

Economics of co-firing rice straw with coal in old and new coal power plants in Vietnam

AN HA TRUONG & MINH HA-DUONG

VIETNAM INITIATIVE FOR ENERGY TRANSITION (VIET)

11th Vietnam Economist Annual Meeting – VEAM 2019 17-18 June 2019, Da Lat, Vietnam







Why consider biomass energy?

Co-firing offset part of coal used in power plants by biomass





Financial model of the sector

Source code available at https://github.com/AnHaTruong/ Costs-and-Benefits-Cofiring-VN

Three aspects evaluated



Social aspect

Local job creation National trade balance

Environmental aspect GHG emissions Air pollutant emissions and health impact



Economic aspect

- Willingness to Accept (WTA) of farmer
- Willingness to Pay (WTP) of plant

Two case studies



Direct co-firing with blended fuel
5% co-firing rate (heat basis)

Co-firing create job mostly through supply chain

	Mong Duong 1		Ninh Binh		
	Full time job equivalent	Total wages	Full time job equivalent	Total wages	
Straw collection	176	304 kUSD	31	54 kUSD	
Straw transportation	14	2 kUSD	1	1 kUSD	
Straw loading	7	11 kUSD	1	2 kUSD	
Operation and Maintenance	22	57 kUSD	2	6 kUSD	
Total	219	394 kUSD	35	63 kUSD	

Co-firing improves trade balance by curbing coal import

- Coal saved by co-firing
 - In Mong Duong 1: 136 kt/y ~ 15 MUSD/y at coal imported price of 112 USD/t (Vietnam Customs 2019)
 - In Ninh Binh: 22 kt/y ~ 2.5 MUSD/y
- In 2018 Vietnam imported 23 Mt of coal and paid 2.5 billion \$ (Vietnam Customs 2019)

Co-firing reduces air pollutant and GHG emissions



Environmental benefits: particulate matter first, Greenhouse gas emission last

		Mong [Duong 1	Ninh Binh	
Pollutant	External cost (USD/t)	Emission reductions (t/y)	Benefit (kUSD/y)	Emission reductions (t/y)	Benefits (kUSD/t)
CO ₂	1	249 474	249	44 788	45
SO ₂	3 767	68	254	244	921
PM10	5 883	2 063	12 141	362	2 133
NO _x	286	2 409	689	382	109

External costs of air pollutants are from Sakulniyomporn, Kubaha, and Chullabodhi (2011)



There is a narrow range of straw price that allow all 3 groups to benefit from co-firing in Mong Duong 1 case



There is a wide range of straw price that allow all 3 groups to benefit from co-firing in Ninh Binh case



Example of costsbenefits of co-firing

Largest benefit is the external benefits of local air quality improvement

Different price structures give benefit to different actor

Conclusions

> The WTA + transportation cost < WTP in both cases.

> The externality of co-firing straw on local air quality improvement is significant enough to justify the technology regardless the external benefit of greenhouse gas emissions reductions.

> Co-firing rice straw is more an agricultural than an energy or environmental policy.

> It's time to implement the Renewable Portfolio Standards!



Thank you for your attention!