

## Response to Consultation on Improving Boiler Efficiency Standards

Submitted by: Hydrogen Science Coalition

20/3/2023 (Updated 15/4/2023)

### Introduction

This response to the consultation on Improving Boiler Efficiency Standards is provided by members of the Hydrogen Science Coalition <https://h2sciencecoalition.com/>, which is a group of independent academics, scientists and engineers who are working to bring an evidence-based viewpoint to the heart of the hydrogen discussion.

We stand for supporting what the scientific evidence indicates, putting facts at the centre of any justification for using hydrogen in the energy transition. Our aim is to ensure that any public investments in hydrogen reflect the most effective path forward in the journey towards net-zero emissions by 2050.

Our time dedicated to the Hydrogen Science Coalition is entirely voluntary and we have no public or private vested interests in our position.

Members of the Hydrogen Science Coalition are:

- (i) Jochen Bard: Director of Energy Process Technology Division, Fraunhofer IEE
- (ii) Tom Baxter: Visiting Professor of Chemical Engineering, University of Strathclyde, Ex BP.
- (iii) David Cebon: Professor of Mechanical Engineering, University of Cambridge
- (iv) Bernard van Dijk: Airplane performance lecturer at Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences
- (v) Paul Martin: Chemical Engineer and process development expert, Canada.
- (vi) Johanne Whitemore: Senior Researcher, Chair in Energy Sector Management, HEC Montréal, Canada.

*Our response to this consultation is entirely concerned with the discussion of **hydrogen-ready boilers**. These are questions 26-38 in the consultation brief.*

### TLDR – Summary of our argument:

- (i) One of the biggest challenges in decarbonisation of the UK economy is domestic heating.
- (ii) There is **overwhelming evidence against use of hydrogen for heating** and in favour of using heat pumps and district heating networks.
- (iii) The **UK government’s current policy is that heat pumps are the best way to heat houses**. This is an environmentally-sound approach to decarbonising heating which minimises energy consumption, minimises carbon emissions and minimises operating costs.
- (iv) The ‘hydrogen-ready boilers’ provision of the Boiler Efficiency Standards bill will **stop consumers from installing heat pumps**. At the point of boiler replacement, consumers will believe that installing a hydrogen-ready boiler is sufficient action to decarbonise their heating system.
- (v) In reality, it is unlikely that hydrogen will ever be used to replace fossil gas for home heating because of its comprehensive disadvantages, particularly in terms of cost, and the necessary **large government subsidies** that will be needed to keep consumers out of energy poverty.
- (vi) Consequently, the ‘H2-ready boilers’ regulation will **undermine the existing environmentally-sound heat pump policy**.
- (vii) *All questions in the consultation brief on hydrogen-ready boilers (questions 26-38) are based on the implicit assumption that hydrogen-ready boilers will have a favourable impact on the national decarbonisation process. However, there is significant evidence that the hydrogen-ready boilers regulation will seriously damage the decarbonisation of home heating. Therefore we have not answered the specific questions in the consultation, but have focussed this document on the central issue of whether the policy to implement a hydrogen-ready boilers regulation is a good idea.*

## Summary of the Case against Hydrogen for Heating

This section summarises the case against use of hydrogen for heating homes. The evidence for the points in this Summary is provided in following sections of this document.

- (i) Promoting heat pumps is the single most important measure that could be implemented to improve the energy efficiency of the UK. It would reduce the energy cost to the economy of heating the UK's housing stock by a factor of 5.5 compared to the alternative of heating by green hydrogen boilers.
- (ii) It is unlikely that the UK could ever build a heating system based on green hydrogen. The amount of renewable electricity required and the economic costs are both implausible. Building sufficient renewable electricity generation would indefinitely delay decarbonisation of the UK economy.
- (iii) If energy for heating was delivered via blue hydrogen, the UK would need to use 45% more fossil gas for heating than if the heat was delivered by conventional gas boilers. Based on 2022 figures [1], the switch to blue hydrogen would increase the UK's natural gas imports to 66% of consumption, significantly damaging the nation's energy security. This proportion of imported gas will increase significantly in the next decade as North Sea gas production falls and the nation relies increasingly on imports.
- (iv) Heating UK homes via blue hydrogen would increase domestic gas bills by 70% to 80%.
- (v) Introduction of hydrogen into UK homes will significantly increase the risk of serious explosions and fires as well as increasing exposure to NOx emissions which pose a significant public health risk.
- (vi) There is overwhelming techno-economic **evidence against use of hydrogen** for heating buildings:
  - **There have been 32 independent studies on use of hydrogen for heating since 2019** [2], by organizations including IPCC, IEA, McKinsey, Imperial College London, Potsdam Institute, University of Manchester, Wuppertal Institute, Element Energy, the International Council on Clean Transportation, the Energy Transitions Commission, etc. **Every one of these studies** has ruled out hydrogen playing a major role in heating buildings, because it will be too expensive and inefficient compared to other clean alternatives such as heat pumps and district heating. (Five more reports have recently been added to this list in [2], taking the total number of independent reports against heating with hydrogen to 37.)
  - In a recent article in The Times, **Chris Skidmore MP** (Chair, Government's Net Zero Review) said: he "**did not think the UK should embrace the idea of repurposing gas networks to run hydrogen boilers**, a proposal that is being trialled at a pilot project at homes in Ellesmere Port in Cheshire." [3]
  - The **House of Lords Environment and Climate Change Committee** recently said: "**Hydrogen is not a realistic replacement for natural gas...It is not a serious option for heating**" [4]
  - The **House of Commons Science and Technology** Committee report, December 2022 said: "**Hydrogen is likely to play only a limited role in home heating and is not a panacea**" [5]
  - In a report in January 2022, the International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA) said "**Residential heating is the lowest priority application for hydrogen because heat pump solutions and district heating options already exist**" [6]

## What is so wrong with the proposed 'hydrogen-ready boiler' legislation?

The 'hydrogen-ready boilers' provision of the Boiler Efficiency Standards bill **will undermine the drive to install heat pumps**. At the point of replacing their conventional gas boiler (approximately once every 15 years), building-owners will be greenwashed into thinking that by installing a 'hydrogen-ready boiler' they will have done all they need to do to decarbonise their heating system and so, will install another fossil fuel boiler instead of installing a heat pump or participating in a local heating network programme.

In reality, due to the very poor case for hydrogen heating, it is most unlikely that hydrogen will ever be used to replace fossil gas for heating UK homes: because of its extremely high cost (requiring massive government subsidies), vast renewable energy requirements (for green hydrogen) excessive carbon emissions (for blue hydrogen) and serious safety issues. So, in all likelihood, **the replacement hydrogen-ready boiler will be used to burn fossil gas throughout its life.** The opportunity to replace a fossil-gas boiler with a heat pump will have been missed or at least delayed by 15 years until the hydrogen-ready boiler reaches the end of its life.

Consequently, the ‘hydrogen-ready boilers’ regulation will, at a stroke, stop consumers from installing heat pumps and will undermine the existing environmentally-sound heat pump policy. Sales of heat pumps will plummet and the opportunity to comprehensively decarbonise UK home heating will be lost.

**The ‘hydrogen-ready boilers’ measures in this bill will therefore have a detrimental effect on the UK’s decarbonisation process. It will be a completely unnecessary ‘own-goal’ for the UK’s energy transition.**

## Supporting Evidence

### *Existing Policy for Home Heating*

In 2020, the government set a target to install 600,000 heat pumps per year by 2028. There are sound environmental reasons for this policy. Heat pumps are the most efficient, lowest energy and lowest carbon way to heat buildings. According to the BEIS/DfESNZ guidance on the Energy Security Bill “[Heat pumps are] highly efficient and consume around a third of the energy of a gas boiler for the same heat output. Accelerating the transition to heat pumps therefore has a key role to play in reducing our reliance on volatile global gas markets” [7].

### *Energy Efficiency*

Energy efficiency simply means ‘using less energy to perform the same task – that is, eliminating energy waste’ [8]. Energy efficiency comes in many forms: insulating houses, reducing the energy consumption, reducing energy losses due to energy transformations and reducing energy losses in vehicles and appliances. Energy efficiency does **not** have to come at the expense of a reduction in utility or comfort. It is not a soft option. It is an essential part of minimising energy consumption and achieving a successful energy transition.

Improving energy efficiency will:

- (i) Directly reduce carbon emissions from the UK’s economy;
- (ii) Reduce the amount of renewable electricity generation needed to decarbonize the country, thereby speeding-up the energy transition;
- (iii) Reduce consumption of gas and the resulting fugitive methane and combustion CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.
- (iv) Improve the country’s energy security by reducing the need to import energy;
- (v) Improve the UK’s economy: Improving energy-efficiency will lower costs on both the household and economy-wide levels. This will improve the economy by increasing the financial headroom available for generating tax revenue from energy users.

### *Hydrogen vs electricity for heating*

The **single most important area** in which to focus energy efficiency effort is in **specifying the core mechanism for heating the UK’s housing stock.** If this is not done correctly, all subsequent efficiency gains in buildings and appliances will simply be ‘sticking plasters’ over a gaping financial wound in the economy caused by profligate waste of energy. One of **the least energy efficient processes possible** is to convert electricity into hydrogen via electrolysis and use this to heat houses.

Figure 1 compares two ways of heating the UK’s housing stock, using renewable electricity as the starting point: green hydrogen boilers and heat pumps. The widths of the pink arrows pointing upwards in the two figures show the amount of energy waste (the opposite of efficiency) in each case.

The UK’s gas consumption for domestic purposes in 2019 was 310 TWh [1]. This equates to an average national requirement for about 70GW of heat through the winter months. Both pathways modelled in the figure deliver this same amount of heat into homes at the right side of the figure. (Note that demand peaks are significantly higher than this, meaning that measures are needed to balance supply and demand. These can include: (i) demand management; (ii) overbuilding and curtailing renewables and (iii) electricity storage systems.)

The top half of Figure 1 shows that for a green hydrogen pathway, a large amount of energy is lost as waste heat (pink arrows):

- (i) during electrolysis, which is about 75% efficient;
- (ii) in compression and transmitting the hydrogen to end-use customers, which is particularly energy intensive for hydrogen [9]; and
- (iii) inefficiency of the condensing boilers that burn the hydrogen to produce heat.

The overall efficiency of the process can be determined by multiplying the individual process efficiencies:  $0.95 \times 0.75 \times 0.9 \times 0.85 \times 0.9 = 0.49$ , ie 49%. This means that to generate the 70GW of heat required on average by the UK’s housing stock,  $70/0.49 = 143\text{GW}$  of renewable electricity would be needed to power the process.

To generate 143GW of renewable electricity, approximately 367GW of installed offshore wind generating capacity would be needed. This would require a sea area of approx. 49,600 km<sup>2</sup>, shown to scale as the blue squares on the maps in figure 1, with 30,600 of the largest (12MW) wind turbines<sup>1</sup>.




Fig. 1 Providing domestic heating in the UK using either Green Hydrogen or Heat Pumps. The colours of the arrows indicate the type of energy: electricity, green hydrogen or heat. The widths of the arrows are proportional to the power flows (in units of GW). The blue boxes show scaled areas of wind turbine farms on the maps. Red polygons on the maps are existing offshore wind turbine installations, which currently total approx. 10 GW.

<sup>1</sup> This large installed capacity (367GW) would be needed because offshore wind power generation in the North Sea has a ‘power factor’ of approximately 39%, due to intermittency...  $367\text{GW} \times 0.39 = 143\text{GW}$ .

The bottom half of Figure 1 shows the more energy-efficient route of using the electricity directly to power heat pumps, located in consumer's houses. Heat pumps use electricity to transfer heat from the environment into buildings. This is measured by a 'Coefficient of Performance' (COP) which is typically around 3: ie '300% efficiency'. This means that one unit of electricity can be used to provide three units of heat. Including 10% losses in electricity transmission, the overall efficiency of the process is approximately 270%. So, to provide the same 70GW of heat to consumers' homes, only  $70/2.7=26$ GW of renewable electricity would be required. This implies an installed offshore wind capacity of approximately 67 GW, requiring a sea area of 9,000 km<sup>2</sup> with 5,600 x 12MW turbines.

This is still a very large amount of renewable electricity generation, but is only about 1/5.5 (ie 18%) of the generating capacity needed by the green hydrogen pathway. The green hydrogen solution will require 5.5 times the amount of energy of the heat pump solution, it will cost 5.5 times more to build and run, and will generate 5.5 times the carbon emissions in-use.

Consequently, consumers would have to pay 5.5 times the price for the energy to heat their homes. Alternatively, the government would have to subsidise the cost of hydrogen, which would have a permanently damaging effect on the economy. There would also be very substantial environmental impact in building and operating the turbines.

### *Renewable electricity capacity*

It is highly doubtful that 367GW of offshore wind capacity could be installed by 2050. A simple comparison of the areas of wind turbines shown to scale in Figure 1 confirms this. The current installed base of offshore wind on the Crown Estate is just 11GW, located across 38 sites (shown as red polygons in the figure). The UK's overall power consumption averaged across a year is approximately 35GW. So 367GW is more than 10 times the average annual power consumption. This is not a plausible amount of offshore wind generation under any foreseeable scenario.

### *'Clean' Hydrogen for Heating*

An alternative to green hydrogen for heating buildings might be to use so called 'clean' (blue) hydrogen, made by reforming natural (fossil) gas, and using carbon capture and storage (CCS) to dispose of the CO<sub>2</sub> in permanent geological storage. Such 'clean' hydrogen is a very poor choice for heating buildings for the following reasons:

- (i) **Rebuilding of the Gas Grid:** As explained in Appendix A, the infrastructure required to generate and transmit blue hydrogen would require rebuilding most of the NTS (gas grid) and development of CCS at scale. The latter does not exist at all in Europe and is hardly more than experimental anywhere in the world. The 'technology readiness' of the Blue Hydrogen route is therefore low, which significantly undermines its ability to be rolled-out at scale by 2050.
- (ii) **Hydrogen has a much lower energy content than natural gas** (See Appendix A). This is because stripping the carbon atoms from the methane molecule (and discarding the resulting CO<sub>2</sub>) removes a large proportion of the energy content. Consequently it takes about 45% more natural gas to heat a house via blue hydrogen than heating it directly with natural gas.
- (iii) **Using clean Hydrogen will substantially increase gas imports:** As a consequence of (ii) it will be necessary to import 143 TWh more natural gas into the UK each year, taking the imports to 66% of total consumption. This will increase dependence on overseas gas supplies, significantly degrading the nation's energy security.
- (iv) **'Clean' hydrogen will be much more expensive** for heating than natural gas. As a consequence of (ii) 45% more gas will be used for domestic purposes. This is the *minimum* amount by which the cost of heating would rise for UK consumers. However, because of the high cost of manufacturing blue

hydrogen, including the costs of the SMR and CCS processes, it will cost between 70% and 80% more to heat a house with blue hydrogen than with natural gas [10].

- (v) **Clean' hydrogen is dirty:** The UK Low Carbon Hydrogen Standard' [11] has been defined by BEIS with the aim that fossil hydrogen used in the UK should not contribute to global warming. Appendix B to this document analyses this standard. It shows that 'clean' hydrogen according to the standard will have 60% lower carbon emissions than heating with natural gas in 2022. However this isn't nearly clean enough to decarbonise heating. Consequently, **such hydrogen will become a major obstacle to decarbonising the UK economy by approximately 2030**. Because the electricity grid is continuously decreasing in carbon intensity, by 2035 a 'clean' hydrogen boiler will generate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions approximately 6.2 times higher than a heat pump run on grid electricity. The only way to prevent this situation will be to tighten the specification of the Clean Hydrogen standard significantly (See Appendix B).

## Hydrogen safety

### Risk of Explosions

Hydrogen safety in a domestic setting is seriously concerning, and this is demonstrated by the UKGOV's own published figures [12].

Hydrogen – whether blue or green - is less inherently safe than natural gas. It has a much broader explosive range, it is much more prone to leak, it has a much lower ignition energy level, it has a significantly higher flame speed, a higher flame temperature and can produce higher over-pressures on explosion.

With the aim of proving hydrogen to be as safe as natural gas from a fire and explosion standpoint, the UKGOV commissioned work package 7 of the 'Hy4Heat' programme [12]. The quantified risk analysis showed that, on a like for like basis, **hydrogen is 4 times more likely than natural gas to result in a fatality or injury to the householder**. This is clearly not consistent with the aim "to be as safe as".

To moderate the like-for-like hydrogen case, two excess flow valves must be introduced into the household hydrogen supply. These valves are designed to close if a large gas leak is experienced. The assumption is that smaller leak rates will reduce the severity of hydrogen explosions and hence cause fewer injuries. However, the results of the safety studies show that fire and explosion incidents remain 3 times more likely than with natural gas [12]. But because the explosion would be smaller, the claim is that the frequency of injury is less, resulting in an overall risk of fatality or injury (probability x consequence) that is the same as natural gas. "There will be 3x more explosions, but each explosion may be smaller than for natural gas – therefore the risk is the same". This is not a sound basis for claiming hydrogen is as safe as natural gas and the results of this analysis are therefore questionable.

### Nitrous Oxides (NOx)

A further issue associated with combusting hydrogen is the emission of nitrogen oxides. Many hydrogen proponents cite that the only product of burning hydrogen is water. That is not true, air contains nitrogen and the combustion flame temperature generates reactions where oxygen and nitrogen combine to produce NOx.

According to the DEFRA's report 'Emissions of air pollutants in the UK' [13], "Short-term exposure to concentrations of NO<sub>2</sub> can cause inflammation of the airways and increase susceptibility to respiratory infections and to allergens. NO<sub>2</sub> can exacerbate the symptoms of those already suffering from lung or heart conditions". Lebel et al [14] showed that households who don't use their cooker hods or who have poor ventilation can surpass the 1-h US national standard for NO<sub>2</sub> (100 ppb) within a few minutes of gas stove usage, particularly in smaller kitchens. Consequently, NOx emissions are a health hazard in kitchens with gas stoves.

The higher flame temperature associated with burning hydrogen than natural gas results in *higher NOx emissions*, further exacerbating the very real dangers of indoor air pollution. This further undermines the case for using hydrogen for domestic heating.



## *Decarbonise through electrification*

The efficiency and cost benefit of electricity over hydrogen for heating is due to a fundamental aspect of energy systems, governed by the laws of thermodynamics.

When water is electrolyzed to make green hydrogen it converts Thermodynamic 'Work' (electricity) into Thermodynamic 'Heat' (hydrogen). Thermodynamic heat is much less useful than thermodynamic work. It has half or less of the energy 'value'. Consequently, electrolysis discards at least half of the value of the energy.

Some consequences of this are:

- it takes 6 times more electricity to heat a house with hydrogen than to heat the same house with a heat pump, as explained above.
- it takes about 3 times more electricity to run a green-hydrogen lorry than a battery electric lorry
- energy storage systems that use green hydrogen will supply electricity to the grid at least 2 to 3 times the cost of alternative systems such as: pumped hydro-electricity, batteries or other storage systems.

The reason that the hydrogen processes are fundamentally inefficient is that large amounts of valuable energy is unavoidably wasted as low-grade heat.

The lesson that can be learned from this is that promoting inappropriate use of hydrogen is probably the worst thing that governments can do for the energy transition, because it causes so much energy to be wasted. **Someone has to pay for that wasted energy and that will end up being the national economy.** For example, government will have to subsidize the price of hydrogen to make heating and road freight transport affordable.

The government should focus on decarbonising the electricity grid and promoting electrical solutions and energy efficiency wherever possible. This is a much better strategy than wasting more than half of the energy value by first converting it into hydrogen.

Consequently, policy focus should be to *electrify everything possible*: all ground transport (cars, trucks, buses and trains), home heating, coastal and short-sea shipping, short-haul aviation, industrial processes, etc. Hydrogen should only be used when absolutely necessary: as a chemical feedstock, to make fertilizer, to process oil for plastics production, to manufacture glass and possibly for steel making.

A strategy to 'electrify everything possible' would hit many of the governments goals simultaneously:

- (i) It would be clean and green
- (ii) It would be efficient and low cost
- (iii) It would reduce primary energy consumption
- (iv) The efficiency gains would provide headroom for tax generation (eg to replace diesel excise duty) [15].
- (v) It would reduce reliance on imported energy and consequently improve energy security
- (vi) It would provide opportunities to create many new jobs to replace jobs lost from traditional UK manufacturing industries over the years. For example, jobs could be created in electric vehicle and EV charging industries; the renewable energy industry; the rooftop solar industry; electrical heating industry (heat pump manufacture and installation); as well as high tech industries involved in electrical device design, control, management, communications and digitalization, etc.

## **Appendix A – Blue Hydrogen Issues**

### *Manufacturing Blue Hydrogen*

Figure A.1 shows energy flows in the manufacture of 'Blue' Hydrogen through Steam Methane Reforming with Carbon Capture and Storage to manage the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Hot steam (H<sub>2</sub>O) is mixed with methane (CH<sub>4</sub>). This oxidises the carbon atoms to make CO<sub>2</sub> which has to be captured and stored (CCS) in permanent geological storage. The remaining hydrogen is stored, compressed and, in heating applications, transported to end users where it is burnt in a condensing hydrogen boiler.




Fig. A.1 Generation blue hydrogen by the SMR process with CCS.

### Infrastructure Requirements

Hydrogen has a significantly lower energy content per unit volume (‘Lower Calorific Value’ LCV=10.8 MJ/m<sup>3</sup>) than Methane (LCV=35.8 MJ/m<sup>3</sup>) [16]. See the top two central boxes in Fig. A.1. The factor of 35.8/10.8 = 3.3 means that transferring the same amount of energy to consumers through the NTS using Blue Hydrogen instead of Methane, at the same transmission pressure, would require all gas pipes in the system to carry 3.3 times higher volume flow rate of gas. This would require replacement of all compressors/pumping stations in the gas network with hydrogen-compatible versions having about 3 x the power rating. Furthermore, much of the gas pipeline network would have to be replaced to make it compatible with hydrogen: preventing leakage and embrittlement.

Of course, it would also be necessary to build the SMR and CCS plant to generate the hydrogen. There is no commercial-scale CCS facility in the UK. It would have to be developed and built before any blue hydrogen could be generated.

According to the [database of CCS facilities](#), run by the Global CCS Institute, there are 25 ‘commercial’ CCS facilities operational in the world today. Most of these are small scale and sequester less than 1 Mega tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> per annum (Mt/a). The sum total capacity of these plants is 38 Mt/a. The largest in the world is a plant at Shute Creek in Wyoming, USA, with a capacity of 7 Mt/a. Its CO<sub>2</sub> is injected into oil wells and the revenue from enhanced oil recovery pays the costs of running the CCS plant. To put 38 Mt/a into perspective: a total of 37 Gt of anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> was emitted by humans in 2019. So the total sequestration capacity of the world is currently 1/1000 (0.1%) of global emissions. This industry has a long way to grow to make a significant impact on global CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

A recent article by Deign [17] explains that the reason for low adoption of CCS is that there is currently no viable business case because the price of Carbon is too low:

“For carbon capture to take off in a meaningful way, companies will need to have a clear financial incentive. That means having carbon pricing comfortably above the cost of capture, usage and/or storage”



Until this situation is resolved, the only way to finance CCS plants (apart from additional oil recovery revenues) will be through government subsidies. Therefore the industry will not be able to scale to the level needed to sequester the CO<sub>2</sub> generated in the manufacture of Blue Hydrogen.

### Carbon Emissions

Carbon emissions due to the Blue Hydrogen process are not zero. Carbon capture from flue gases is not a perfect process. There are a number of available methods and technologies. In general, the higher the effectiveness of carbon capture, the more energy it takes and the less efficient the SMR process becomes [18]. Figure A.1 includes one version of the SMR+CCS process, ('SMR with CO<sub>2</sub> capture from flue gas using mono-ethanolamine'), from [18]. This is the most effective available CCS process and results in 90% of Carbon being captured from the SMR. However, this particular SMR+CCS process has an energy efficiency of only 69%. Other SMR+CCS processes have higher energy efficiencies (up to 76%) but CO<sub>2</sub> capture rates as low as 53% (ie 47% of carbon escapes into the atmosphere). See [18] for details.

The low percentage carbon capture combined with the high level of **fugitive carbon** emissions of upstream methane would make it impossible to reach the net zero carbon commitments of the UK government. The worst SMR+CCS process generates carbon emissions as high as a natural gas boiler [19].

If heat was provide by Blue Hydrogen boilers, fugitive emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> would always be significant- at least 10% of the carbon in the input methane, which would prevent 'net zero' emissions targets being reached. This contrasts with the heat pump route which would have decreasing emissions with time, reaching near zero by 2040.

### Natural gas consumption

Substantially more natural gas would need to be imported or fracked to supply the blue hydrogen process.

### Increased Gas Imports

The UK used 318TWh of gas per year for domestic purposes, mainly for heating in 2021 (Figure A.2). Increasing this by this 45% would correspond to importing or fracking an additional 143 TWh of natural gas. This would increase gas imports by 25%, from 561TWh to 704TWh. This would mean that 66% of the nation's natural gas would be imported, severely impacting energy security. (In fact, National Grid's future energy scenario sees the UK importing 100% of gas by 2040 because of depleting North Sea reserves. So the additional gas consumption for Blue Hydrogen would make the energy security situation considerably worse.)

Natural Gas Flow Chart 2021 (TWh)




Fig. A.2 Natural Gas supply and demand in the UK in 2021. Numbers indicate TerraWatt hours (TWh). From BEIS [1].

## Appendix B : The cleanliness of ‘Clean’ Hydrogen

### ‘Clean’ Hydrogen

When 1kg of hydrogen is made from methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), it generates 10-12 kg CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, ie 10-12 kgCO<sub>2</sub>/kg H<sub>2</sub>.

The Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) currently defines ‘Clean Hydrogen’ as meeting the UK Low Carbon Hydrogen Standard (UKLCHS)<sup>2</sup> [11]. For hydrogen to be considered ‘low carbon’ it must have a greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions intensity of 20g CO<sub>2</sub>e/MJLHV of produced hydrogen, or less. This is equivalent to 2.4 kg<sup>3</sup> of equivalent<sup>4</sup> CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for every kg of hydrogen, ie **2.4 kgCO<sub>2</sub>e/kg H<sub>2</sub>**. This level is approximately one quarter of the emissions released in manufacture of grey hydrogen, so it represents approximately 75% emissions reduction compared to ‘unabated’ manufacture of hydrogen.

### Green Hydrogen

An alternative definition of Clean Hydrogen is the ‘Green Hydrogen Standard’ proposed by the Green Hydrogen Organization (GH2) [20]:

“Green hydrogen is hydrogen produced through the electrolysis of water with 100% or near 100% renewable energy with close to zero greenhouse gas emissions ( $\leq 1$  kg CO<sub>2</sub>e per kg H<sub>2</sub> taken as an average over a 12-month period).” [20]

The GH2 definition of Green Hydrogen includes ‘scope 1’ emissions from production, including water treatment and desalination and ‘scope 2’ emissions from on-site or purchased renewable electricity. According to GH2, this standard is “the only option [hydrogen definition] aligned with a 1.5 degree pathway”<sup>5</sup>.

So hydrogen generated according to the Green Hydrogen standard would generate  $1.0/2.4 = 42\%$  of the emissions of hydrogen generated according to the BEIS ‘Clean hydrogen’ standard.

### Grid Hydrogen

It is commonly thought that heating using green hydrogen would be ‘clean’, ie near zero carbon. This is not likely to be correct. Even if there is sufficient electrolyser capacity available to generate the hydrogen, it will be necessary to use grid-mix electricity because there will not be sufficient renewable electricity for decades as explained above. Hydrogen made by electrolysis using ‘grid mix’ electricity is know as ‘Grid’ hydrogen in this document. It has a much higher Carbon intensity than Green hydrogen.

### Is the BEIS standard clean enough?

The problem with the BEIS ‘clean’ hydrogen standard is that it is not sufficiently ‘clean’. As the electricity grid is decarbonised with time and electrical systems become cleaner, ‘clean’ hydrogen according to the BEIS definition will rapidly become ‘dirty’ relative to all other solutions. Chemical engineering process plants that deliver products like blue hydrogen typically have a life span of 30 years. It is not economical to run them for shorter lives because of the cost of capital. The BEIS definition and approach will therefore build-in industries that rapidly become a problem to decarbonise in themselves, rather than being solutions to the energy transition.

<sup>2</sup> The BEIS definition accounts for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions up to the ‘point of production’, including feedstock supply, energy supply, input materials, process, fugitive non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, CCS process and infrastructure, CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration and compression and purification.

<sup>3</sup> The ‘Lower Heating Value’ (LHV) of hydrogen is 120 MJ/kg, so  $0.02 \text{ kg/MJ} \times 120 \text{ MJ/kg} = 2.4 \text{ kgCO}_2\text{e/kg H}_2$ .

<sup>4</sup> Equivalent CO<sub>2</sub> emissions account for the global warming potential of all greenhouse gases emitted during manufacture, not just the CO<sub>2</sub>.

<sup>5</sup> The GH2 criterion is easy to understand. Since it takes approximately 50 kWh of electricity to manufacture 1 kg of hydrogen by electrolysis, the GH2 definition implies use of electricity with a low ‘Carbon Factor’ of 20 gCO<sub>2</sub>e per kWh of electricity:  $50 \text{ kWh/kgH}_2 \times 20 \text{ gCO}_2\text{e/kWh} = 1000 \text{ gCO}_2\text{e/kg H}_2 = 1 \text{ kgCO}_2\text{e/kg H}_2$ .

An example of this issue is modelled in figure A.3. Here, various energy sources for heating homes are compared in terms of their estimated future carbon emissions.

Projections of the future carbon 'emissions intensity' of the electricity grid are published in the UK Treasury's 'Green Book' which provides 'guidance on how to appraise policies, programmes and projects' [21]. In 2022, the grid-average factor recommended by the Green book was 144 gCO<sub>2</sub>e per kWh of electricity generated. The 'emissions intensity' of the grid, was therefore measured to be 144 gCO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh. This intensity is gradually reducing as coal-fired power stations are phased out and the amount of renewable generation (wind, solar) increases. So electricity is becoming 'cleaner' with time.

The projected future carbon emissions from heating the UK's buildings can be estimated roughly using the Green Book emissions intensity divided by the 'wind-to-heat' efficiencies in figure 1. For example, in 2022 a heat pump using grid electricity generated carbon emissions of approximately 144/2.7=53 gCO<sub>2</sub> per kWh of heat delivered. As can be seen in the figure, this will fall to just 18 gCO<sub>2</sub>/kWh by 2035 due to decarbonisation of the grid.

A heating system based on 'Grid hydrogen' (ie hydrogen made by electrolysis, using electricity from the grid) will generate carbon emissions of 144/0.49=294 gCO<sub>2</sub> per kWh of heat delivered in 2022. The ratio of carbon emissions from the Grid Hydrogen boiler to the heat pump, (294/49) is the same factor of 5.5 as the ratio of energy efficiencies of the two process routes.




Figure A.3. Projected carbon emissions generated by various possible heating energy systems, based on the BEIS 'EEP 2018' carbon intensity projections [22]. The Grid hydrogen boiler, electric heater and heat pump are all assumed to run on grid-mix electricity, which is an appropriate assumption when considering UK-wide heating.

Similarly, a portable electric heater, that can be purchased from any high street department store, will have a 'wind to heat' efficiency of about 86% [23]. So in 2022, it will generate carbon emissions of 144/0.86 = 167gCO<sub>2</sub> per kWh of heat delivered. Compared to a Grid hydrogen boiler, this is 167/294 = 57%, ie a little more than half the emissions<sup>6</sup>. So if heating is to be based on electricity, a simple electric heater generates

<sup>6</sup> The same factor will apply if both the electric heater and the hydrogen boiler were powered on low carbon electricity. The electric heater will always be 57% lower than an electrolytic hydrogen boiler powered by the same electricity.

much lower carbon emissions than a hydrogen-based route. Furthermore, the electric heater is low cost, is available now, and requires no infrastructure other than possibly upgrading the existing electricity grid in places. So the case for hydrogen heating as a route to decarbonisation is difficult to justify.

Also plotted in grey on figure A.3 are the levels of carbon emissions generated by a modern condensing boiler burning natural gas, which is approximately 220 gCO<sub>2</sub> per kWh of heat delivered; a condensing boiler that burns 'clean' hydrogen according to the BEIS standard (2.4 kgCO<sub>2</sub>e/kg H<sub>2</sub>) and a condensing boiler that burns 'green' hydrogen according to the Green Hydrogen standard (1.0 kgCO<sub>2</sub>e/kg H<sub>2</sub>). These are shown as horizontal lines in figure A.3, since they are expected to stay constant with time.

Some further observations can be made from Figure A.3:

- (i) An electric heater running on grid electricity in 2022 generates approximately the same emissions as a natural gas boiler. The emissions of the electric heater will improve with time, while the emissions of the natural gas boiler will stay constant.
- (ii) Grid Hydrogen boilers have approximately 60% higher emissions than natural gas boilers in 2022.
- (iii) Grid hydrogen boilers won't reach the performance of 2022's heat pumps until nearly 2040.
- (iv) Heat generated by burning 'green' hydrogen that satisfies the GH2 standard of 1.0 kg/kg would generate emissions about half those of a heat pump in 2022, but these would be expected to stay at that level in future, whereas heat pump emissions will fall with time. By 2035, the green hydrogen boiler will generate 5.4 times higher emissions than a heat pump running on grid electricity.
- (v) Hydrogen, satisfying the BEIS 'clean' hydrogen requirement of 2.4 kg/kg will generate emissions of 94 gCO<sub>2</sub>/kWh in 2022 and this is not expected to change in future. By 2035 this will be about 13 times higher emissions than a heat pump run from grid electricity (6.8 gCO<sub>2</sub>/kWh).

Although the 'clean' hydrogen standard will give a 60% reduction in carbon emissions in 2022 compared to natural gas, by 2035 a 'clean' hydrogen boiler will be generating a completely unacceptable level of emissions, 13 times higher than the alternative heat pump solution.

It is difficult to see the current BEIS 'clean' hydrogen standard as a real pathway to net zero by 2050, because it will never be better than 60% improvement on a natural gas boiler.

## References

1. Anon. *Energy Efficiency*. 2022; Available from: <https://www.eesi.org/topics/energy-efficiency/description#:~:text=Energy%20efficiency%20simply%20means%20using,household%20and%20economy%2Dwide%20level>.
2. Anon. *Digest of United Kingdom Energy Statistics (DUKES), 2020, 2020*, Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy; Available from: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/924591/DUKES\\_2020\\_MASTER.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/924591/DUKES_2020_MASTER.pdf).
3. Bossel, U., *Does a Hydrogen Economy Make Sense? Proc. IEEE*, 2006. **94**(10): p. 1826-1837. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1109/JPROC.2006.883715>.
4. Patel, J., et al. *Hydrogen Costs, 2022*; Available from: <https://www.cornwall-insight.com/mcs-charitable-foundation-hydrogen-costs/>.
5. Anon. *UK Low Carbon Hydrogen Standard, 2022*, Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS); Available from: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1092809/low-carbon-hydrogen-standard-guidance-v2.1.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1092809/low-carbon-hydrogen-standard-guidance-v2.1.pdf).
6. Anon. *Hy4Heat Project - Work Package 7: Safety Assessment, 2022*, Hy4Heat Project; Available from: <https://www.hy4heat.info/wp7>.
7. Anon. *Emissions of air pollutants in the UK – Nitrogen oxides (NOx), 2022*, Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs: London; Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/emissions-of-air-pollutants/emissions-of-air-pollutants-in-the-uk-nitrogen-oxides-nox>.
8. Lebel, E.D., et al., *Methane and NOx Emissions from Natural Gas Stoves, Cooktops, and Ovens in Residential Homes. Environ Sci Technol*, 2022. **56**: p. 2529-2539. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c04707>.

9. Rosenow, J., *Is heating homes with hydrogen all but a pipe dream? An evidence review*. *Joule*, 2022. **6**(10): p. 2225-2228. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joule.2022.08.015>.
10. Ainalis, D., C. Thorne, and D. Cebon. *White Paper: Decarbonising the UK's Long-Haul Road Freight at Minimum Economic Cost*. Technical Report: CUED/C-SRF/TR 017, ISSN: 2054-4081., 2020, Centre for Sustainable Road Freight: Cambridge. p. 27pp; Available from: <https://www.csrf.ac.uk/outputs/decarbonising-the-uks-long-haul-road-freight-at-minimum-economic-cost/>.
11. Anon. *The Engineering Toolbox*, 2022; Available from: <https://www.engineeringtoolbox.com/index.html>.
12. Deign, J. *Carbon Capture: Silver Bullet or Mirage?* *Greentech Media* 2020; Available from: <https://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/no-clearer-if-carbon-capture-is-silver-bullet-or-mirage>.
13. Collodi, G., et al., *Techno-economic Evaluation of Deploying CCS in SMR Based Merchant H<sub>2</sub> Production with NG as Feedstock and Fuel*. *Energy Procedia*, 2017. **114**: p. 2690-2712. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2017.03.1533>.
14. Howarth, R.W. and M.Z. Jacobson, *How green is blue hydrogen?* *Energy Science and Engineering*, 2021. **9**: p. 1676-1687. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/ese3.956>.
15. Mettrick, A. and D. Ying. *Digest of UK Energy Statistics (DUKES) - Chapter 4, 2022*, BEIS: HMSO; Available from: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1094421/DUKES\\_2022\\_Chapter\\_4.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1094421/DUKES_2022_Chapter_4.pdf).
16. Anon. *The Green Hydrogen Standard*, 2022, Green Hydrogen Organisation, GH<sub>2</sub>; Available from: [https://gh2.org/sites/default/files/2022-05/GH2\\_Standard\\_2022\\_A5\\_11%20May%202022\\_FINAL\\_REF%20ONLY%20%281%29.pdf](https://gh2.org/sites/default/files/2022-05/GH2_Standard_2022_A5_11%20May%202022_FINAL_REF%20ONLY%20%281%29.pdf).
17. Anon. *Updated energy and emissions projections, 2018, 2019*, Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS): London; Available from: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/794590/updated-energy-and-emissions-projections-2018.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/794590/updated-energy-and-emissions-projections-2018.pdf)
18. Cebon, D. *Hydrogen for heating? 2020* [cited 2022 28 Sept, 2020]; Available from: <https://www.csrf.ac.uk/blog/hydrogen-for-heating/>.

## Further Information

For further information on this briefing, please contact:

Professor David Cebon FEng, FIMechE  
 Cambridge University Engineering Department  
 Trumpington St, Cambridge, CB2 1PZ, UK  
 Tel: +44-1223-332665  
 Email: [dc29@cam.ac.uk](mailto:dc29@cam.ac.uk)

## References

1. Mettrick, A. and D. Ying. *Digest of UK Energy Statistics (DUKES) - Chapter 4, 2022*, BEIS: HMSO; Available from: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1094421/DUKES\\_2022\\_Chapter\\_4.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1094421/DUKES_2022_Chapter_4.pdf).
2. Rosenow, J., *Is heating homes with hydrogen all but a pipe dream? An evidence review*. *Joule*, 2022. **6**(10): p. 2225-2228. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joule.2022.08.015>.
3. Skidmore, C., 'Scrap planning rules for solar panels, says energy tsar: Net-zero report calls for a 'rooftop revolution'', in *The Times*. 2023: London.
4. Oliver, M., *Hydrogen not a realistic replacement for natural gas, warn Lords*, in *The Telegraph*. 2022: London.
5. Anon. *The role of hydrogen in achieving Net Zero, 2022*, UK Parliament, House of Commons Science and Technology Committee: London; Available from: <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/33292/documents/180198/default/>.
6. Anon. *Geopolitics of the Energy Transformation: The Hydrogen Factor*, 2022, IRENA: Abu Dhabi; Available from: <https://www.irena.org/publications/2022/Jan/Geopolitics-of-the-Energy-Transformation-Hydrogen>.



7. Anon. Energy Security Bill factsheet: Low-carbon heat scheme. 2023 20th March, 2023 20th March, 2023]; Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/energy-security-bill-factsheets/energy-security-bill-factsheet-low-carbon-heat-scheme>.
8. Anon. Energy Efficiency. 2022; Available from: <https://www.eesi.org/topics/energy-efficiency/description#:~:text=Energy%20efficiency%20simply%20means%20using,household%20and%20economy%2Dwide%20level>.
9. Bossel, U., Does a Hydrogen Economy Make Sense? Proc. IEEE, 2006. **94**(10): p. 1826-1837. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1109/JPROC.2006.883715>.
10. Patel, J., et al. Hydrogen Costs, 2022; Available from: <https://www.cornwall-insight.com/mcs-charitable-foundation-hydrogen-costs/>.
11. Anon. UK Low Carbon Hydrogen Standard, 2022, Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS); Available from: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1092809/low-carbon-hydrogen-standard-guidance-v2.1.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1092809/low-carbon-hydrogen-standard-guidance-v2.1.pdf).
12. Anon. Hy4Heat Project - Work Package 7: Safety Assessment, 2022, Hy4Heat Project; Available from: <https://www.hy4heat.info/wp7>.
13. Anon. Emissions of air pollutants in the UK – Nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), 2022, Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs: London; Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/emissions-of-air-pollutants/emissions-of-air-pollutants-in-the-uk-nitrogen-oxides-nox>.
14. Lebel, E.D., et al., Methane and NO<sub>x</sub> Emissions from Natural Gas Stoves, Cooktops, and Ovens in Residential Homes. Environ Sci Technol, 2022. **56**: p. 2529-2539. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c04707>.
15. Ainalis, D., C. Thorne, and D. Cebon. White Paper: Decarbonising the UK's Long-Haul Road Freight at Minimum Economic Cost. Technical Report: CUED/C-SRF/TR 017, ISSN: 2054-4081., 2020, Centre for Sustainable Road Freight: Cambridge. p. 27pp; Available from: <https://www.csrf.ac.uk/outputs/decarbonising-the-uks-long-haul-road-freight-at-minimum-economic-cost/>.
16. Anon. The Engineering Toolbox, 2022; Available from: <https://www.engineeringtoolbox.com/index.html>.
17. Deign, J. Carbon Capture: Silver Bullet or Mirage? Greentech Media 2020; Available from: <https://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/no-clearer-if-carbon-capture-is-silver-bullet-or-mirage>.
18. Collodi, G., et al., Techno-economic Evaluation of Deploying CCS in SMR Based Merchant H<sub>2</sub> Production with NG as Feedstock and Fuel. Energy Procedia, 2017. **114**: p. 2690-2712. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2017.03.1533>.
19. Howarth, R.W. and M.Z. Jacobson, How green is blue hydrogen? Energy Science and Engineering, 2021. **9**: p. 1676-1687. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/ese3.956>.
20. Anon. The Green Hydrogen Standard, 2022, Green Hydrogen Organisation, GH<sub>2</sub>; Available from: [https://gh2.org/sites/default/files/2022-05/GH2\\_Standard\\_2022\\_A5\\_11%20May%202022\\_FINAL\\_REF%20ONLY%20%281%29.pdf](https://gh2.org/sites/default/files/2022-05/GH2_Standard_2022_A5_11%20May%202022_FINAL_REF%20ONLY%20%281%29.pdf).
21. Anon. The Green Book (2022), Section 15, Supplementary Guidance: valuation of energy use and greenhouse gas emissions for appraisal, 'Data Tables 1 to 19: supporting the toolkit and the guidance'. (Table 1), 2022, HM Treasury; Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/valuation-of-energy-use-and-greenhouse-gas-emissions-for-appraisal>.
22. Anon. Updated energy and emissions projections, 2018, 2019, Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS): London; Available from: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/794590/updated-energy-and-emissions-projections-2018.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/794590/updated-energy-and-emissions-projections-2018.pdf)
23. Cebon, D. Hydrogen for heating? 2020 [cited 2022 28 Sept, 2020]; Available from: <https://www.csrf.ac.uk/blog/hydrogen-for-heating/>.