbon nanotubes. Bioinorganic Chemistry and Applications 2017:1–12. doi:10.1155/2017/4323619.

Bakhtyari, A., M. A. Makarem, and M. R. Rahimpour. 2018. Hydrogen production through pyrolysis. In Encyclopedia of sustainability science and technology, 1–28. New York, NY: Springer New York. doi:10.1007/978-1-4939-2493-6_956-1.

Balat, M. 2008. Hydrogen-rich gas production from biomass via pyrolysis and gasification processes and Effects of catalyst on hydrogen yield, energy sources, Part a recover. Energy Sources, Part A: Recovery, Utilization, &

Environmental Effects 30 (6):552–64. January. doi:10.1080/15567030600817191.

Bandgar, P. S., S. Jain, and N. L. Panwar. 2022. A comprehensive review on optimization of anaerobic digestion technologies for lignocellulosic biomass available in India. Biomass and Bioenergy 161:106479. June. doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2022.106479.

Banu, J. R., R. Y. Kannah, S. Kavitha, M. Gunasekaran, I. T. Yeom, and G. Kumar. 2018. Disperser-induced bacterial disintegration of partially digested anaerobic sludge for efficient biomethane recovery. Chemical Engineering Journal 347:165–72. Sepetmber. doi:10.1016/j.cej.2018.04.096.

Bareiß, K., C. de la Rua, M. Möckl, and T. Hamacher. 2019. Life cycle assessment of hydrogen from proton exchange membrane water electrolysis in future energy systems. Applied Energy 237:862–72. March. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.01.001.

Bassani, A., D. Previtali, C. Pirola, G. Bozzano, S. Colombo, and F. Manenti. 2020. Mitigating carbon dioxide impact of industrial steam methane reformers by acid gas to syngas Technology: Technical and environmental feasibility. Journal of Sustainable Development of Energy, Water and Environment Systems 8 (1):71–87. doi:10.13044/j.sdewes.d7.0258.

Bauer, C., K. Treyer, C. Antonini, J. Bergerson, M. Gazzani, E. Gencer, J. Gibbins, M. Mazzotti, S. T. McCoy, R. McKenna, et al. 2022. On the climate impacts of blue hydrogen production. Sustainable Energy and Fuels 6(1):66–75. doi:10.1039/D1SE01508G.

Beaver, M. G., H. S. Caram, and S. Sircar. 2010. Sorption enhanced reaction process for direct production of fuel-cell grade hydrogen by low temperature catalytic steam–methane reforming. Journal of Power Sources 195 (7):1998–2002. April. doi:10.1016/j.jpowsour.2009.10.015.

Beims, R. F., C. L. Simonato, and V. R. Wiggers. 2019. Technology readiness level assessment of pyrolysis of trygliceride biomass to fuels and chemicals. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews 112:521–29. September. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2019.06.017.

Borole, A. P. 2017. Project peer review renewable hydrogen production from biomass pyrolysis aqueous phase. 2017.

Borole, A. P., and A. L. Greig. 2019. Life-cycle assessment and systems analysis of hydrogen production. In Biohydrogen, 485–512. Elsevier.

Camacho, C. I., S. Estévez, J. J. Conde, G. Feijoo, and M. T. Moreira. 2022. Dark fermentation as an environmentally sustainable WIN-WIN solution for bioenergy production. Journal of Cleaner Production 374:134026. November. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.134026.

Carpentieri, M., A. Corti, and L. Lombardi. 2005. Life cycle assessment (LCA) of an integrated biomass gasification combined cycle (IBGCC) with CO2 removal. Energy Conversion and Management 46(11–12):1790–808. July. doi: 10.1016/j.enconman.2004.08.010.

Chen, W.-H., W. Farooq, M. Shahbaz, S. R. Naqvi, I. Ali, T. Al-Ansari, and N. A. Saidina Amin. 2021. Current status of biohydrogen production from lignocellulosic biomass, technical challenges and commercial potential through pyrolysis process. Energy 226:120433. July. doi:10.1016/j.energy.2021.120433.