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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA-CAES</td>
<td>Advanced Adiabatic Compressed Air Energy Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALK</td>
<td>Alkaline Electrolyser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZEL</td>
<td>Clean Energy Atlas (Mexico)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BaU</td>
<td>Business as Usual Scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BESS</td>
<td>Battery Energy Storage System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>Compressed Air Energy Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPEX</td>
<td>Capital Expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCGT</td>
<td>Combined-Cycle Gas Turbine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Concentrated Solar Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPS</td>
<td>Electric Power Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS</td>
<td>Energy Storage Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EZ</td>
<td>Electrolyzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FES</td>
<td>Flywheel Energy Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂</td>
<td>Hydrogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂MX</td>
<td>Hydrogen Mexico Scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTON</td>
<td>Kiloton, thousand metric tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTPA</td>
<td>Kiloton Per Annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFP</td>
<td>Lithium Iron Phosphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCOE</td>
<td>Levelized Cost of Electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCOH</td>
<td>Levelized Cost of Hydrogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCOS</td>
<td>Levelized Cost of Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTO</td>
<td>Lithium Titanate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSES</td>
<td>Molten Salt Energy Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTCO₂</td>
<td>Megaton (million tons) of carbon dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTON</td>
<td>Megaton, million metric tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG</td>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMC</td>
<td>Lithium Nickel Manganese Cobalt Oxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCGT</td>
<td>Open-Cycle Gas Turbine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEX</td>
<td>Operational Expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEMEL</td>
<td>Proton Exchange Membrane Electrolyzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>Pumped Hydro Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODESEN</td>
<td>Development Program of the National Electricity System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>Photovoltaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>Renewable Energy Source (non variable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOEC</td>
<td>Solid Oxide Electrolyzer Cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>Total Annual Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRES</td>
<td>Variable Renewable Energy Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRFB</td>
<td>Valve-regulated Lead Acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRLA</td>
<td>Vanadium Redox Flow Battery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZBFB</td>
<td>Zinc Bromine Flow Battery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Executive summary

One of the most promising enablers for the decarbonization of the power sector is the use of hydrogen produced by electrolysis using renewable energy.

Using variable renewable energy sources such as wind, generates both a challenge for the massive production of hydrogen, providing limited and discontinuous working hours for the electrolyzers, as well as an opportunity to use hydrogen to store the energy coming from these intermittent sources. This study analyzes how suitable renewable energy sources are for producing green hydrogen in Mexico and what is the role such hydrogen would play in the decarbonization of the power system towards 2050.

A glimpse of what could be achieved in Mexico with the use of wind and solar PV by 2050 is found in a first assessment, which starts from the total Mexican territory and integrates historical meteorological data, land restrictions related to its different uses, and current trends in the technology’s performance and price. For on-shore wind generation, up to 2.7 TW of installed capacity that generates around 6.3 PWh of yearly energy with an LCOE equal or lower than 60 USD/MWh could be installed using 22% of the Mexican territory. For solar PV, up to 33.5 TW of installed capacity that generates 69 PWh yearly with an LCOE lower or equal than 25 USD/MWh could be installed using around one third of the national territory.

An analysis of green hydrogen production potential shows that, in theory, up to 22 TW of electrolysis capacity could be installed across the country to produce 1,400 MtonH₂ per year in 2050 with an average cost of 1.4 USD/kg H₂, driven mainly by low-cost PV generation. The yearly water demand used in the electrolysis for the total production would represent only 0.13% of the country’s water consumption in 2017.

Figure 1. Levelized cost of hydrogen from hybrid wind-solar PV production for 2050.
An updated state of the art of different storage technologies for power systems and a competitiveness analysis is done considering different applications to show the most suitable technology for each application. Hydrogen energy storage is far from being the most competitive storage alternative, ranking in 7th place out of 11 evaluated technologies. Further results of this analysis are summarized in Table 1, in a color scale, where green indicates the best performance and red indicates the worst performance for each application.

Table 1. Competitive analysis of energy storage technologies. Ratings shown on a scale of 1 (worst) to 5 (best), and rankings from 1 (most) to 11 (least competitive).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PHS</th>
<th>CAES</th>
<th>FES</th>
<th>MSes</th>
<th>H₂</th>
<th>LFO</th>
<th>LTO</th>
<th>NMC</th>
<th>VRLA</th>
<th>VRFB</th>
<th>ZBFB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity firming</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary services</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable shifting</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable smoothing</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average rating</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last step of the study analyses the impact of hydrogen integration in both the national power system and the isolated power grid in Mulege, Baja California. It’s important to consider that for this analysis, hydrogen applications are only focused on re-electrification, leaving raw materials and mobility applications aside.

For the national power system a multi-node model is built and analyzed in three time horizons: 2020 (to calibrate), 2030 and 2050 with information obtained mainly from the PRODESEN, international reports, and Hinicio know-how. For 2030 and 2050 two scenarios are defined, H₂MX (with H₂) and BaU (without H₂), to compare how hydrogen affects the system.

For 2030 the re-electrification of hydrogen is almost non-existent compared to the more than 100 GW projected installed capacity of the national power system, with only 1 GW of electrolysis capacity needed, producing 60 kton H₂/year to power a 300 MW hydrogen gas turbine for re-electrification.

The total emissions of the national power system in the BaU2030 scenario are of 134 MtCO₂/year, almost the same as the 133 MtCO₂/year of the H₂MX2030 scenario. The specific GHG emissions were around 290 gCO₂/kWh in both cases, a reduction of over 40% compared with the emissions factor of 505 gCO₂/kWh in 2019 as reported by the Mexican Energy Regulatory Commission (CRE).

It is in 2050 that green H₂ could become more relevant in the National power system, driven mainly by the improvement in prices and performance that can be seen in the current trends. The results of the model show that in 2050 5.5 TWh/year are produced from hydrogen re-electrification, that is about half of the current nuclear electricity generation in the country, for which around 1.5 GW of hydrogen power turbines are needed, as is shown in Figure 2.
Hydrogen integration also allows to increase renewable generation in the system. The results show that in H₂MX2050 scenario there is an additional 2% generated from renewable sources, or 15 TWh/year growing to a national renewable generation of 815 TWh/year.

Regrading GHG, the total emissions are similar in both cases, 30 MtCO₂/year for BaU2050 and 29 MtCO₂/year for H₂MX2050, which leads to a specific emission of 39 gCO₂/kWh and 38 gCO₂/kWh respectively, 90% less than in 2020. It must be noted, however, that the emissions reduced are mostly due to a higher participation of renewables rather than the use of hydrogen. The water required for this amount of hydrogen accounts for less than the 0.1% of the current consumption in each region of production.

For the power system of Mulegé, Baja California, two scenarios are analyzed in 2050: 100% renewable without hydrogen (scenario ZERO) and 100% renewable with hydrogen (scenario H₂-ZERO).

As in the 2050 scenarios for the national power system, hydrogen integration enables a competitive storage solution for the low-cost solar energy in Mulegé, which explains why wind capacity is reduced and PV capacity is increased. For wind, capacity is reduced from 108 MW to 30 MW from scenario ZERO to H₂-ZERO; whereas for solar PV capacity increases from 302 MW to 407 MW as shown in Figure 4.

The energy storage capacity increases from 0.9 GWh in the ZERO scenario, to 2.4 GWh (1.7 in form of hydrogen, around 50 ton) in H₂-ZERO.

The analysis done shows an overview of how green hydrogen energy storage and re-electrification could affect the Mexican power system in different times frames.

Further studies would be required to include different sectors of the economy and to analyze how aggregating demands can improve the power system model for the development of hydrogen across all applications.
Introduction

This study is framed within the planning of power systems, specifically on the estimation of the potential resource available in the Mexican territory for two variable renewable energy sources (VRES): solar PV and wind. Over the last decade, they have progressively become economically attractive and more efficient globally, and the costs of solar PV have fallen by 82% and of onshore wind by 40%\(^1\). Nevertheless, some challenges need to be overcome such as their generation intermittency and geographical distribution. To tackle these challenges, assessments of VRES potential are usually carried out in the first place to help identify zones with high generation potential and then look for strategies and new alternatives to achieve a smooth integration of the VRES potential found and existing energy infrastructure without compromising the security of the power supply. In this context, energy carriers such as green hydrogen are being investigated to complement with energy storage and help the integration of VRES in a cost-optimal manner.

The main objectives of the study are to:

• Estimate the potential of renewable generation (solar PV and onshore wind) in Mexico;

• Calculate the potential of green hydrogen production in Mexico;

• Provide an updated overview of the state of the art of Energy Storage Systems (ESS) for electric power systems;

• Assess the benefits of the integration of renewable generation using green hydrogen in the Mexican Power system;

• Explore the integration and the requirements for the region of Mulegé, Baja California, to become 100% renewable.

While this report follows the detailed methodologic process of the assessments performed, the key results and conclusions for each section can be found in the latest subchapters of each, as well as a synthesis from all the report’s in chapter 5. Conclusions and recommendations.

\(^1\) IRENA, Renewable Power Generation Costs in 2019.
2. Renewable energy and green hydrogen potential

The renewable potential assessment for onshore wind, solar PV, and green hydrogen production in Mexico for a 2050 time horizon is presented in this section. First, the methodology and main assumptions considered are described. Second, the renewable generation potentials and insights from the analysis are presented.

The results and conclusions can be found on subchapters 2.2 and 2.4, respectively.

2.1 Methodology

The methodology followed for the renewable potential assessment consists of five steps, as shown in Figure 2-1.

1. **Assessment definition**: define the renewable energy technologies to be considered, techno-economical parameters, regional and temporal context for the assessment.

2. **Geospatial analysis**: computational analysis to determine the amount and distribution of land available for renewable production after applying land restrictions.

3. **Renewable potential assessment**: computational simulation used to determine the renewable energy capacity that could be installed on the land available and its corresponding Levelized Cost of Electricity (LCOE).

4. **H₂ cost minimization**: simulation of hydrogen production via electrolysis based on the LCOE and geospatial analysis from the previous steps.

5. **Potential maps**: the results are shown in maps, plots, and tables, which provides elements for the reader to gain a better understanding of the insights found in the analysis.

Figure 2-1. Methodology block diagram.
2.1.1 Assessment definition

The complete Mexican inland territory of around 1.9 million km² is analyzed in a 2050 context. The technologies assessed are onshore wind turbines and open-field PV plants with improved efficiency according to the technology development expected by 2050⁴.

Green hydrogen production is evaluated for large-scale stationary Proton exchange Membrane Electrolysers (PEMEL) according to the technology development and costs expected by HINICIO for the same 2050 context.

2.1.2 Geospatial Analysis

The geospatial analysis consists of a step-by-step land removal based on certain restrictions that limit the deployment of Variable Renewable Energy Sources (VRES) in areas that do not fulfill the requirements and constraints necessary for power plant development. At the end of the land removal, the total amount of potential land that is available for renewable installations and its geographical distribution is obtained. Figure 2–2. shows a summary of the geospatial analysis procedure.

Figure 2-2. Geospatial analysis block diagram.

---

The land deduction from the complete Mexican territory was carried out using the Geospatial Land Availability for Energy Systems (GLAES) model developed by the Jülich Research Center\(^5\), and an adapted methodology\(^6\) is followed with adjusted considerations for Mexico. A spatial resolution of 100 m\(^2\) is used which represents a good balance between accuracy and computational complexity.

### 2.1.3 Renewable potential assessment

The assessment of renewable potential is aimed at determining the maximum renewable generation capacity that can be installed and its LCOE in the available land estimated in the previous steps for both wind and solar PV. The maximum installable capacity is obtained by placing individual projected turbines and solar PV parks in the remaining land. As an example, the geospatial analysis process for the Mexican state of Aguascalientes for onshore wind turbines is shown in Figure 2–3.

---


---

### Table 2-1. Land exclusion criteria for PV parks deployment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land restrictions</th>
<th>Exclusion rule</th>
<th>Buffer zone</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural areas</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>0 m</td>
<td>Ryberg, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archeological areas</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>1000 m</td>
<td>SENER, AZEL 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country borders</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>1000 m</td>
<td>Heuser , 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical sites</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>1000 m</td>
<td>SENER, AZEL 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jungles</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>1000 m</td>
<td>Peña–Sánchez, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining sites</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>0 m</td>
<td>Ryberg, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected areas</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>1000 m</td>
<td>Ryberg, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlements</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>200 m</td>
<td>Ryberg, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volcanoes</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>2000 m</td>
<td>Ryberg, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water bodies</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>1000 m</td>
<td>Ryberg, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>0 m</td>
<td>Ryberg, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevation</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>2 m</td>
<td>Ryberg, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>30°</td>
<td>Ryberg, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northward slope</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>3°</td>
<td>Ryberg, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2-2. Land exclusion criteria for onshore wind turbines deployment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land restriction</th>
<th>Exclusion rule</th>
<th>Buffer zone</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archeological areas</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>1000 m</td>
<td>SENER, AZEL 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country borders</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>1000 m</td>
<td>Heuser , 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical sites</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>1000 m</td>
<td>SENER, AZEL 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jungles</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>200 m</td>
<td>Peña–Sánchez, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining sites</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>200 m</td>
<td>Ryberg, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected areas</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>1000 m</td>
<td>Ryberg, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railways</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>200 m</td>
<td>Ryberg, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>300 m</td>
<td>Ryberg, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlements</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>1000 m</td>
<td>Ryberg, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volcanoes</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>2000 m</td>
<td>Ryberg, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water bodies</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>300 m</td>
<td>Ryberg, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water lines</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>200 m</td>
<td>Ryberg, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>200 m</td>
<td>Peña–Sánchez, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind speeds</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>5 m/s</td>
<td>Ryberg, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevation</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>3 km</td>
<td>Ryberg, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>30°</td>
<td>Ryberg, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An LCOE is obtained considering a power plant lifetime of 20 years. This is done using the RESKit\textsuperscript{7} model developed by the Jülich Research Center and a methodology adapted to Mexico. The simulation model takes as input the installed capacity that was previously estimated, and geo-referenced weather data parameters such as wind speed, temperature, pressure, and irradiance from NASA’s MERRA-2\textsuperscript{8} data set. This weather data is computed to produce time-series generation profiles with a 1-hour resolution for individual wind turbines and solar PV plants. Terrain and location conditions that affect the technology performance are also accounted for. The LCOE calculation procedure is summarized in Figure 2-4.

---

\textsuperscript{7} Renewable Energy Simulation toolkit for Python, Jülich Research Center.

\textsuperscript{8} Modern-Era Retrospective analysis for Research and Applications, Version 2, NASA.
For this analysis, 20 years of weather data (2000–2019) were considered and averaged to obtain historical time-series generation profiles, the LCOEs, and the renewable techno–economical potential. The main techno–economical parameters used for the calculations are presented in Table 2–3.

Table 2-3. Main techno–economical parameters by 2050 for solar PV and onshore wind turbines according to estimations by HINICIO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solar PV</td>
<td>CAPEX</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>USD/kWp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPEX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>% of capex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degradation</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>%/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land usage</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>m²/MWp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lifetime</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Fixed axis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onshore wind</td>
<td>CAPEX</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>USD/kWp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPEX</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>% of capex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degradation</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>Ha/MWp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lifetime</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Onshore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.4 Hydrogen production simulation

A simulation algorithm was developed to find the optimal electrolysis capacity while minimizing the green hydrogen production cost. Hybrid solar PV and wind plants were considered to maximize the hours of operation of the electrolyzer, with the hypothesis that they would yield lower costs of hydrogen than with solar PV or wind alone (however, results showed the lowest LCOHs come from solar PV alone). The simulation computes the theoretical green H₂ production from the PEM electrolyzer according to the 20-years of weather data simulated to determine the corresponding Levelized Cost of Hydrogen (LCOH). A block diagram of the procedure is shown in Figure 2–5.

Figure 2-5. Hydrogen production simulation block diagram.
Around 5,800 renewable generation sites were delineated across the Mexican territory, each spanning on average of 365 km² of area containing wind turbines and solar PV modules. Methodologically, each site was defined as a Voronoi polygon⁹.

Then, an optimization is made where the algorithm computes all the possible PEMEL electrolyzer capacities (from 0 MW up to the VRES park capacity) according to the 20-years of weather data and selects the one that yields the lowest LCOH.

The capacity selected represents the on-site optimal electrolyzer capacity for the renewable energy plant. The production cost of green hydrogen (LCOH) includes investment costs, fixed and variable costs, depreciation, and contingencies and is calculated at the outlet of the electrolyzer. Hydrogen storage, conditioning, or transportation are not considered in the reported LCOH. The techno-economic parameters used in the model are shown in Table 2-4.

### 2.2 Results

This section presents the results of renewable energy and green hydrogen potential. Selected parameters are plotted in heat maps where red colors are associated with the best locations and progressively turn into blue as the potential decrease. White color is assigned to unavailable land according to the geospatial analysis.

---

⁹ Voronoi polygons are geometric figures constructed around a set of points (Voronoi centers) such that each polygon contains all points (turbines or PV parks in this case) closer to its Voronoi center than to the center of any other Voronoi polygon, according to Evans, 1987.
2.2.1 Onshore wind energy potential

Results show that 430,000 km² of land in Mexico (~22% of the total) is eligible to accommodate up to 2.7 TW of onshore wind turbines that can produce up to 6.3 PWh¹⁰ of renewable electricity each year with an LCOE equal to or lower than 60 USD/MWh. The LCOE potential map for onshore wind energy is shown in Figure 2-7. White areas are assigned to un-available land for onshore wind turbine installation.

Most of the un-available land is found along the Pacific coast, inside the Baja California and Yucatan peninsulas, and around the center of the country. The constraints responsible for this distribution of land are low wind resources and population-related constraints such as proximity to human settlements and roads.

Human settlements-related constraints are especially important for the densely populated center of the country. Constraints related to the conservation, woodlands, jungles, water bodies, and water lines are distributed slightly more towards the south of the country. In opposition, mining sites limiting the onshore wind turbine deployment are found mostly in the north of the country.

Moreover, wind resources are regional and of mountainous origin, as shown in Figure 2–7. There are three notorious wind-rich regions, in which the resulting LCOEs can be yielded at low costs starting from 15 USD/MWh:

---
¹⁰ PWh (Petawatt-hour) are equivalent to 1012 kilowatt-hours.
• In the state of Oaxaca, isthmus of Tehuantepec: this region is currently the location with most of the wind energy installations in the country.

• The Western Sierra: the northern-central mountain chain that runs alongside the states of Chihuahua, Durango, and some parts of Zacatecas and San Luis Potosí.

• The last area is found in the north-eastern part of the country: in the states of Coahuila, Tamaulipas, and Nuevo León.

The LCOEs for wind energy represented in the previous map are clustered in bins every 5 USD/MWh increment in Figure 2–8. The corresponding potential that could be installed is shown in dark blue bars in GW for each bin. The cumulative capacity is marked for reference by the dotted light blue line.

Figure 2-8. Onshore wind capacity potential by LCOE.

There are up to 165 GW of wind potential with LCOEs lower than 30 USD/MWh capable of producing around 600 TWh/year of electricity. This amount of energy would be enough to power the complete current electricity demand in Mexico. The capacity potential increases as the LCOE threshold increases for this regional resource in Mexico.

2.2.2 Solar PV energy potential

Results show that 650,000 km² of land in Mexico (~33% of the total) is eligible to accommodate up to 33.5 TW of solar PV parks that can produce up to 69 PWh of renewable electricity each year with an LCOE equal to or lower than 25 USD/MWh. The LCOE potential map for solar PV energy is shown in Figure 2–9. White areas are assigned to un-available land for installations of PV parks.
The unavailable land corresponds mostly to slope-related constraints, conservation areas, and settlement-related areas. Slope-related constraints, i.e., terrain too inclined to place PV panels, affect generally all the country. In both the Baja California and Yucatan peninsulas, there are large portions of unavailable land that are due to natural reserves and protected areas. The center of the country and regions with large urban settlements and agriculture show little land availability for PV.

The solar PV potential appears to be affected by regional weather conditions near the coasts. Tropical weather, more clouds, and higher humidity in the air affect the full load hours of the solar PV plants. These effects explain the difference in potential across the country.

Furthermore, the LCOEs coming from PV are much lower and less variable than those from onshore wind, as shown in Figure 2-10. The vast majority of PV potential (96% of the total) falls in the 15 – 20 USD/MWh LCOE range. Only 3% is in regions a bit less favorable with production cost varying from 20–25 USD/MWh and the remaining 1% of the potential can be yielded at LCOEs lower than 15 USD/MWh.
Renewable energy and green hydrogen potential

The energy coming from the 1% best PV locations is enough to satisfy around 1.5 times the current national energy demand, confirming Mexico’s expected large PV potential.

### 2.2.3 Hybrid solar PV-wind energy potential

Both the wind and solar PV potentials are merged in a heat map as displayed in Figure 2–11. The LCOEs shown represented are for solar PV and wind energy together. As shown previously by Figure 2–7 and Figure 2–8, only good wind locations can produce LCOEs lower than 30 USD/MWh, which means that virtually all wind locations in Figure 2–11 are shown in blue, which is the highest in the color scale for LCOEs.

When no LCOE is taken into consideration, the solar PV potential is 10 times more abundant than onshore wind energy. But since there is a lot of wind resource variability, if an LCOE of 30 USD/MWh is considered as a cost ceiling, the proportion is ten folded to 100 times more. This proportion gives clear evidence about the differences in renewable potential between these two VRES technologies and reveals that a strong solar PV dominance for producing green hydrogen is likely to occur.

However, the location of wind resources will determine the possible location of hybrid wind and PV parks. Good wind regions overlap with good solar regions as shown in Figure 2–11, like in the Western Sierra and medium solar regions (such as Oaxaca and Tamaulipas), as well as in regions where no big solar parks can be deployed like the shores of the Yucatán peninsula.

Figure 2-11. Hybrid wind-solar PV levelized cost of electricity potential map.
2.2.4 Green hydrogen potential

Up to 22 TW of PEM electrolysis capacity can be installed across Mexico. They can produce up to 1,400 MtH₂/year with an average of 1.4 USD/kgH₂. The LCOH potential map locations for green hydrogen production from VRES sources is shown in Figure 2-12.

The map reveals that the green hydrogen potential is similar to the solar PV potential, driven by the low-cost solar energy, which enables the most competitive green hydrogen production. Given the large difference between onshore wind and solar potential in Mexico, it is expected that the green hydrogen production at low LCOEs will be powered mainly by solar PV in a 100 to 1 proportion relative to wind. The strong prevalence of solar energy in green hydrogen production also means that Mexico could follow the same production cycles as solar energy radiation if no energy storage or complementary power from the grid are considered.

Places where there can be hybrid green hydrogen production like in Oaxaca and the Western Sierra appear to have LCOHs of around 1.5 USD/MWh, but not as low as the solar-only green hydrogen production that occurs in the north-western part of the country, for example.

There are also some competitive wind-only green hydrogen production locations like in the western shores of the Yucatán peninsula and the north of Tamaulipas. The LCOHs resulting in these locations are in the upper-cost range of around 1.8 USD/kgH₂.

Figure 2-12. Levelized cost of hydrogen from hybrid wind-solar PV production.

The water usage for green hydrogen production as compared with the total water use per state according to official CONAGUA records¹¹, as shown in Figure 2-13.

If all of the states’ shown green hydrogen production potentials were put to use, less than 1% of the water that is used in each would be compromised. Added together, 116.8 (~0.13%) of water used nationally would be required to produce all the green hydrogen potential.

¹¹ CONAGUA, Estadísticas del Agua en Mexico 2017.
Figure 2-13. Water use of green H₂ production as a share of the total water consumption in 2017.

Table 2-5. Green hydrogen production parameters by state.
The installed capacities for electrolyzer and their corresponding capacity factors at several LCOH ranges are shown in Figure 2–14. Most of the hydrogen potential can be produced at around 1.2 – 1.3 USD/kgH₂ with a 25% electrolyzer capacity factor. As expected, the hydrogen production cost increases as the electrolysis capacity factor decreases.

Green hydrogen production sites with 26% capacity factor values can produce hydrogen at 1.1 USD/kg H₂ whereas in sites with 21% capacity factor values the cost of production is up to 27% more expensive at 1.5 USD/ kgH₂.

Nevertheless, hydrogen production sites with LCOHs clustered within the 1.5 – 1.8 USD/kgH₂ range are an exception to the rule. This LCOH bin corresponds to hybrid and wind–only renewable sites.

The capacity factor in these parks is 36% on average but some hybrid parks can have up to 52% capacity factors. The resulting LCOHs at their locations are not lower than solar–only parks because there is a trade–off between higher capacity factors that the wind energy brings to the electrolyzer and the higher electricity cost due to wind energy usage. Moreover, because the wind potential is considerably lower in comparison with solar, only 1% of the electrolysis capacity (200 GW) could be a hybrid or wind–only park. It must be noted, however that this 200 GW of hybrid capacity are several times larger than the total expected installed capacity in Mexico even in 2050.

From an electrolyzer capacity factor heat map it can be observed that locations with capacity factors from 20 to 25 % correspond with the less favorable solar locations, as shown in Figure 2–15. Locations with capacity
It is important to highlight that having electrolyzers with higher capacity factors means that hydrogen production occurs also in non-diurnal times. Since 99% of the hydrogen production could be bounded to solar cycles, investments in hybrid parks could still be attractive under some conditions.

### 2.3 Comparison of results with official estimates

The Mexican Government released in 2017 the National Inventory of Zones with High Potential for Clean Energy or AZEL\(^\text{12}\) that assessed the solar and wind potentials in Mexico in four scenarios. HINICIO’s wind assessment is comparable with AZEL’s wind scenario 3, which only considers sites within 10 km of the national transmission system. HINICIO’s solar assessment is comparable with AZEL’s solar scenario 1 due to the similar land restrictions considered in the geospatial analysis, which do not consider proximity to transmission lines. In terms of green hydrogen potential, no similar assessment was found by official sources to make a results comparison.

The onshore wind energy generation potential obtained by HINICIO in this assessment is 6.3 PWh/year or ~10% lower than in the 6.9 PWh/year found in the AZEL.

Several differences in the applied methodologies can explain this difference. First, there is a big difference in the land available determined by AZEL’s scenario 3. AZEL installable capacity determination does not discriminate between good and bad wind locations which results in around 10% higher generation potentials compared with HINICIO’s results despite having similar installable capacities. Another difference is the land available for onshore wind installations. In AZEL’s assessment, only land within 10 km from a transmission line is considered. This land consideration largely reduces by 90% the land available for installations compared to HINICIO’s assessment, which did not consider it to allow for possible grid expansion that could be directed by the newly found renewable potential. Other land restrictions are similar in both studies. Lastly, the generation estimation by HINICIO was a physics-based simulation.
of 20 years of weather data, whereas AZEL used a generation density estimation.

In terms of solar PV potential, AZEL estimates around 511,000 km² available for PV installations, whereas HINICIO estimated 650,000 km² (~20% more). The difference is due to AZEL does not consider sparse potential (fewer than 150 hectares), whereas HINICIO does. Additionally, AZEL includes restrictions for natural disaster zones, which HINICIO did not consider. The solar generation potential in HINICIO’s assessment is 15% larger than AZEL due to improvements in the PV panel efficiency expected by 2050. Nevertheless, the similar solar potential above 60 PWh/year found in both assessments brings certainty about the large solar PV potential in Mexico.

### 2.4 Conclusions

The results of the assessment presented in this chapter lead to several conclusions which will be used to design an energy system model for the following activities to assess the benefits and integration potential of hydrogen in the Mexican power system.

- Both wind and solar energy have the potential to cover the entire current electricity demand at a cost lower than 30 USD/MWh by 2050. However, a huge difference between solar and wind energy was found. Solar generation potential is up to 100 times higher than wind at LCOEs equal to or lower than 30 USD/MWh.

- The distribution of solar is more homogeneous across the country with a tendency to be higher in the north-west region, whereas wind resources are region-specific.

- Up to 33 TW of solar panels can be installed with an LCOE equal to or lower than 26 USD/MWh, whereas the wind potential is up to 2 TW installed capacity with an LCOE equal to or lower than 60 USD/MWh.

- Green hydrogen production will be driven strongly by the PV potential due to its large renewable potential and low energy cost, and hydrogen production would be subjected to the same hourly operational characteristics.

- Hybrid solar PV-wind hydrogen production can be up to 40% more expensive but from a system perspective it can be useful to match energy consumption by being produced at non-diurnal times. Considering both cases, 1,400 Mton of green hydrogen can be produced yearly.

- Since wind energy production has higher LCOEs than solar, renewable hybrid parks for hydrogen generation have a higher LCOH than solar only, despite having a higher capacity factor.
3. Energy Storage Technologies

3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a detailed review of the basic concepts and an updated state of the art of the main energy storage technologies used in power systems. Additionally, a suitability and performance analysis of each technology on different applications is made. An overall presentation of energy storage systems can be found in this subchapter, 3.1., the methodology followed is illustrated in 3.2, a description of each of the technologies assessed is included in 3.3, a summary of the results in 3.4, and finally the conclusions in 3.5. Energy storage systems (ESS) allow the accumulation of energy in different ways: mechanical, thermal, electromagnetic, chemical, and electrochemical. The most common classification is based on the form of the stored energy as shown in Figure 3-1.

Figure 3-1. Scientific categorization of energy storage technologies\cite{13}.

Energy storage systems (ESS) allow the accumulation of energy in different ways: mechanical, thermal, electromagnetic, chemical, and electrochemical. The most common classification is based on the form of the stored energy as shown in Figure 3.1.

The pumped hydro (PHS), compressed air (CAES), flywheel (FES), molten salt (MSES), and lithium-ion battery (BESS) technologies covered 99.2 % of the total installed capacity worldwide in 2020 with 189 GWh of 191 GWh\cite{14}. Figure 3-2. shows the worldwide installed capacity by technology group and Figure 3-3. shows the global operational energy storage power capacity by technology to date.

\begin{itemize}
\item World Energy Council, World Energy Resources - E-storage: Shifting from cost to value, 2016.
\item US Department of Energy, DOE Global Energy Storage Energy Storage Database.
\end{itemize}
Figure 3-2. Worldwide installed capacity of ESS by technology, Nov-2020.

Figure 3-3. Global operational energy storage power capacity by technology excluding PHS, Nov-2020.
This provides a general overview of the performance of different technologies. For example, for lithium ion (Li–ion) batteries it is possible to notice that they cover almost the whole center of the graph, between the diagonals of 1 minute and 1 hour response time, which shows that they are a fast technology, with a high power capacity and that they are better suited for short-term non-stationary applications (with rated energy under 30 MWh). On the other hand, pumped hydro and compressed air have a high power rating and a high rated energy capacity, showing that they are more suitable for long-term stationary applications.

### 3.2 Methodology

The first step of methodology consisted in a detailed bibliographic review of the existing storage technologies and their main parameters and characteristics. The review included sources such as the International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA), Bloomberg NEF, Lazard, the International Energy Agency (IEA), the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), ScienceDirect, World Energy, and the U.S Department of Energy (US DOE).

To make a fair comparison between different energy storage technologies, all the required equipment for storing and delivering energy were included, allowing the inputs and outputs to be the same for all the technologies. After the standardization, all energy storage technologies are comparable within the framework of a power-to-power system. Although the levelized cost of storage (LCOS) can be used to compare the different storage technologies, it will not be used because its calculation requires further research which is beyond the scope of this report.

Once the information was collected and to make a quantitative comparison of the different technologies, a methodology by IRENA was followed which is composed of six phases used to determine which technologies have the best performance per application in electric power systems.

---

15 X. Luo, “Overview of current development in electrical energy storage technologies and the application potential in power system operation”, 2015.
**Phase 1: Selection of relevant parameters**

The selection of the relevant parameters will depend on the application to which the energy storage system is oriented. In this case, the best-adapted technologies are sought for their general application to Electric Power Systems (EPS).

Therefore, it is required a mature technology that can compete with the storage currently installed in power systems, and at the same time, their performance must be good enough to participate in the different markets. For example, the ESS must have a fast time of response to provide ancillary services, store energy for long periods of time to provide capacity firming, or must be able to perform a daily cycle in the case it provides smoothing for renewable energy.

Considering this, the relevant parameters for this study are CAPEX, roundtrip energy efficiency, lifetime, self-discharge, maturity, space required, and response time. Then, depending on the application to be studied in each case, a weighted or “percentage of importance” will be assigned to each relevant parameter, which will be explained in Phase 3 of this methodology.

**Phase 2: Assignment of competitive scores to each parameter of each technology**

Based on the values of technical and commercial parameters identified as relevant, competitiveness scores between 1 and 5 were assigned to each parameter, where 5 represents the best score and 1 the worst.

**Phase 3: Parameter weight for applications**

Four applications oriented to electric power systems were identified. Depending on the application, a weight was associated with each parameter. In this way, it will be possible to differentiate that for certain applications some parameters are more important than others. The applications to be analyzed are capacity firming, ancillary services, renewable shifting, and renewable smoothing.

**Phase 4: Applying a suitability matrix**

The competitiveness score of each technology (Phase 2) and the rated weights (Phase 3) provide an overall picture of how suitable each technology is for each application. However, the combination of scores and weights is often insufficient because they could vary depending on the specific case.

To address this issue, a suitability matrix is created to provide the opportunity of adjusting the weighted score. This is done by associating to each technology a value between 0 and 1, depending on how adapted the technology is to each application.

**Phase 5: Calculation of the final weighted score for each technology**

Phase 5 consists of calculating the final weighted score of each technology. First, the factors mentioned in phases 2, 3, and 4 are multiplied, obtaining the weighted score of each parameter. Then all the scores belonging to each technology are added together, obtaining the final weighted score for each application.

**Phase 6: Application ranking**

Finally, with the average weighted scores, all the technologies are rated, obtaining a ranking from 1 to 11 of all the analyzed technologies.
3.3 Technologies description

3.3.1 Pumped Hydro Storage (PHS)

Pumped storage power plants are the most widely developed large-scale energy storage technology available today. In the 1890s it began its commercialization, reaching an installed capacity of 182 GW by the end of 2020. Therefore, PHS is a mature technology that has reached a high level of development in terms of improvements in the efficiency and maintenance of the plants.

PHS consists of a system with two water reservoirs located at different heights, a dam, and an invertible engine/generator. The principle consists of storing energy in the form of potential gravitational energy in the upper reservoir, then opening the dam and directing the water to the lower reservoir when the electricity demand is high. In the lower part of the channel there is a system of turbines connected to an invertible generator/motor that receives the water at high speed, passes through the turbine, and transforms the mechanical energy of the water into electrical energy.

During the charging process, the inverse process takes place and the water in the lower reservoir is pumped by the generator/motor to the upper dam, using energy from the network. Therefore, charging processes are performed when demand is low and energy costs are low. A general scheme of a pumping station is shown in Figure 3–5.

Figure 3-5. Diagram of the operation of a typical pump hydro station.

The main advantages of PHS are that they correspond to a mature technology with extensive operational experience, they have a good efficiency between 70 and 84%, they can store large volumes of energy and for long periods (low self-discharge), they have low operating costs of 2 USD/kWh and they have an extensive lifetime, up to 40 to 60 years.

On the other hand, the main disadvantages are the geographical restrictions for the installation of the reservoir, low energy density, the slow response time (minutes), long construction periods, and there are environmental barriers due to the need to flood the upper reservoir area. Currently, pumped storage power plants have become more attractive due to the high potential for development in conjunction with solar power plants.

The main applications are:

- Frequency restoration reserve
- Energy arbitrage
- Load following
- Electric supply capacity
- Renewable capacity firming
- Ancillary services
- Island grid
3.3.2 Compressed Air Energy Storage (CAES)

A CAES system stores energy in the form of compressed air (potential elastic energy) in an underground cavern which is used as a reservoir. Old salt deposits or depleted gas fields can be conditioned for use, which lowers costs significantly16.

In low-demand periods surplus of electricity is used to power an invertible motor/generator that drives a chain of air compressors and then stores the air in the reservoir. During this process, the air heats up. In a classic (diabatic) CAES system, this heat is removed by an air cooler (radiator) and released into the atmosphere.

When the electricity demand is high, the stored air runs a gas–fired turbine generator. As the compressed air is released from the reservoir (i.e. expanded), it consequently cools down and needs to be heated to improve efficiency. This is achieved by mixing compressed air with natural gas in a combustion chamber to drive the turbine system as shown in Figure 3–6. The classic CAES design involves fossil fuel combustion in the turbine chambers to provide heat during the expansion phase, with the drawback of emitting CO₂.

A more recently developed concept is the advanced adiabatic compressed air energy storage (AA–CAES) system that addresses this issue. In this system, the heat that normally would be released to the atmosphere during the compression phase is stored and then added back through heat exchangers. This enables AA–CAES systems to do the charge/discharge process without emitting greenhouse gases.

The main advantages are regarding the capability to store energy for a long period with a low self-discharge (0.5% per day), the low capital expenditure costs of 48 USD/kWh (only if a cavern is available), and low OPEX (1 USD/kWh). The main disadvantages are related to the geographical restrictions, low efficiency (64%), CO₂ emissions (diabatic CAES), low energy density (4 Wh/L) and the AA–CAES has not been yet validated on an industrial scale.

The main applications are:
- Frequency restoration reserve
- Electric supply capacity
- Capacity firming
- Flex ramping
- T&D deferral
- Energy arbitrage
- Load following
- Island grid

---

16 IRENA, Electricity Storage and Renewables: Costs and markets to 2030, 2017.
Among the large-scale ESS technologies, Liquid Air Energy Storage (LAES) has attracted significant attention in recent years due to the high expansion ratio from the liquid state to the gaseous state and the high power density of liquid air compared to the gaseous one\textsuperscript{17}.

LAES uses electricity to cool the air until it is liquefied, and then it is stored in a tank. For the re-conversion, liquefied air is brought back to a gaseous state by exposure to ambient air or with waste heat from an industrial process. The gas obtained is used to drive a turbine and generate electricity. LAES is sometimes referred to as Cryogenic Energy Storage (CES)\textsuperscript{18}.

The main advantages are that the LAES is not subject to geographical constraints such as PHS or CAES and it has a long lifetime (30 years or 20,000 cycles). The main disadvantages are that despite the maturity of machinery used for LAES (compressors, expanders, heat exchangers), the lack of experimental validation of the technology generates a high investment risk reducing the economic viability for investors\textsuperscript{19}.

### 3.3.3 Flywheel Energy Storage (FES)

Flywheel Energy Storage (FES) is an electromagnetic system that stores energy as rotational kinetic energy by accelerating and braking a rotating mass around a fixed axis with two magnetic bearings that are coupled to a reversible electric motor/generator. Figure 3–7 shows the components of the FES technology.

The main advantages of the FES technology are the fast charge capabilities (milliseconds and seconds), the long life cycle (>100,000 cycles), no capacity degradation, high efficiency (85%), low maintenance required, and wide operational experience (due to using in motor and other industrial application). The main disadvantages are the low energy density compared with battery systems (110 Wh/L), the highest self–discharge rate (60% per day), and high CAPEX (2,656 – 3,000 USD/kWh).

### 3.3.4 Molten Salt Energy Storage (MSES)

Molten Salt Energy Storage facilities store energy as heat. For this purpose, salts are heated and kept in isolated environments. An MSES system normally consists of a reservoir/tank, a packaged chiller or built-up refrigeration system, piping, pump(s), and controls. When energy needs to be generated, the thermal energy is released by pumping cold water onto the hot salts in order to produce steam which drives the movement of the turbines\textsuperscript{20}, as shown in Figure 3–8.

---


\textsuperscript{19} C. Damak, “Liquid Air Energy Storage as a large-scale storage technology for renewable energy integration”, 2020.

The main advantages are the good efficiency (80%), low CAPEX and OPEX of 60 USD/kWh and 6 USD/kWh respectively, the large amount of energy can be stored for long periods (low self-discharge = 0.05 % per day). The main disadvantages are the low energy density (200 Wh/l) and the slow time of response (hours). The Molten Salt Energy Storage is the dominant commercial thermal energy storage solution deployed today and they account for three-quarters of the globally installed capacity of thermal energy storage for electricity applications, mainly in concentrated solar power (CSP) plants. Therefore, the main use case is renewable capacity firming.

3.3.5 Hydrogen (H₂)

Hydrogen storage systems stores energy in form of chemical energy (hydrogen), which is used to perform a chemical reaction between two reactants (H₂ and O₂). The three main components are an electrolyzer, that uses electricity and water to generate hydrogen, a hydrogen storage system (tanks, caverns, among others), and a fuel cell, that performs the reverse chemical reaction: combine hydrogen with oxygen obtained from air to generate electricity.

The principle of operation is similar to that of a battery. The main difference is that a battery is usually intended as a portable or self-contained source of electricity and it must carry the reactants to generate electricity within it. Once they are exhausted, the battery can no longer supply any power. A fuel cell, by contrast, does not contain any chemical reactants itself but is supplied with them from an external source. So long as these reactants are made available, the cell will continue to provide power. Figure 3–9. shows the principle of operation of hydrogen energy storage system.

The main applications are:

- Renewable smoothing
- Capacity firming
- Ancillary services
- Reactive power management
- Peak shaving
- Island grid

---

3.3.5.1 Electrolyzers

Three main electrolyzer technologies are used or are being developed today: Alkaline EZ (ALK), Proton Exchange Membrane EZ (PEM), and Solid Oxide EZ (SOEC). Of these technologies, the most mature, less expensive, and with a longer lifetime is the ALK\textsuperscript{23}. In this one, an aqueous solution (KOH or NaOH) is used as the electrolyte, with an operating pressure between 1 to 15 bar, it can reach efficiencies between 65 – 68% and the capital costs vary between 700 – 1,200 USD/kW (western-made) and 200 USD/kW (Chinese-made)\textsuperscript{24}. On the other hand, PEM is a less mature technology, that is commercially available today and due to R&D efforts, their capital costs have been dropping significantly. PEM is rapidly gaining market traction because is a flexible technology with a smaller footprint. These factors offer significant advantages in allowing a flexible operation to capture revenues from multiple electricity markets, a wider operating range, and has a shorter response time (1 second to 5 minutes).

Another characteristic is that they have a higher operating pressure than ALK, around 30 bar, making them the best option for applications for mobility. Figure 3-10. shows the topology of both electrolyzers and their techno-economic characteristics.

---

\textsuperscript{23}IRENA, “Hydrogen from renewable power: Technology outlook for the energy transition”, 2018.


The values consider a 1 GW green hydrogen electrolyzer plant. The money conversion used is 1.2 USD = 1 EUR (€). Total installation costs consider all costs borne by the owner including procurement engineering construction, commissioning, owner costs, and contingencies of the electrolyzer and BoP.

On the other hand, Solid Oxide EZ holds the potential to improve energy efficiency, but the technology is still being demonstrated at laboratory and small demonstration scale. Its investment costs are currently higher, however, SOEC production mainly requires ceramics and a few rare materials for their catalyst layers, while PEM needs significant amounts of platinum. The need for high-temperature sources of heat close by might also limit the long-term economic viability of SOEC – for which the only renewable sources are likely to be concentrated solar power and high temperature geothermal.

### 3.3.5.2 Hydrogen storage

According to the physical state of the molecule, there are several methods to store hydrogen. The methods of storing hydrogen in a gaseous state are: underground storage (salt caverns, depleted gas fields, and rock caverns), pressurized gas tanks (steel tanks and composite tanks), and pipelines (dedicated and mixed with natural gas). In the liquid state are: liquid hydrogen tanks, liquid ammonia, and liquid organic hydrogen carriers. In solid-state instead, there is only one method of storage which is metal hydrides. Figure 3–11. summarizes all the storage options currently available and their working capacity.
3.3.5.3 Large-scale storage (more than 100 ton H₂)

The best option is to store the hydrogen in salt caverns because they have the most competitive cost (LCOS of 0.23 USD/kg H₂), losses are low, the gas is kept pure, and commercial use is already available. However, salt caverns are limited geographically. In case of the absence of salt caverns, rock caverns with an LCOS of 0.71 USD/kg H₂ and depleted gas fields (LCOS of 1.9 USD/kg H₂) are the next best solution in terms of cost.

When the geologic options of any of the three storages technologies above are not possible, the fourth–best option for large-scale storage is converting hydrogen to ammonia with a cost of 2.83 USD/kg H₂, considering the cost of conversion. It is mentioned in “Hydrogen: The Economics of Storage” by BloombergNEF that this cost can fall further to 1.41 USD/kg H₂ by using the ammonia directly, for instance in gas turbines, ships, or solid oxide fuel cells.

In case local transport is required, the cheapest option will depend strongly on the mode, distance, and amount of H₂, because the additional costs of conversion need to be weighed against transport savings. Today, the majority of hydrogen is compressed and then distributed by trucks. If larger volumes are needed, then larger pipes reduce the cost of delivery. For example, if 100 ton H₂/day are required at a location 500 km away from the point of import, then the use of trucks would be cheaper than pipelines. But, if 500 ton H₂/day are required, then a pipeline would have lower unit cost.

As the transmission distances increases, the cost of transporting hydrogen by pipelines escalates faster than the cost for ammonia since a greater number of compressor stations are required. For inland transmission and distribution, gaseous hydrogen is the cheaper option for distances below 3,500 km. Above this distance, ammonia pipelines would be the cheaper option.

Comparing transport using pipelines and ships, transporting gaseous hydrogen by pipelines is cheaper for distances below 1,500. Above this distance, it is expected that by 2030, LOHC and ammonia transport by ship become the cheaper delivery options.

---

3.3.5.4 Small-scale storage (less than 1 ton $H_2$)

Regarding the small-scale storage, the most viable option is pressurized hydrogen in steel tanks, with costs starting at 0.19 USD/kg$H_2$. Tanks are already widely used and are getting lighter and stronger, storing more hydrogen than before, making them the best option for short distances\(^28\). It is important to notice that these costs can only be reached if a daily cycle is considered.

For longer distances or if there are space constraints, the best is liquid hydrogen storage, due to its superior density. This characteristic allows to amortize the cost of liquefaction since less investment in tanks is required for each unit delivered, making LH$_2$ a good candidate for transporting hydrogen by truck (and eventually by ship) across longer distances with an LCOS of 4.57 USD/kg$H_2$.

3.3.5.5 Fuel Cells

Fuel cells can convert chemical energy into hydrogen and oxygen (from the air) to electricity. The overall reaction is: $2H_2 + O_2 \rightarrow 2H_2O + \text{energy}$. They are composed of two electrodes, the anode with hydrogen molecules, the cathode with oxygen atoms, and an electrolyte that separate the two electrodes.

The electrolyte is the key element in any electrochemical cell because it acts as a filter to both stop the cell reactants from mixing directly with one another and to control how to charged ions created during the partial cell reactions are allowed to reach each other\(^29\). Depending on the fuel and electrolyte, there are six major groups of fuel cells, which are: Alkaline Fuel Cell (AFC), Phosphoric Acid Fuel Cell (PAFC), Solid Oxide Fuel Cell (SOFC), Molten Carbonate Fuel Cell (MCFC), Proton Exchange Membrane Fuel Cell (PEMFC) and Direct Methanol Fuel Cell (DMFC)\(^30\).

The main applications of hydrogen storage are:

- Ancillary services
- Capacity firming
- Renewable smoothing
- Peak shaving
- Island grid

The main advantages of hydrogen storage are its long lifetime (10,000 cycles), it has the highest energy density of all the technologies (2,364 Wh/L liquid hydrogen at 1 bar), it’s very suitable for long-term applications due to its low self-discharge (0.01 % per day) and if a PEM electrolyzer is considered, it has a fast time of response (seconds), allowing this technology to provide ancillary services of frequency regulation.

On the other hand, the cons are that it is still a developing technology and therefore its investment costs are still high to compete with other ESS with the same characteristics. Another disadvantage is that its efficiency is the lowest of all storage technologies since it has 2 conversion blocks.

3.3.6 Lithium-ion Batteries (BESS)

The rechargeable Battery Energy Storage System is one of the most widely used EES technologies in industry and daily life. The batteries are composed of several electrochemical cells connected in series or parallel, which produce electricity with the desired voltage from an electrochemical reaction. Each cell contains two electrodes (one anode and one cathode) with an electrolyte which can be at the solid, liquid, or viscous states. The electrolyte allows ion exchange between the two electrodes, while the electrons flow through the external circuit\(^31\).

There are different types of BESS depending on the type of electrolyte. Among them are Li-ion batteries, which are the dominant storage technology today for short-duration applications (i.e., 1-4 hours), representing ~90% of the market\(^32\). Therefore, this report will only address batteries with Li-Ion electrolytes.

BESS Li-Ion usually has a cathode made of a lithium metal oxide (LiMEO$_2$), while the anode is often made of graphite or titanate. The electrolyte, on the other hand, is usually a non-aqueous organic solution containing dissolved lithium salts (LiClO$_4$). The charging and discharging cycle of Li-Ion batteries is shown in Figure 3-12. During the charging process, lithium ions ($Li^+$) are exchange from the cathode to the anode and during the discharge process, the reverse movement occurs\(^33\).

\(^{29}\) P. Breeze, Power Generation Technologies, 2019.
\(^{30}\) X. Luo, 2015.
\(^{31}\) X. Luo, 2015.
Today, due to the advantageous characteristics and the promising avenues to further improve the key parameters of Li-ion batteries, new technologies with different materials for the electrolyte, cathode, and anode have been developed. Among them are lithium titanate batteries, lithium iron phosphate batteries, and lithium nickel manganese cobalt oxide batteries. Table 3–2. shows the comparison of lithium–ion chemistry properties, advantages, and disadvantages. Although lithium batteries have high investment costs, they are expected to drop by an additional 54–61% by 2030⁴°.⁵

Table 3-2. Comparison of lithium-Ion chemistry properties, advantages, and disadvantages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key active material</th>
<th>Lithium titanate (LTO)</th>
<th>Lithium iron phosphate (LFP)</th>
<th>Lithium nickel manganese cobalt oxide (NMC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cathode</td>
<td>$Li_iTi_{12}O_{12}$</td>
<td>$LiFePO_4$</td>
<td>$LiNi_{1-x}Mn_xCo_{1-y}O_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anode</td>
<td>$Li^+$</td>
<td>$Li^+$</td>
<td>$Li^+$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>○○○○○○</td>
<td>○○○○○○</td>
<td>○○○○○○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power density</td>
<td>○○○○○○</td>
<td>○○○○○○</td>
<td>○○○○○○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy density</td>
<td>○○○○○○</td>
<td>○○○○○○</td>
<td>○○○○○○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell costs advantage</td>
<td>○○○○○○</td>
<td>○○○○○○</td>
<td>○○○○○○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime</td>
<td>○○○○○○</td>
<td>○○○○○○</td>
<td>○○○○○○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bess system performance</td>
<td>○○○○○○</td>
<td>○○○○○○</td>
<td>○○○○○○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>• Very good thermal stability</td>
<td>• Very good thermal stability</td>
<td>• Good properties combination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Long cycle lifetime</td>
<td>• Very good cycle life</td>
<td>• Can be tailored for high power or high energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High rate discharge capability</td>
<td>• Very good power capability</td>
<td>• Can operate at high voltages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No solid electrolyte interphases issues</td>
<td>• Low costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantages</td>
<td>• The high cost of titanium</td>
<td>• Lower energy density due to lower cell voltage</td>
<td>• Patent issues in some countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduced cell voltage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Low energy density</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The structure of lithium titanate (LTO) is gaining attraction due to some advantages over graphite that may be relevant to stationary applications. In particular, LTO cells exhibit benefits in terms of efficiency and lifetime, while the increased ion agility in the LTO structure enables fast charging (i.e. high rate operation).

Although they have the best performance among the lithium-ion batteries, the capital costs are still high to compete with the other Li-Ion batteries.

On the other hand, lithium iron phosphate possesses a relatively high-power capability, the environmental advantage of inexpensive, non-toxic cathode material, and a long lifetime. These characteristics, as well as the relatively low discharge rate, make the LFP BES system a very attractive technology for stationary applications.

Finally, the nickel Manganese Cobalt Oxide (NMC) cells emerged due to the necessity to find lower costs, so the breakthrough was the approach of substituting part of the Ni by Co and Mn. The careful adjustment of the composition succeeded in balancing energy density, stability, safety, and cost concerning the targeted application, which eventually led to the commercial success of NCM. As a result, this material is nowadays dominating the lithium-ion battery market, and a further increase is anticipated36.

3.3.7 Lead-acid Batteries

Lead-acid batteries were first developed more than 150 years ago and are the oldest and most widely deployed rechargeable battery. They have the same working principle as the lithium-ion batteries and like them, were specially created to provide fast frequency regulation services. Lead-acid batteries sometimes are combined with other high-power storage technologies, such as Li-ion batteries or flywheels, to create cost-efficient hybrid battery systems that work well37.

There are two types of lead-acid batteries: flooded and valve-regulated lead-acid batteries (VRLA). The first one uses liquid sulphuric acid (H₂SO₄) as an electrolyte (usually 37% acid weight), a negative electrode made of metallic lead (Pb), a positive electrode made of lead dioxide (PbO₂) and a separator used to insulate electrodes from one another as can be seen in Figure 3-13.

The second one has the same components but has valves that regulate the cell’s maximum overpressure, in order to prevent electrolyte loss.

The main applications of the three technologies are:

- Fast frequency response
- Energy arbitrage
- Ancillary services
- Capacity firming
- Renewable smoothing
- Flex ramping
- Peak shaving
- Island grid
- T&D Deferral
- Reactive power management

36 Armand M., "Lithium-ion batteries - Current state of the art and anticipated developments", 2020.
Another battery storage technology is the flow batteries also known as regenerative fuel cells. They differ from conventional rechargeable batteries in that the electroactive materials are not all stored within the electrode but, instead, are dissolved in electrolyte solutions that are stored within the electrode. The electrolytes are stored in tanks (one at the anode side and the other one on the cathode side). These two tanks are separated from the regenerative cell stack (i.e. reaction unit). The electrolytes are pumped from the tanks into the cell stacks where reversible electrochemical reactions occur during charging and discharging of the system as can be seen in Figure 3-14.

Depending on the type of electrolyte used, the main technologies on the market are: Vanadium Redox with a total installed cost of 268 USD/kWh and Zinc Bromine with a total installed cost of 696 USD/kWh. By 2030, the cost is expected to come down to 108 USD/kWh and 576 USD/kWh for each of them. Round-trip efficiencies for these flow batteries are expected to improve from 72% in 2020 to 78% by 2030. Although they currently have high upfront investment costs compared to other technologies, these batteries often exceed 10,000 full cycles, enabling them to make up for the high initial cost through very high lifetime energy throughputs.

### 3.3.8 Flow Batteries (FB)

Another battery storage technology is the flow batteries also known as regenerative fuel cells. They differ from conventional rechargeable batteries in that the electroactive materials are not all stored within the electrode but, instead, are dissolved in electrolyte solutions that are stored within the electrode. The electrolytes are stored in tanks (one at the anode side and the other one on the cathode side). These two tanks are separated from the regenerative cell stack (i.e. reaction unit). The electrolytes are pumped from the tanks into the cell stacks where reversible electrochemical reactions occur during charging and discharging of the system as can be seen in Figure 3-14.

![Figure 3-13. Working principle of a lead-acid battery [18]](image)

![Figure 3-14. Working principle of a flow battery.](image)

They typically have a good cost–performance ratio in a wide range of applications. However, they have a relatively low energy density (75 Wh/L), very heavy, typically do not respond well to deep discharging (DoD = 50%), have a short lifetime (500 cycles), and lead may be a restricted material in some applications or locations due to its toxicity. However, lead–acid batteries are relatively easily recycled and there is a large existing market.

The main applications are:

- Fast frequency response
- Renewable shifting
- Flex ramping
- T&D Deferral
- Reactive power management
- Peak shaving
- Island grid

The main applications are:

- Frequency restoration reserve
- Renewable shifting
- Electric supply capacity
- Capacity firming
- Flex ramping
- T&D Deferral
- Energy arbitrage
- Load following
- Peak shaving
- Island grid
3.4. Summary and results

The tables below show a summary of the commercial and technical characteristics of the energy storage systems discussed in this chapter, including their Technology Readiness Level (TRL)\(^38\), and Commercial Readiness Index (CRI)\(^39\). All the technologies consider a large-scale project (bigger than 1 MW). Specifically, hydrogen technology considers a 12-hour stationary hydrogen energy storage large-scale project of 2–3 MW, composed of an alkaline electrolyzer, a pressurized hydrogen storage tank (50–80 bar), a compressor, and a Solid Oxide Fuel Cell.

Table 3-3. Commercial characteristics of energy storage systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Power USD/kW</th>
<th>Energy USD/kWh</th>
<th>USD/kWh</th>
<th>Wh/l</th>
<th>Nº full cycles</th>
<th>TRL</th>
<th>CRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2,000 - 4,000</td>
<td>21 - 80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>400 - 1,000</td>
<td>48 - 53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FES</td>
<td>250 - 350</td>
<td>2,656 - 3,000</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal</td>
<td>MSES</td>
<td>200 - 300</td>
<td>30 - 60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>Hydrogen</td>
<td>4,000 - 5,000</td>
<td>1,040 - 1,500</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2,364</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electro-chemical</td>
<td>Li-Ion</td>
<td>1,000 - 1,500</td>
<td>284 - 456</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batteries</td>
<td>Li-Ion LFP</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>350 - 590</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Li-Ion LTO</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>880 - 1,050</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Li-Ion NMC</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>250 - 450</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pb-Acid VRLA</td>
<td>300 - 600</td>
<td>226 - 263</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electro-chemical</td>
<td>VRFB</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>268 - 347</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Batteries</td>
<td>ZBFB</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>696 - 900</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-4. Technical characteristics of energy storage systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Installed capacity MW (%)</th>
<th>Round-trip efficiency (%)</th>
<th>Dod (%)</th>
<th>Self-discharge % per day</th>
<th>Time of response h, min, s, ms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>181,798 (95.2%)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>min, h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>1,291 (0.7%)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>min, h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FES</td>
<td>953 (0.5%)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>ms, s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal</td>
<td>MSES</td>
<td>2,452 (1.3%)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>Hydrogen</td>
<td>20 (&lt;0.1%)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>min, h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electro-chemical</td>
<td>Li-Ion General</td>
<td>2,036 (1.4%)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>ms, s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batteries</td>
<td>Li-Ion LFP</td>
<td>191 (0.1%)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>ms, s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Li-Ion LTO</td>
<td>62 (&lt;0.1%)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>ms, s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Li-Ion NMC</td>
<td>86 (&lt;0.1%)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>ms, s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pb-Acid VRLA</td>
<td>110 (0.1%)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>ms, s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electro-chemical</td>
<td>VRFB</td>
<td>327 (&lt;0.2%)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>min, h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Batteries</td>
<td>ZBFB</td>
<td>85 (&lt;0.1%)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>min, h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{38}\) Technology Readiness Levels were developed by NASA and are widely used, ranging from 1 (basic principles observed) to 9 (system proven in operational environment).

\(^{39}\) Commercial Readiness Index were developed by the Australian Renewable Energy Agency (ARENA) to complement TRLs and go from 1 (hypothetical commercial proposition, TRL 1-8) to 2 (commercial trial, TRL 9+), and up to 6 (Bankable asset class).
Table 3-5. Look-up table for competitive scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAPEX</th>
<th>Lifetime</th>
<th>Maturity</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Self-discharge</th>
<th>Time of response</th>
<th>Space required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 100 USD/kWh</td>
<td>10,000 – 100,000 cycles</td>
<td>TRL=10, CRI=5</td>
<td>&gt; 90%</td>
<td>&lt; 0,01</td>
<td>Miliseconds (ms)</td>
<td>&gt; 1,000 Wh/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 – 325 USD/kWh</td>
<td>5,000 – 10,000 cycles</td>
<td>TRL=10, CRI=3 – 4</td>
<td>80 – 90%</td>
<td>0.01 – 0.02</td>
<td>Seconds(s)</td>
<td>600 – 1,000 Wh/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325 – 550 USD/kWh</td>
<td>3,500 – 5,000 cycles</td>
<td>TRL=9, CRI=2</td>
<td>70 – 80%</td>
<td>0.02 – 0.1</td>
<td>Minutes (min)</td>
<td>300 – 600 Wh/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550 – 800 USD/kWh</td>
<td>1,000 – 3,500 cycles</td>
<td>TRL &lt; 9, CRI &lt; 2</td>
<td>60 – 70%</td>
<td>0.1 – 0.5</td>
<td>Hours (h)</td>
<td>100 – 300 Wh/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 800 USD/kWh</td>
<td>500 – 1,000 cycles</td>
<td>TRL &lt; 9, CRI &lt; 1</td>
<td>&lt; 60%</td>
<td>&gt; 0,05</td>
<td>Days (d)</td>
<td>&lt; 100 Wh/l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-6. Competitive scores for storage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHS</th>
<th>CAES</th>
<th>FES</th>
<th>MSES</th>
<th>H₂</th>
<th>LFO</th>
<th>LTO</th>
<th>NMC</th>
<th>VRLA</th>
<th>VRFB</th>
<th>ZBFB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPEX</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-discharge</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of response</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space required</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-7. Parameter weightings for the selected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity firming</th>
<th>Ancillary Services</th>
<th>Renewable shifting</th>
<th>Renewable smoothing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round-trip efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-discharge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-8. Suitability matrix for the selected applications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHS</th>
<th>CAES</th>
<th>FES</th>
<th>MSES</th>
<th>H₂</th>
<th>LFO</th>
<th>LTO</th>
<th>NMC</th>
<th>VRLA</th>
<th>VRFB</th>
<th>ZBFB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity firming</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary Services</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable shifting</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable smoothing</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-9. Final weighted scores, their average, and ranking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PHS</th>
<th>CAES</th>
<th>FES</th>
<th>MSES</th>
<th>H2</th>
<th>LFO</th>
<th>LTO</th>
<th>NMC</th>
<th>VRLA</th>
<th>VRFB</th>
<th>ZBFB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity firming</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Services</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable shifting</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable smoothing</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Conclusions

In this chapter, first, the necessary information was collected from reliable sources such as IRENA, IEA, U.S DOE, BNEF, Lazard, Science Direct, among others. Then, the state of the art of energy storage systems was carried out, allowing to construct a general overview of the technologies adapted to electric power systems. Finally, the relevant parameters were chosen, taking into account that the selection will depend on the main application of each energy storage technology.

Based on the previous analysis, only mature technologies can compete with the ESS currently installed in electric power systems, but also their performance must be good enough to participate in the different markets, e.g., time of response to provide ancillary services, long-term storage to provide capacity firming, or ability to perform daily cycles for renewables smoothing.

In line with this, the relevant parameters considered for this study were: CAPEX, roundtrip efficiency, lifetime, self-discharge, maturity, space required, and response time. Then, depending on the application to be studied in each case, a weighted or “percentage of importance” was assigned to each relevant parameter, and the suitability matrix was defined, to calculate the final weighted scores of each technology. With this, the ranking of the technologies for each application is shown in Table 3-10.

Table 3-10. Ranking of the technologies for each application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Capacity firming</th>
<th>Ancillary Services</th>
<th>Renewable Shifting</th>
<th>Renewable smoothing</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>NMC</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>NMC</td>
<td>NMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MSES</td>
<td>LFP</td>
<td>MSES</td>
<td>LFP</td>
<td>LFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NMC</td>
<td>LTO</td>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>LTO</td>
<td>LTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>FES</td>
<td>NMC</td>
<td>FES</td>
<td>PHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>VRLA</td>
<td>LFP</td>
<td>VRLA</td>
<td>VRLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LFP</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>MSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LTO</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>LTO</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>H2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>VRFB</td>
<td>MSES</td>
<td>VRFB</td>
<td>MSES</td>
<td>CAES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>VRLA</td>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>VRLA</td>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>FES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ZBFB</td>
<td>VRFB</td>
<td>ZBFB</td>
<td>VRFB</td>
<td>VRFB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>FES</td>
<td>ZBFB</td>
<td>FES</td>
<td>ZBFB</td>
<td>ZBFB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once the results are obtained, they allow the identification of the technologies that are better suited to electric power systems, leading to the following conclusions.

- For capacity firming the best technologies are pumped hydro (PHS), molten salt (MSES), and lithium nickel manganese cobalt oxide (Li-ion NMC). This is in line with expectations, since PHS provides significant levels of power capacity, making them the best technology to provide this service as a main-use case. MSES is mainly deployed in CSP plants, therefore, today’s main-use case is capacity firming. Regarding Li-ion NMC, they are mainly used for fast frequency restoration, due to their fast discharge, but sometimes they are also used for capacity firming if a power-intensive system is installed. PHS, MSES, and Li-ion NMC have in common that they have a low CAPEX, they are a mature technology, and their round-trip efficiency is relatively high.

- For Ancillary Services and renewable smoothing, the best technologies are Li-ion batteries (NMC, LFP, and LTO). For these applications, it is mandatory to have a fast response to frequency, load, and renewable generation changes, and therefore, the characteristic that weighs more is the time of response. In line with this, the Li-ion batteries have the fastest discharge time of all technologies. The second feature that weighs more is the capital expenditure, hence the Li-ion NMC battery is the leader of the ranking.

- Finally, the general performance required to provide renewable shifting (renewable energy arbitrage) is to be able to perform a daily cycle, in order to charge de ESS in the solar or wind hours, i.e., in off-peak hours (low prices), and then to discharge the ESS in peak hours (high prices). Considering this, the technologies that lead the ranking are PHS, MSES, and CAES. They have in common the characteristic of having a long lifetime, even cycling daily with a low loss of efficiency, making them the best suited for this application.

- Hydrogen as an energy storage system does not stand out over other technologies, since its investment costs are still high and it has a very low efficiency as a result of having two energy conversion blocks.
4. Hydrogen integration potential in the National and Mulegé energy systems

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter, the potential integration of hydrogen into the National power system of Mexico (SEN) and the Mulegé, Baja California, system is investigated, using an energy system model to quantify the benefits of this integration. The chapter follows the next structure: first, the methodology employed for both system models is described jointly due its similarities. Then, the results and important insights from the analysis are presented and discussed for each system separately. Finally, a set of conclusions and recommendations are drawn.

4.2. Methodology

The methodology followed for both energy system models can be divided in four steps:

- **Scenario definition**: Selection of the type of energy system model employed, and definition of the parameters for the scenarios to be evaluated.

- **Energy data collection**: Collection of publicly available energy data by official sources and internationally recognized institutions. When needed, it also includes the simulation and/or projection of missing and/or future parameters.

- **Energy system modeling**: Model set up according to the defined scenarios, energy data, and defined boundary conditions.

- **Results analysis**: Evaluation of the system and interpretation of results.

Figure 4-1. Energy system modeling block methodology.

Each step is explained in more detail in the upcoming subchapters.
### 4.2.1 Scenarios definition

This subchapter explains the aspects considered for the design of the scenarios modeled. It begins with a description of five scenarios that were used to model the national power system, and two scenarios that were defined to look at the Mulegé system.

#### 4.2.1.1 National power system

Five scenarios were analyzed to investigate the possible development of the Mexican power sector when hydrogen is introduced in it. Furthermore, it is also important to estimate when such hydrogen integration could occur (in the mid-term vs. in the long-term). Consequently, the hydrogen integration potential is investigated for two timeframes (2030 for the mid-term and 2050 for the long-term) in five scenarios. The timeframes were chosen according to the years used by the Mexican government to set Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC). Figure 4-2. Scenarios modeled for the national power system evaluation below shows the scenario timeline with a short description underneath.

![Figure 4-2. Scenarios modeled for the national power system evaluation.](image)

- **BaU2020** - “Business-as-Usual by 2020” control scenario used to benchmark, calibrate and normalize the results.
- **BaU2030** - “Business-as-Usual by 2030” Mid-term scenario under foreseeable system characteristics.
- **H2MX2030** - “H₂ integrated by 2030” Mid-term scenario under foreseeable system characteristics and hydrogen integration.
- **BaU2050** - “Business-as-Usual by 2050” Long-term scenario at cost-optimal characteristics.
- **H2MX2050** - “H₂ integrated by 2050” Long-term scenario at cost-optimal characteristics and hydrogen integration.

In this report, the Mexican power system is thought to be able to develop in one of the two directions represented in Figure 4-2. Scenarios modeled for the national power system evaluation. The “Business-as-Usual” direction represented by the dark blue corresponds to the expected natural development for 2020, 2030, and 2050. Under this direction, the scenario labeled “BaU2020” is the first evaluated. It is designed to resemble as close as possible the current power system in Mexico as of 2020 using the publicly available information. The BaU2020 objective is to normalize the results of the model so the results from other scenarios can be compared against this control scenario. Two scenarios more under this direction, “BaU2030” and “BaU2050”, are conceived to evaluate an expected development of the Mexican power system by 2030 and 2050.

Alternately, the light-blue line in Figure 4-2. Scenarios modeled for the national power system evaluation represents a system-development direction that is facilitated by hydrogen. Two time frames are
considered for this hydrogen integrated vision; a mid-term integration by 2030 and a long-term integration by 2050. Two scenarios called “HMX2030” and “HMX2050” model this alternative system development with hydrogen integration. They include the same considerations as the BaU scenarios plus the addition of hydrogen technologies into the system (electrolysis, hydrogen power turbines, hydrogen pipelines, hydrogen vessels).

A multi-nodal energy system modeling approach is chosen to evaluate the multi-regional system, consists of several “nodes” that represent regions. These nodes have energy demands associated with them (in this case, electricity demand) as well as technologies that can provide the energy. The nodes are interconnected, so energy can be transmitted from one node to another to match energy deficits. Nine nodes corresponding to nine transmission regions and their interconnection capacities according to SENER’s National Electricity System Development Program (PRODESEN) 2018 are followed and kept unchanged for all the national energy system scenarios.

### 4.2.1.2 Mulegé energy system

The Mulegé power system is currently isolated from the rest of the national power system. Due to its geographical location and weather characteristics, Mulegé’s electricity production is more expensive. Nevertheless, its isolation and high electricity cost make it an interesting candidate to develop a zero-emissions power system. Therefore, two scenarios were designed to investigate the extent up to which hydrogen can facilitate turning the Mulegé system into a zero-emissions system by 2050. They are called “ZERO” and “H$_2$-ZERO”. The only difference between them is that the H$_2$-ZERO scenario includes H$_2$-technologies while the ZERO scenario does not.

Figure 4-3. Scenarios modeled for the Mulegé renewable system shows the two scenarios with a short description underneath.

ZERO – Cost optimal design for a zero-emissions system with no hydrogen integration.

H$_2$-ZERO – Cost optimal design for a zero-emissions system with hydrogen integration.

Both scenarios of the Mulegé system are modeled as a single node energy system, which consists of a single demand associated with a region that does not interact with other regions (nodes). There is no transmission modeling in a single-node energy system, so the results will be reported for the generation, conversion, and storage of energy.

### 4.2.2 Energy data collection

Official data sources by Mexican authorities were preferred when possible, followed by internationally recognized organizations and other similar studies. The main data source is the PRODESEN. The PRODESEN is the main planning instrument for the power sector in Mexico and it is published each year by The Mexican Ministry of Energy (SENER). HINICIO referred to the 2018 and 2019 versions of the PRODESEN to obtain the following data: electricity demands with a hourly resolution, transmission regions and inter-regional transmission capacities, techno-economic parameters of existing hydropower plants, geothermal plants, nuclear plants, conventional generation technologies, and fuel costs. In general, the values for 2020 and 2030 were either projected using the expected growth rates of the PRODESEN or assumed the same as the 2030 values.

---

40 Zero emissions regarding only the electrical generation of the system.
The 2030 CO₂ emissions reduction targets were taken from Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation Commitments for 2020–2030 released by the Mexican Government in 2015 in the Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) to comply with the Paris Agreement. A 2050 emission target is proposed, not being a commitment explicitly stated by the Mexican government. Data regarding the renewable energy techno–economical parameters, generation time–series, and maximum capacities were obtained from the renewable assessment presented in section 2 of this report. Other techno–economical parameters were taken from the IEA, NREL, and other sources as shown in Table 4–1., which summarizes the input data and references used.

Table 4-1. Energy data inputs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data regarding</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference/Data source</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electricity demand</td>
<td>Hourly–electricity demand profile per region of the transmission</td>
<td>PRODESEN, 2018</td>
<td>2020 and 2030 as the planning scenario by the PRODESEN 2018. 2050 values were projected according to the average growth rate reported in the PRODESEN 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regions</td>
<td>9 transmission regions and inter–regional electric transmission capacity</td>
<td>PRODESEN, 2018</td>
<td>Fixed regions and inter–regional transmission capacity for all scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRES</td>
<td>Wind and PV generation time–series, maximum installed capacities, and techno–economical parameters</td>
<td>PRODESEN, 2019 and renewable assessment</td>
<td>2020 installed capacities according to PRODESEN 2019 and future potential as per the results of task 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydropower</td>
<td>Techno–economical parameters of large hydropower plants</td>
<td>PRODESEN, 2018</td>
<td>Fixed techno–economical parameters for all scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geothermal</td>
<td>Techno–economical parameters of geothermal power plants’ techno–economical parameters</td>
<td>PRODESEN, 2018</td>
<td>Fixed techno–economical parameters for all scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>Techno–economical parameters of nuclear power plants</td>
<td>PRODESEN, 2018</td>
<td>Fixed techno–economical parameters for all scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel costs</td>
<td>Techno–economical parameters of natural gas, diesel, coal, fuel–oil</td>
<td>PRODESEN, 2018</td>
<td>As PRODESEN projections for 2020 and 2030. Costs for 2050 were taken the same as 2030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.3 Energy system model

The tool employed to carry out the energy system optimization model was the Framework for Integrated Energy System Assessment (FINE)\textsuperscript{41}. A time-series aggregation algorithm\textsuperscript{42} was used to cluster the input time series data into 30 typical days with 1 hour resolution to match the PRODESEN’s. The margin of error reported of FINE with this configuration is ~5\%\textsuperscript{43}.

The generation time-series for wind and solar PV were obtained by simulating the 2019 weather data records according to the renewable assessment methodology presented in section 2.1. Given the hour time resolution of the model, peak capacity technologies like open combined cycle gas turbines (OCCGT) could be underestimated in some scenarios since periods shorter than one hour are not evaluated.

The five scenarios built are:

- **BaU2020**: This scenario control was modeled with the capacity operation “Fixed” which means constant capacity factors for all the input technologies according to PRODESEN 2019, except for the VRES technologies to resemble as much as possible to the current Mexican power system. The VRES technologies were modeled with the capacity installed as the PROESEN 2018 but the operation was optimized.

- **BaU2030**: In addition to the technologies used in the **BaU2020**, Li-ion batteries, new natural gas–powered combined cycle gas turbine (CCGT–NG), and more VRES capacity are allowed to enter the system to compete with all other technologies on a cost-optimal basis. Conventional fossil-fuels technologies are modeled as “Fixed+” which means that they start with the same installed capacity as for e with the option to install more capacity if needed. Geothermal energy is modeled with the installed capacity of 2020 but in a cost-optimal dispatch. Nuclear and hydropower plants are input with fixed capacity and operation as the PRODESEN 2018.

- **H₂MX2030**: It has the same system characteristics as the **BaU2030** plus the allowance for hydrogen technologies with a 2030 CAPEX projection to participate in the cost-optimal solution.

---

\textsuperscript{41} Weller L., Spatio-temporal optimization of a future energy system for power-to-hydrogen applications in Germany, 2018.

\textsuperscript{42} L., Impact of different time series aggregation methods on optimal energy system design, 2018.

\textsuperscript{43} D. G. Caglayan, Robust Design of a Future 100 % Renewable European Energy System with Hydrogen Infrastructure., 2020.
• **BaU2050**: It has the same system characteristics as the BaU2030 regarding all technologies except for nuclear and hydropower plant set to a cost-optimal capacity expansion and operational dispatched.

• **H₂MX2030**: It has the same system characteristics as the BaU2050 plus the allowance for hydrogen technologies with a 2050 CAPEX projection to participate in the cost-optimal solution.

The modeling configuration between scenarios can be compared with Table 4-2. below.

Table 4-2. Comparison of the scenarios modeled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs/Scenario</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Mulegé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VRES (PV and Wind)</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Optimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geothermal</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydropower</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional technologies</td>
<td>Fixed+</td>
<td>Fixed+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Fixed+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂ technologies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li-ion batteries</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Optimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission grid</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ reduction target [MtCO₂/a](% reduction)</td>
<td>143 (0%)</td>
<td>136 (-30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Zero” “H₂ Zero”</td>
<td>Optimal</td>
<td>Optimal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Fixed: Capacity and operation as given. Not optimized.
- Fixed+: Capacity as given and expansion allowed. Operation optimized
- Optimal: Capacity and operation allocated at cost-optimal. Fully optimized
- : Not included in the model

### 4.3 Results

The results for the national power system are presented in the first place. Afterward, the results from the Mulegé zero-emission system are presented.

#### 4.3.1 National power system

The five scenarios about the national power system development follow a time-frame order. The first scenario presented is the BaU2020, the closest representation of today’s Mexican power system, so subsequent results can be compared to these control results. Next, the two scenarios modeling the mid-term time horizon for 2030, BaU2030 and H₂MX2030, are presented and compared to one another. Finally, the 2050 scenarios for the long-term, BaU2050 and H₂MX2050, are presented.

#### 4.3.1.1 Control scenario - BaU2020

For this control scenario, a total annual cost (TAC) of 35 Billion USD/year was found, which corresponds to an average electricity cost of 100 USD/MWh. The total emissions by the system were estimated at 116 MtCO₂/year.

Figure 4-4. shows an installed capacity comparison between the PRODESEN 2019 data and the BaU2020 control scenario. In comparison with the PRODESEN 2019, the BaU2020 scenario shows a very similar capacity mix.

BaU2020 TAC does not include charges such as capital cost of the grid, distribution grid costs, taxes, and other charges that could not be included due to lack of information publicly available. Nevertheless, the capacity installed, transmission capacities, and electricity demand were taken from the PRODESEN, making these two systems comparable in the generation and conversion, and transmission stages.

---

44 Referring to the annual contribution to the capital costs and operational costs of the generation, conversion, fuel costs, and storage infrastructure of the system. The operation of the transmission lines is also included in this cost.
4.3.1.2 Hydrogen integration by 2030 - BaU2030 and H₂MX2030 scenarios

This section compares BaU2030 against H₂MX2030 to assess the hydrogen integration potential by 2030. Firstly, Figure 4-5 compares the installed capacity of the two possible scenarios by 2030. In general terms, both scenarios show a similar capacity mix. Both scenarios rely on 56 GW of fossil-fuels based technologies, 1.6 GW of Nuclear power plants, 13.3 GW of hydropower and geothermal power plants (RES), around 27-29 GW of PV, and nearly 6 GW of wind installations. When looking closer, there are some small changes between the two scenarios such as the addition of 100 MW of wind and 1.5 GW of solar in the H₂MX2030 scenario. The H₂MX2030 scenario also has 1 GW of PEMEL capacity installed, producing 60 kTH₂/year. The re-electrification process chosen by the models is carried out by 300 MW of OCGT–H₂. Despite these differences, the capacity installed in both scenarios remains very similar.

Secondly, Figure 4-6 below shows that the percentage of renewable electricity in both scenarios is also similar. Around 24% of the electricity is expected to come from renewable sources in each scenario. The rest, around 76% of the total, is still of fossil–fuel origin. One difference is that approximately 4 TWh of renewable electricity was facilitated by hydrogen in the H₂MX2030 scenario to make up for the power–H₂–power conversion processes.
Thirdly, the storage needs in both systems can be compared in Figure 4–8. In general, hydrogen causes a reduction in the electricity storage needs by allowing physical storage of energy in the form of gaseous hydrogen. In the BaU2030 scenario, the system storage needs are around 25 GWh of electricity storage.

Figure 4–9. Total annual costs of the Mexican power system by 2030 under two scenarios.

Complementary, Figure 4–7. shows the electricity production of the different renewable technologies in both 2030 scenarios. PV is the renewable technology with the biggest electricity production in Mexico by 2030. In the BaU2030 scenario, PV shows an annual generation of 50 TWh, whereas this yearly production increases to 54 TWh in the H₂MX2030 scenario. Geothermal and Hydropower technologies show no changes between the 2030 scenarios. The wind electricity output is shown to marginally decrease by 1 TWh/year in the H₂MX2030 scenario. Nevertheless, this decrease is offset by 1 TWh/year of electricity produced additionally from hydrogen.

Figure 4–7. Renewable production in the Mexican power system by 2030 under two scenarios.
For the $\text{H}_2\text{MX2030}$ scenario, the electricity storage needs were reduced to 22 GWh, but additional 11 GWh$\text{H}_2$ (330 tons of $\text{H}_2$) were needed in $\text{H}_2$ vessels. Approximately 25% more energy storage was possible in the $\text{H}_2\text{MX2030}$ scenario compared with the $\text{BaU2030}$ one at the same cost.

Despite the differences in the two 2030 scenarios, the hydrogen integration caused no sensible changes in the TAC. As shown in Figure 4-9, the TAC of either scenario was found at 43 billion USD/year. The corresponding electricity cost is 91 USD/MWh. There was a ~10% reduction in the electricity cost as compared with the $\text{BaU2020}$ scenario. The generation and conversion of electricity is the main cost driver. It accounted for approximately 95% of the cost of the system. The total annual emissions by 2030 were estimated at 134 MtCO$_2$/year for the $\text{BaU2030}$ scenario and 133 MtCO$_2$/year for the $\text{H}_2\text{MX2030}$ one. This represents an absolute 15% more emissions by 2030 than in 2020. Nevertheless, the increased electricity production by the system increased by around 35% so the specific carbon emissions per kWh of electricity decreased by 18% from 339 to 289 gCO$_2$/kWh.

Figure 4-10 presents the installed capacities of $\text{BaU2030}$ and $\text{H}_2\text{MX2030}$ compared to the $\text{BaU2020}$. From the figure two major changes from 2020 to 2030 can be seen; an additional 13 GW of CCGT-NG installed capacity and 26 GW of PV. Also, around 700 MW of thermo-power plants and diesel generators were shut down. Nuclear, coal, hydropower, geothermal, and wind stayed unchanged.
4.3.1.3 Hydrogen integration by 2050 - BaU2050 and H₂MX2050 scenarios

This section compares BaU2050 against H₂MX2050 to assess the hydrogen integration potential by 2050. Again, the first comparison is regarding the installed capacities as shown in Figure 4-11.

There is an increase of 6 GW of solar PV and 1.5 GW of hydrogen–powered combined cycle gas turbine (CCGT-H₂) in the H₂MX2050 scenario. Also, the installed capacity of the CCGT-NG was reduced by 800 MW in the hydrogen integrated scenario.

Similar to the 2030 scenarios, in 2050 PV is the technology that dominates electricity production.

Figure 4-12. shows that PV could be responsible for more than 50% of the total electricity generation by 2050 in either scenario. Wind energy is found to be the second most important electricity source with ~21% of the electricity production share regardless of the scenario, whereas CCGT-NG is third with ~18–19% depending on the scenario.
The model chose not to dispatch any other fossil-fuel-based technology except for CCGT-NG and nuclear power. As explained previously, nuclear energy was modeled fixed, so its share in the energy mix obeys the scenario design decisions rather than to an optimal solution. The lack of other fossil-fuel technologies can be explained by several factors.

Firstly, the costs of fossil fuels cause the marginal cost of production of electricity not to be competitive with VRES technologies. Next, the low efficiencies of present fossil fuel technologies compared to new CCGT-NG or CCGT-H₂. Another reason is the reduced capacity factors that are a consequence of having a system with such large amounts of renewable energy. Finally, the preference for low-carbon technologies by the optimizer so that the carbon budget is maximized by using less polluting technologies such as CCGT-NG.

In the same line, no dispatch of geothermal power plans was present in either scenario by 2050. This can be explained also by the marginal cost of production of geothermal energy and its reduced load factors. It is important to remark that geothermal technologies were modeled with constant prices for 2020, 2030, 2050 since no major developments in this renewable technology are expected.

Should the investment cost be reduced and the marginal cost of production fall to nearly zero so this technology could compete with VRES and, geothermal energy can have higher importance by 2050.

Another change between the BaU2050 and the H_MX2050 scenarios is the total amount of energy generated. There are 15 TWh/year of additional electricity generated (~2% of the total) in the H_MX2050 scenario to account for power-H₂-power conversion processes.

Figure 4-13 shows that the increment is caused by around 20 TWh/year of additional renewable electricity; 17 TWh/year of them coming from an additional 5.6 GW of PV and other 6 TWh/year from 1.5 GW of GGCT-H₂. There were also 3 TWh/year less wind energy from ~600 MW of wind installations. There is also a 5 TWh/year reduction in electricity production by ~800 MW of CCGT-NG plants.

Figure 4-13: Changes in electricity production in the Mexican power system by 2050 under the two scenarios.
With nearly 80% VRES penetration, the storage needs by 2050 are approximately 18 times higher than for the 2030 scenarios. There \textit{BaU2050} needs approximately 453 GWh of electric storage, whereas the \textit{H₂MX2050} needs 443 GWh of electric storage and 52 GWh of H₂ storage (1.5 ktH₂). The \textit{H₂MX2050} system needs around 10% more storage to be able to yield more PV energy.

### 4.3.1.4. Hydrogen in the \textit{H₂MX2050} scenario

The past two sections showed a one-to-one comparison between the scenarios with and without hydrogen integration. This section looks specifically at the hydrogen infrastructure in the \textit{H₂MX2050} scenario, which was the scenario that showed the largest integration potential.

According to the model results, 5.5 TWh/year of electricity was from hydrogen re-electrification. This amount is approximately 0.7% of the electricity mix at a national level by 2050 and around half of today’s Nuclear energy output. The share of re-electrified hydrogen is not the same across the transmission regions of the Mexican power system. Figure 4–16. Share of electricity from hydrogen re-electrification in the total electricity consumed in the \textit{H₂MX2050} scenario.

The total emissions by 2050 were calculated in 30 MtCO₂/year and 29 MtCO₂/year for the \textit{BaU2050} and \textit{H₂MX2050} respectively, which a decrease of around 75% compared to the \textit{BaU2050}. The specific emissions per kWh of electricity produced decreased by almost 90% from 339 gCO₂/kWh in the \textit{BaU2030} to 39 gCO₂/kWh in the \textit{BaU2050} and 38 gCO₂/kWh in the \textit{H₂MX2050} scenario.

### Figure 4-15. Total annual cost (TAC) of a Mexican power system by 2050 under two scenarios.

![Figure 4-15. Total annual cost (TAC) of a Mexican power system by 2050 under two scenarios.](image)

The TAC of both systems decreased ~20% from the 2030 systems despite producing approximately 60% more electricity. The TAC by either 2050 scenario is found to be 34 billion USD/year. The corresponding electricity cost is 43 USD/MWh. This means that there is a ~57% reduction in the electricity cost compared to the control scenario \textit{BaU2020}. The reduction in the TAC was possible due to the lower capital costs of the PV, wind turbines, and Li-ion batteries expected by 2050. Given the large amounts of energy that need to be stored, the weight that the energy storage cost has in the TAC is much bigger. By 2050 it will be around 20% of the electricity cost. Generation and conversion of energy is still the higher cost contributor.
In total 280 ktH₂/year are produced in 6 regions. Figure 4-17. Hydrogen production by region of transmission in the H₂MX2050 scenario, shows the hydrogen production share by region. Approximately 148 ktH₂/year (53% of the total production) occurs in the central region. According to the renewable assessment of section 2 this region lacks wind resources and it is the region with the highest electricity demand so hydrogen helps taking advantage of solar energy, the only renewable resource available there. Another 67 ktH₂/year (24% of the total production) is produced in the Noroeste region where there is the highest solar potential and also a lack of wind resources. The remaining hydrogen is produced among the other regions. No H₂-pipelines were installed by the model, so all the hydrogen produced in a region is consumed on-site.

The hydrogen was produced by PEMEL with an average capacity factor of 26% which points out that solar energy was the main source of energy to produce hydrogen. Figure 4-18. shows a map of the PEMEL installed capacity per region. In total, 4.2 GW of PEMEL capacity is required and its distribution is proportional to the hydrogen produced with some small differences according to the region’s variable resource potential available. Approximately 50% (2.2 GW) of PEMEL capacity will be installed in the central region. Another 25% of PEMEL installed capacity is located in the Noroeste region.
The re-electrification of hydrogen is carried out by CCGT-H₂ with an average capacity factor of 42%. As explained before, the 1-hour time-resolution of the model does not favor OCGT-H₂ installations. It is expected that both technologies would co-exist in a proportion of around 95% CCGT-H₂ and 5% OCGT-H₂. Other hydrogen re-electrification technologies such as fuel-cells could be considered in a more in-depth analysis at higher spatial and temporal resolution.

Figure 4-18. Proton exchange membrane electrolyzer installed capacity per region in the H₂MX2050 scenario.

Figure 4-19. shows the distribution of CCGT-H₂ installed capacity by region. In total 1.5 GW of CCGT-H₂ would be needed. The PEMEL and CCGT-H₂ distribution are proportional. There are approximately 3 times more PEMEL installed capacity than CCGT-H₂.
According to the model results, 2.8 billion USD are needed for hydrogen infrastructure. The regions with the highest share are again Central and Noroeste regions as shown in Figure 4-20. The largest cost contributor is the hydrogen production stage, it represents around 45% of the total investment. The re-electrification stage represents around 40% and the storage of hydrogen around 15%.

Figure 4-19. Combined-cycle gas turbine (hydrogen) installed capacity per region in the H$_2$MX2050 scenario.

Figure 4-20. Investment in hydrogen infrastructure by region under the H$_2$MX2050 scenario.
4.3.2 Mulegé zero-emission system

There were considerable changes in the Mulegé zero-emissions system with and without hydrogen. The first one is the total installed capacity. For the H₂-ZERO scenario, the total installed capacity is 460 MW whereas for the ZERO scenario it is 410 MW. Approximately 11% more capacity installed was chosen in the hydrogen scenario. This change was due to a shift in an energy source that was facilitated by hydrogen. Solar PV is the cheapest energy source, so approximately 105 MW of additional PV was preferred over 78 MW of wind to produce green hydrogen. Besides, 23 MW of CCGT-H₂ was needed to re-electrify the hydrogen produced.

The shift to more solar energy can be seen in the electricity generation mix represented in Figure 4-22. In the ZERO scenario, solar energy takes 75% of the total electricity mix and the 25% remaining is electricity coming from the wind. In the hydrogen-integrated scenario, there is up to 86% of solar energy in the system with only 6% of wind and 8% of CCGT-H₂.

The electricity mix changes are not only in proportions but also in total numbers. The H₂-ZERO scenario needs to produce 19% more energy to make up for the electricity-H₂-electricity processes.
The storage needs of the system also decreased. In the ZERO scenario, 943 MWh of electric storage was needed, whereas in the H₂-ZERO scenario 718 GWh of electric storage (24% less compared to the ZERO scenario) and 1.6 GWh of H₂ storage (50 tonH₂) was required. Figure 4-24 shows the storage needs of both systems.

The system TAC also shows a reduction when hydrogen was integrated. In the H₂-ZERO scenario, the TAC was found to be 36 million USD/year and in the H₂-ZERO the TAC was 33 million USD/year. The was a net 8.3% TAC reduction caused entirely by the reduction in storage needs. Despite having 11% more installed capacity, the H₂-ZERO scenario did not increase the TAC contribution of the generation and conversion of the electricity stage. The cost of generation and conversion of electricity was maintained at 21 million USD/year in both scenarios. It is important to highlight that no transmission lines were modeled in the single-node energy model used in the Mulegé system, so local distribution lines need to be evaluated and added to the total system cost.
4.3.3. Summary table

Table 4-3 shows a summary of the benefits in percentages of the total that hydrogen brought to the system in the H₂-MX2030, H₂-MX2050, and H₂-ZERO scenarios compared with the scenarios with no hydrogen integration.

Finally, Table 4-4 shows that the water requirements for hydrogen production per region according to the energy system model are negligible in comparison with the total amount of water consumed. In all cases the water usage for hydrogen production would represent 0.01% or less of the total water consumed in the region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Water consumption for H₂ production estimated by 2050 [hm³/year]</th>
<th>Water consumption in the region* [hm³/year]</th>
<th>Water consumption for H₂ production as percentage of the water consumption in the region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEN 2030</td>
<td>SEN 2050</td>
<td>Mulegé 2050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of H₂ re-electrified in the electricity mix</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC reduction</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01%</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ emissions reduction</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar energy integration</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind energy integration</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in electric storage</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Limited integration potential</td>
<td>Low integration potential</td>
<td>Medium integration potential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Quantity estimated by adding the water consumption by the states included in the region.
** Quantity estimated by assuming 1/3 of water consumption in the Baja California Sur state according to Mulegé territorial share in the state.
4.4. Conclusions

From the results of the model, several conclusions can be drawn:

The national power system and hydrogen integration by 2030

- The electricity production by 2030 will be still dominated by fossil-fuel technologies and the 2030 NDC would not be met unless actions are taken to renovate the existing electricity generation infrastructure, especially the carbon, thermoelectric, and diesel power plants. The optimization model did not consider the installation of more of these technologies, so, unless they dramatically reduce their capital cost and improve their efficiency, the best option is replacing them with renewable energy technologies (mainly solar PV) with utility-scale battery storage systems and new CCGT-NG.

- The similarities between the BaU2030 and H$_2$MX2030 scenarios point out that the development of the Mexican power system is going to be more or less the same for the next 10 years. Hydrogen technologies need to take advantage of large amounts of VRES energy at nearly zero marginal cost, but those high levels of renewable energy are not expected in the Mexican power sector by 2030. Therefore, hydrogen integration by 2030 is limited. The hydrogen integration at a large scale is likely to occur after 2030. Still, some hydrogen production clusters could be implemented in the coming decade to pave the way for a larger hydrogen infrastructure deployment in the future. Installing electrolyzers powered by solar energy and hydrogen power turbines as close as possible to electricity (and potentially hydrogen demand centers) is the suggested approach.

- Solar energy could become the largest renewable source of electricity as early as 2030. Combining the projected cost of PV plants of 320 USD/kW by 2030 and the large potential of this resource across the country, the Mexican power system needs to be prepared to handle fluctuations in electricity production according to the solar cycles. Consequently, the Mexican power system needs to invest in the control and dispatchability of its existing and new conventional technologies. Besides, new geological studies to find pumped-hydro possible reservoirs, as well as feasibility location studies for gas storage in salt cravens (hydrogen) are additional options to enable storage of energy and create resilience in the power system. In parallel, the Mexican power system needs to deploy utility-scale battery storage and eventually explore the physical storage of energy in the form of hydrogen.
The national power system and hydrogen integration by 2050

- The national power system by 2050 will naturally shift from fossil fuel-based to a variable renewable energy-based system according to the VRES technology development and decreasing cost expected by then. According to the model results of either development line, the optimal national power system configuration by 2050 includes approximately 80% of VRES electricity. With this intensity of renewable energy integration, hydrogen integration can occur at a national level.

- The green hydrogen production in Mexico will be mainly of solar origin. Its integration into the system translates into making more use of the low-cost solar energy in non-day times. The level of integration of hydrogen showed in the model is comparatively small (between 0.5% and 1% of participation in the electricity mix). Nevertheless, the hydrogen infrastructure does not require additional investment and could enable strategic sector coupling with other important economic segments.

- The deployment of hydrogen infrastructure will follow demand centers such as the proximity of the Mexico City metropolitan area and regions with the highest solar resources such as the Northeast region.

- According to current technology and cost projections, PEM electrolyzers and CCGT-H₂ are the green hydrogen technologies that will dominate the hydrogen investments for power generation.

- The effect of hydrogen integration in the power systems evaluated is enabling more solar PV into the energy mix and reducing the storage needs. Green hydrogen production will be mostly solar based. Hydrogen integration reduces the needs for onshore wind installations in regions where high proportions of the land are natural reserves and have the best wind locations contained within.

- Energy storage is key for integrating high levels of solar PV and wind into the power system. Batteries and hydrogen storage are responsible for the high VRES integration and cost reductions in the generation of electricity. Around 20% of the cost of the system is going to be spent on energy storage.

- Investigating and keeping up to date on other options of storage such as geological storage of hydrogen in salt caverns and pumped-hydro storage is important. Novel findings and storage potentials can be incorporated into future analyses and reduce the need for Li-ion batteries showed by the model here.
A zero-emissions Mulegé system by 2050

- Green hydrogen will increase the solar integration level in the system. According to the results of the optimization, the integration of hydrogen would increase the solar share in the energy mix to up to 86%. Having a larger share of solar energy in the system could be beneficial since solar energy is an accessible, predictable, and low-cost energy source available widely in the region. It will also reduce the need for deploying wind energy in protected areas with good wind resources. On the other hand, there must be enough storage capacity in the system to increase the security of supply in order for the system to be able to handle the possibility of not having sunlight in a determined period of time given the large dependency of the system for this energy source.

- Deploying higher quantities of wind energy is not a warranty for a more secure energy supply by the system, despite having higher capacity factors than solar energy. If more wind energy integration was to be encouraged in the system, the energy storage capabilities would also need to be able to handle periods of no wind and no sunlight combined.

- The hydrogen integration would also cause a reduction in storage cost. With large quantities of solar, the system will need to store a large amount of energy. Doing that in Li-ion batteries alone will be 8.3% more expensive than to use hydrogen storage in vessels for a portion of the energy.

- The generation of electricity from re-electrification of hydrogen could have a higher participation in the energy mix than the electricity from wind turbines according to the cost and technology development projections.
5. Conclusions and recommendations

Mexico has a large renewable potential for both solar PV and wind plants but due to the resource available, solar PV is more attractive, reaching 15 USD/MWh in a grand part of the territory. The energy that can be produced could be enough to cover all the electricity demand of the country, but this is unlikely to happen in the short term because of the inherent restrictions and challenges of an energy system with high variable renewable energy penetration, despite the cost benefits.

The green hydrogen potential is driven mainly by solar PV plants. Their competitive energy prices could allow to produce green $H_2$ at a cost around 1.5 USD/kg $H_2$ in 2050 following the current trend in technology cost decrease. The water that would be required for hydrogen production is almost negligible compared with the current national consumption as seen in Figure 2-13, and water consumption in Mexico will not be threatened with massive-scale green hydrogen production.

Several scenarios were made and evaluated to assess the effects of renewables and green hydrogen integration in both the national energy system and the Mulegé energy system in Baja California. For the national system, it is expected for the midterm that the system will not have significant changes. After several cost reduction and improvements of the technologies leading to 2050, the system will incorporate hydrogen (for power-to-power applications) in significant amounts for economic reasons.

For the Mulegé region, due to its geographical and operational characteristics, a 100% renewable system was analyzed, with and without green hydrogen. To supply the total demand in 2050, more than 400 MW of renewable generation will be necessary. The main benefit of integrating hydrogen is that it will allow a higher usage of energy coming from lower-cost solar PV plants, decreasing the total cost of the system.

This study recommends the analysis of the integration of green hydrogen in different sectors, such as heavy-duty transport and chemical and thermal uses in industry in addition to power generation. Coupling different sectors to the use of green hydrogen could improve its competitiveness and accelerate its deployment, as aggregated demand can create a more suitable scenario for green hydrogen production at a large scale.


Gobierno de México, Compromisos de Mitigación y Adaptación ante el Cambio Climático para el periodo 2020-2030, 2015.


IEA, Construction costs for most power plant types have fallen in recent years, 2917.


NREL, Battery storage: Cost Projections for Utility-Scale, 2019.


