



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Levelized Cost of Electricity with Storage Degradation*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/132105/>

Version: Publishers draft (with formatting)

Proceedings Paper:

Lai, CS orcid.org/0000-0002-4169-4438, Locatelli, G, Pimm, A et al. (2 more authors)
(Accepted: 2018) Levelized Cost of Electricity with Storage Degradation. In: Proceedings of Offshore Energy and Storage 2018. Offshore Energy and Storage Summit 2018 (OSSES2018), 04-06 Jul 2018, Ningbo, China. . (Unpublished)

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Levelized Cost of Electricity with Storage Degradation

Chun Sing Lai, Giorgio Locatelli*

*School of Civil Engineering, Faculty of Engineering
University of Leeds
Leeds, LS2 9JT, United Kingdom*

Andrew Pimm

*School of Chemical and Process Engineering, Faculty of Engineering
University of Leeds
Leeds, LS2 9JT, United Kingdom*

Xuecong Li*, Loi Lei Lai

*Department of Electrical Engineering, School of Automation
Guangdong University of Technology
Guangzhou, 510006, China*

Abstract

Electrochemical Energy Storage (EES) will be a crucial asset to support the increasing high penetrations of intermittent renewables and to provide means for energy arbitrage. In investment perspective, the economics of energy systems with EES can be challenging to appraise due to not being an electrical generator. This work investigates the impact on Levelized Cost of Electricity (LCOE) with EES degradation cost. Here, a Kenyan energy system consisting of Photovoltaic (PV), Anaerobic Digestion biogas power plant (AD) and EES is used as a case study with EES energy capital cost at 200 \$/kWh. This paper begins by providing an overview of lithium-ion storage and its studies in energy systems. Sensitivity analysis is conducted for various PV and EES capacity to examine the LCOE with and without degradation cost. For more accurate economic analysis, the future research areas are identified as follows: techno-economic analysis needs to consider storage degradation at different operating conditions; and storage degradation models that consider various temperature, C-rate and State of Charge, calendar ageing are required. When comparing energy storage options, cell degradation for EES is an important factor to be addressed in the techno-economic analysis for Generation Integrated Energy Storage (GIES) and non-GIES systems.

1. Introduction

More and more energy systems heavily rely on non-dispatchable intermittent renewables, such as solar photovoltaic and wind energy. Electrochemical Energy Storage (EES) can possibly store the surplus generation that produced by renewables and is dispatched at a later time. This effectively smooths the energy system operation by acting as an additional generator or load, and to better utilize the surplus generation and reducing power curtailment [1]. Due to the quick response time, e.g. milliseconds with EES, the short-term negative phenomena such as over/under frequency and voltage dip/surge that appear in a power system can be relieved by releasing or absorbing energy from the storage system. With the inclusion of EES, State of Charge (SOC) and Depth of Discharge (DOD) have been considered in hybrid energy systems optimal planning and operation [2-6].

It is crucial to fully comprehend the amount of energy that can be stored and called upon at any time instance when storage is included in an energy system. Due to numerous parameters with the most prominent ones such as temperature, C-rate and change in SOC that may affect the storage's state of health, e.g. normalized discharge capacity; a comprehensive model that quantifies the capacity and power fade is challenging [7]. References [7, 8] provide a technical discussion on the mechanisms that cause cell degradations for Li-ion, affecting the electrolyte, electrodes, separator and the current collectors. It is worth mentioning that our work is not intended to provide a deep technical discussion on the battery degradation process and its chemistry. The techno-economic analysis for a hybrid energy system with battery degradation is the focus of this work.

Several storage options are available ranging from mechanical, electrical, electrochemical, chemical and thermal storage systems [9]. Unlike EES, storage degradation may be negligible in certain types of energy storage such as molten salt or gravel thermal storage. These thermal storages can store thermal energy without causing permanent material structure and properties changes. When connecting energy storage with electricity generators, storage systems can be classified as Generation Integrated Energy Storage (GIES) and non-GIES systems [10]. GIES 'combines' energy storage with the electricity generator by storing energy in primary form. An example of GIES system is storing thermal energy produced by concentrating solar power in thermal storage. This class of system may increase the overall

*corresponding authors, g.locatelli@leeds.ac.uk; leexuecong@126.com

conversion efficiency and reduces costs. As such, it may be a better option than using EES. However, thermal storage may not have a response time that matches EES. Therefore, when comparing storage options, technical and economic properties need to be compared and accounted for in a non-bias approach.

In the techno-economic analysis, Levelized Cost of Electricity (LCOE) is widely used to compare generation cost for an asset or system [11]. However, the context and parameters that compute the LCOE need to be clearly clarified otherwise an unfair comparison will be made. In light of this, this paper examines the LCOE for a hybrid energy system with accounting the storage degradation costs. Section 2 provides an overview of the techno-economic analysis with EES for energy systems and Electric Vehicles (EVs), with an emphasis on Li-ion. Section 3 presents the context of hybrid energy system operation, with case studies including and excluding degradation cost on LCOE analysis. Conclusions will be given in Section 4 with the inclusion of the future works.

2. Techno-economic Analysis with Energy Storage Degradation

EES has been used extensively in many electronic and electrical applications such as mobile phones, laptops, and uninterrupted power supply systems. In the recent decades, EES has been extended to the high energy and power density applications such as EVs and electricity grids.

In the realm of EVs, one of the key issues arose in wide adoption over the traditional diesel and petrol vehicles is the degradation, e.g. capacity loss, performance reduction and timely replacements of battery packs [12-14]. Reduced mileage range and impedance raise from battery's accessible power output will be the consequence of battery degradation in EVs. The quantitative analysis of costs and risks associated with accelerated EV battery degradation needs additional efforts, such as for vehicle-to-grid applications [13]. The challenge is on the variability working conditions of EV batteries, which is directly related to the driver's behaviour. This is also accompanied by the dynamic battery temperature influenced by solar radiation, ambient temperature, heat generated from chemical reactions in battery cycling, electrical resistance and friction of mechanical components. The work in [13] has provided a methodology to quantify the EV battery degradation with different vehicle-to-grid services. In addition to the detailed EV powertrain model and battery thermal model, it adopted a semi-empirical Li-ion cell capacity fade model for the degradation analysis. The trade-off for the vehicle to provide grid services with maximum value with minimal impact on vehicle battery life was identified.

Storage degradation has a significant impact on the storage performance. It affects the cell's capability to hold energy and meet electrical demands [7]. Lithium-ion (Li-ion) cells degrade due to the operation, i.e. charging and discharging and environmental conditions exposure. The degradation can be classified as cycle-life degradation and calendar ageing, describes as follows [13, 15, 16]:

- Cycle-life degradation: Cycle-life loss is caused by storage operation, which is a function of charge/discharge rate, i.e. C-rate, temperature, and energy throughput. The degradation is caused by mechanical strain in the lithium plating or electrode active materials. This is promoted by deep discharges, high C-rate, temperature, and energy throughput. As such, LiFePO_4 storage can potentially achieve 2100 cycles at 30% DOD or 670 cycles at 90% DOD [17].
- Calendar ageing: This class of degradation is independent of charge-discharge cycling. Calendar ageing is largely caused by time and temperature exposure. This is due to the change in passivation layers at the electrode-electrolyte interfaces. This is encouraged by high SOCs and operating temperatures.

In a techno-economic analysis for grid applications storage systems, the cost and revenue can be broken down into four categories [18], namely:

- Monetary savings and profits: Revenues or savings accumulated based on power, energy or reliability related applications;
- Investment cost: Direct storage cost such as a battery, casing, and electrolyte. In addition, the grid coupling cost such as the transformers and power electronics;
- Operational cost: Indirect cost such as conversion losses due to component's efficiency, auxiliary consumptions such as thermal management systems, and direct operational cost such as labour and insurance; and
- Degradation and replacement cost: Battery performance degradation due to increased resistance and capacity fade, and fatigued materials replacement cost for battery and power electronics. Replacement cost needs to be taken into account as the unit of analysis is the hybrid system.

Due to the complex chemical and physical mechanisms of battery degradation, this phenomenon is considered as a restricted level in the techno-economic analysis [19]. Recently, HOMER Energy has provided the Advanced Storage Module which can personalize a storage system and takes the changes in storage capacity with temperature and variable DOD for cycle-life [20]. The prominent energy system packages HOMER Energy and RETScreen do not provide Levelized cost of storage studies, which may be useful in comparing storage options particularly the “energy delivery” lifetime cost in \$/kWh [21, 22]. LCOE allows comparing electricity generation sources and systems. LCOE is used in offshore wind energy system studies [23, 24]. In [25], a case study for offshore wind farm in Switzerland is provided. Currently, the use of natural gas as a bridging fuel for intermittent generation gives ineligible cost savings. Technology cost uncertainties largely affect the cost and benefit. It is identified that currently, seldom research work has been conducted on the techno-economic analysis for energy storage in offshore energy systems [26].

An energy system typically operates for a long lifetime, such as a PV system may last for 25 years [27]. As such, LCOE includes a discount rate that converts the future cash flows into the present value. A classical formulation of LCOE is [21]:

$$\text{LCOE} = \frac{C_{\text{cap}} + \sum_{n=0}^N \frac{C_{\text{O\&M}_n}}{(1+d)^n}}{\sum_{n=0}^N \frac{E_n}{(1+d)^n}} \quad (1)$$

Where C_{cap} is the capital cost (\$), assumed all spent at year zero, $C_{\text{O\&M}}$ is the operational and maintenance cost (\$), E is the energy output (kWh), N is the system lifetime in years, and d is the discount rate. The cost of an asset typically consists of fixed capital cost and variable operational and maintenance cost. The energy output of an asset is typically calculated with an annual average value in kWh or capacity factor at %. As depicted in Eq. (1), one of the key challenges in calculating the LCOE will be to identify the costs and energy produced.

3. Case Studies for System LCOE with Storage Degradation

The hybrid system adopted for the case studies is a hybrid energy system consisting of the AD, EES, and PV in [17]. Since the dispatchable sources are AD and EES, there is an option to meet the energy demand by operating AD or to discharge EES. The operating regime proposed in [17] uses a threshold indicator that will prioritize the dispatch of EES when the battery is above a predefined SOC, namely $\text{SOC}_{\text{Threshold}}$. Same as [17], the study interval is at 15min/sample for 22 years of Kenya Turkwel Gorge Dam irradiance data.

In this case study, the discount rate is at 6 % [21, 27], PV capital cost at 0.36 \$/W [28]. The capital cost for EES can reach 200 \$/kWh within the next decade [29]. The AD rated capacity is at 2.4 MW with a Kenyan load curve at 2 MW peak [17]. The cost and technical parameters for the system can be found in [17]. To frequently cycle the storage system a $\text{SOC}_{\text{Threshold}}$ at 30% is used. The lifetime characteristics of the LiCoO₂ employed in this work, including the anticipated cycle life for the cycling range can be found in [17, 30]. All cost assumptions are presented in Table 2 in [17], unless predefined in this paper. The replacement is calculated from the degradation cost, it is assumed that a replacement needs to take place once the accumulated degradation cost is equal to the storage capital cost.

The SOC constraints are enforced and the power balance is achieved in the operating regime. For the case where degradation cost is not considered, $C_{\text{EES DegkWh}}$ is not included in the LCOE. The mathematical formulation for obtaining the degradation cost via a capacity fade model can be found in [17]. A fixed ‘operational cost’ is assigned for storage energy discharge at 0.42 \$/MWh [17]. In this work, System LCOE refers to the LCOE for the hybrid system which considers the lifetime system, i.e. PV, AD, EES, inverters and charge controllers costs and energy productions that meets the energy demand. The mathematical modelling for the cost and energy calculations can be found in [17].

3.1 Sensitivity Analysis on PV and EES Rated Capacities

This case study aims to understand the System LCOE at different energy storage capacity in MWh, and PV rated capacity in MW when degradation cost is considered. EES energy capital cost is at 200 \$/kWh. Figures 1 and 2 depict the results for the System LCOE when degradation is considered and not considered respectively. The System LCOE is higher when degradation cost is included. For both cases, the minimal LCOE is achieved when no storage is installed and have a 1.5 MW to 2.5 MW of PV rated capacity. The low capital cost and negligible marginal cost for PV can offset the biogas fuel cost. Storing the surplus energy produced by PV for later use is not the most economic solution, this may be due to the capital cost and degradation cost for EES. The maximal LCOE occurs when PV rated capacity

is at 9.5 MW with EES at rated energy capacity at 0.5 MWh. This may be due to the waste of surplus energy produced by PV that is not utilized, but the high capital cost exists. When degradation cost is not considered as shown in Figure 2, the nonlinear mathematical relationship between cycle-life degradation (cycles) and cost (\$) is excluded in the techno-economic analysis. When degradation cost is included, high EES rated capacity can give a high LCOE which is not reflected in the case when degradation cost is not included.




Figure 1. System LCOE with degradation cost considered




Figure 2. System LCOE with degradation cost not considered

3.2 Sensitivity Analysis on SOC Threshold

This case study aims to understand how the dispatch priority for EES will affect the LCOE when degradation cost is considered. The PV rated capacity is at 5 MW, and the EES energy capacity is at 5 MWh [17]. Figure 3 presents the results for the sensitivity analysis with various $SOC_{Threshold}$. The diamond and circle symbols denote the maximum and minimum LCOE respectively.




Figure 3. System LCOE studies with various $SOC_{Threshold}$

The maximal and minimal LCOEs locate at similar $SOC_{Threshold}$ for both studies. It is observed that the minimal LCOE is achieved when $SOC_{Threshold}$ is at 20-30%, indicating frequent storage usage is ideal. The LCOE increases when the $SOC_{Threshold}$ value further reduces, this may be explained by the cost incurred with AD dispatch when EES SOC is too low. It is not possible to discharge the EES when system energy deficit occurs. If degradation is not taken into account, the frequent usage of storage is ideal since it maximizes the use of asset and the “fuel cost” for storage is minimal as compared to other energy sources, since the marginal cost for PV is close to zero.

4. Conclusions

The accurate determination of energy system’s cost, risk and energy production is a complicated task [31]. This challenge is elevated when energy storage is included. Comprehensive capacity fade models that include different temperature, C-rate and charge/discharge cycles, and calendar ageing will increase techno-economic analysis accuracy when electrochemical storage is used. This work shows that degradation can affect the techno-economic analysis for electrochemical storages.

Future work will look into developing techno-economic models for each storage type, e.g. mechanical, electrochemical, thermal that takes the technical attributes into consideration, e.g. discharge rate and degradation. A comparison of different Li-ion storage technologies such as $LiFePO_4$, $LiPo$ etc. on the LCOE will be an interesting study. This will require the corresponding cell degradation models. The energy system context, e.g. frequency regulation, load leveling will be highly relevant on deciding the storage type. As such, an area for future work would be a model for comparison on using thermal storage or EES for alleviating grid issues. How storage is integrated with generation will influence the overall economics due to energy efficiency.

Acknowledgements

This work is supported by EPSRC Grant “GIES: Generation Integrated Energy Storage: A Paradigm Shift” (EP/P022049/1); Department of Finance and Education of Guangdong Province 2016[202]; Key Discipline Construction Program, China; and Education Department of Guangdong Province: New and Integrated Energy System Theory and Technology Research Group [Project Number 2016KCXTD022]. Discussions with Dr. Daniel J. Rogers

and Professor Richard McMahon are very much appreciated. The authors thank the anonymous reviewers for their comments.

References

- [1] G. Locatelli, E. Palma, and M. Mancini, "Assessing the economics of large Energy Storage Plants with an optimisation methodology," *Energy*, vol. 83, pp. 15-28, 2015.
- [2] Z. Zhang, J. Wang, and X. Wang, "An improved charging/discharging strategy of lithium batteries considering depreciation cost in day-ahead microgrid scheduling," *Energy Conversion and Management*, vol. 105, pp. 675-684, 2015.
- [3] J. Sachs and O. Sawodny, "A two-stage model predictive control strategy for economic diesel-pv-battery island microgrid operation in rural areas," *IEEE Transactions on Sustainable Energy*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 903-913, 2016.
- [4] A.-S. Hamed and A. Rajabi-Ghahnavieh, "Explicit degradation modelling in optimal lead–acid battery use for photovoltaic systems," *IET Generation, Transmission & Distribution*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 1098-1106, 2016.
- [5] E. Hittinger, T. Wiley, J. Kluza, and J. Whitacre, "Evaluating the value of batteries in microgrid electricity systems using an improved Energy Systems Model," *Energy Conversion and Management*, vol. 89, pp. 458-472, 2015.
- [6] B. Zhou, X. Liu, Y. Cao, C. Li, C. Y. Chung, and K. W. Chan, "Optimal scheduling of virtual power plant with battery degradation cost," *IET Generation, Transmission & Distribution*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 712-725, 2016.
- [7] C. R. Birkl, M. R. Roberts, E. McTurk, P. G. Bruce, and D. A. Howey, "Degradation diagnostics for lithium ion cells," *Journal of Power Sources*, vol. 341, pp. 373-386, 2017.
- [8] S. F. Schuster *et al.*, "Nonlinear aging characteristics of lithium-ion cells under different operational conditions," *Journal of Energy Storage*, vol. 1, pp. 44-53, 2015.
- [9] X. Luo, J. Wang, M. Dooner, and J. Clarke, "Overview of current development in electrical energy storage technologies and the application potential in power system operation," *Applied Energy*, vol. 137, pp. 511-536, 2015.
- [10] S. D. Garvey *et al.*, "On generation-integrated energy storage," *Energy Policy*, vol. 86, pp. 544-551, 2015.
- [11] S. B. Darling, F. You, T. Veselka, and A. Velosa, "Assumptions and the levelized cost of energy for photovoltaics," *Energy & Environmental Science*, vol. 4, no. 9, pp. 3133-3139, 2011.
- [12] M. Safari, "Battery electric vehicles: Looking behind to move forward," *Energy Policy*, vol. 115, pp. 54-65, 2018.
- [13] D. Wang, J. Coignard, T. Zeng, C. Zhang, and S. Saxena, "Quantifying electric vehicle battery degradation from driving vs. vehicle-to-grid services," *Journal of Power Sources*, vol. 332, pp. 193-203, 2016.
- [14] S. Saxena, C. Le Floch, J. MacDonald, and S. Moura, "Quantifying EV battery end-of-life through analysis of travel needs with vehicle powertrain models," *Journal of Power Sources*, vol. 282, pp. 265-276, 2015.
- [15] P. Keil *et al.*, "Calendar aging of lithium-ion batteries I. impact of the graphite anode on capacity fade," *Journal of The Electrochemical Society*, vol. 163, no. 9, pp. A1872-A1880, 2016.
- [16] S. Pelletier, O. Jabali, G. Laporte, and M. Veneroni, "Battery degradation and behaviour for electric vehicles: Review and numerical analyses of several models," *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, vol. 103, pp. 158-187, 2017.
- [17] C. S. Lai *et al.*, "Levelized cost of electricity for photovoltaic/biogas power plant hybrid system with electrical energy storage degradation costs," *Energy Conversion and Management*, vol. 153, pp. 34-47, 2017.
- [18] H. C. Hesse, M. Schimpe, D. Kucevic, and A. Jossen, "Lithium-ion battery storage for the grid—A review of stationary battery storage system design tailored for applications in modern power grids," *Energies*, vol. 10, no. 12, p. 2107, 2017.
- [19] C. Bordin, H. O. Anuta, A. Crossland, I. L. Gutierrez, C. J. Dent, and D. Vigo, "A linear programming approach for battery degradation analysis and optimization in offgrid power systems with solar energy integration," *Renewable Energy*, vol. 101, pp. 417-430, 2017.
- [20] Advanced Storage Module, HOMER Energy, [Online]. Available: <https://www.homerenergy.com/products/pro/modules/advanced-storage.html>.
- [21] C. S. Lai and M. D. McCulloch, "Levelized cost of electricity for solar photovoltaic and electrical energy storage," *Applied Energy*, vol. 190, pp. 191-203, 2017.
- [22] V. Jülch, "Comparison of electricity storage options using levelized cost of storage (LCOS) method," *Applied Energy*, vol. 183, pp. 1594-1606, 2016.

- [23] S. Abdelhady, D. Borello, and A. Shaban, "Assessment of levelized cost of electricity of offshore wind energy in Egypt," *Wind Engineering*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 160-173, 2017.
- [24] G. Nagababu, S. S. Kachhwaha, and V. Savsani, "Estimation of technical and economic potential of offshore wind along the coast of India," *Energy*, vol. 138, pp. 79-91, 2017.
- [25] P. Díaz, O. van Vliet, and A. Patt, "Do we need gas as a bridging fuel? A case study of the electricity system of Switzerland," *Energies*, vol. 10, no. 7, p. 861, 2017.
- [26] A. J. Pimm, S. D. Garvey, and M. de Jong, "Design and testing of energy bags for underwater compressed air energy storage," *Energy*, vol. 66, pp. 496-508, 2014.
- [27] C. S. Lai and M. D. McCulloch, "Sizing of stand-alone solar PV and storage system with anaerobic digestion biogas power plants," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 2112-2121, 2017.
- [28] R. M. Swanson, "A vision for crystalline silicon photovoltaics," *Progress in photovoltaics: Research and Applications*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 443-453, 2006.
- [29] C. S. Lai, Y. Jia, L. L. Lai, Z. Xu, M. D. McCulloch, and K. P. Wong, "A comprehensive review on large-scale photovoltaic system with applications of electrical energy storage," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 78, pp. 439-451, 2017.
- [30] S. Saxena, C. Hendricks, and M. Pecht, "Cycle life testing and modeling of graphite/LiCoO₂ cells under different state of charge ranges," *Journal of Power Sources*, vol. 327, pp. 394-400, 2016.
- [31] G. Locatelli, D. C. Invernizzi, and M. Mancini, "Investment and risk appraisal in energy storage systems: A real options approach," *Energy*, vol. 104, pp. 114-131, 2016.