



Deposited via The University of Leeds.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/182024/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Bhagaloo, K, Ali, R, Baboolal, A et al. (2022) Powering the sustainable transition with geothermal energy: A case study on Dominica. *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, 51. 101910. ISSN: 2213-1388

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seta.2021.101910>

---

© 2021, Elsevier. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

**Reuse**

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

**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](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



# 1 **Powering the Sustainable Transition with Geothermal Energy: A** 2 **Case Study on Dominica.**

3 **Keeara Bhagaloo<sup>a</sup>, Rehannah Ali<sup>a</sup>, Anastasia Baboolal<sup>a</sup> and Keeran Ward<sup>\*a, b</sup>**

4 <sup>a</sup>Department of Chemical Engineering, The University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad and  
5 Tobago.

6 <sup>b</sup>School of Chemical and Process Engineering (SCAPE), University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, United  
7 Kingdom. Telephone: 1-868-730-1980; [keeran.ward@sta.uwi.edu](mailto:keeran.ward@sta.uwi.edu);

## 8 **Abstract**

9 Climate change impacts continue to threaten the islands within the Caribbean where guidance on  
10 achieving a sustainable energy transition is relatively absent. Thus, we present for the first time,  
11 multiple decision criteria utilizing techno-economic and environmental assessments to inform on  
12 the hidden benefits of the geothermal rich nation of Dominica. In determining the most sustainable  
13 option for Dominica to deploy its geothermal energy capacity, several cases were explored using  
14 current and future levelized electricity (LCOE) costs, product annualized costs (TAC) and life  
15 cycle assessments (LCA). Our results highlight a 99.5% reduction in national life cycle GHG  
16 emissions, coupled with 70% cheaper power by 2030 exploiting 100% geothermal energy.  
17 Furthermore, excess energy storage platforms through methanol and ammonia production showed  
18 increased financial and environmental benefits in 2030, with a 38% reduction in TAC and avoided  
19 burdens as high as 149,000 CO<sub>2</sub>-eq/year observed. Nevertheless, the most sustainable outcome for  
20 Dominica was revealed through energy exportation to neighbouring islands-avoiding up to 2.5  
21 million tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>-eq/year while producing 20% cheaper dispatchable power. Although this  
22 energy transition accompanies high capital investment, our results confirm sustainable operations  
23 and illustrate the potential for geothermal activity in supporting clean and affordable energy  
24 production across the Eastern Caribbean Region.

25 **Keywords:** Geothermal Energy, Small Island Developing States, Sustainable Energy, Techno-  
26 economics, Life Cycle Assessment.

# 1 **Nomenclature**

- 2 AFC- Annualised Fixed Cost
- 3 bbl- Barrel of oil
- 4 BAU- Business as Usual
- 5 CAPEX- Capital Costs
- 6 CARICOM- Caribbean Community and Common Market
- 7 CEPCI- Chemical Engineering Cost Indices
- 8 DAC- Direct Air Capture
- 9 FC- Fixed Costs
- 10 FU- Functional unit
- 11 GDP- Gross Domestic Product
- 12 GHG - Greenhouse gases
- 13 INDC- Intended Nationally Determined Contribution
- 14 LCA- Life Cycle Assessment
- 15 LCI- Life Cycle Inventories
- 16 LCIA- Life Cycle Impact Assessment
- 17 LCOE- Levelized Cost of Electricity
- 18 LCOE2019 – Levelized Cost of Electricity (2019)
- 19 LCOE2030- Levelized Cost of Electricity (2030)
- 20 LCOEDom – Levelized Cost of Electricity for Dominica
- 21 LCOEMar – Levelized Cost of Electricity for Martinique
- 22 MeOH- Methanol
- 23 META- Model for Electricity Technology Assessment
- 24 MW- Megawatt
- 25 MWh- Megawatt hour
- 26 OECS - Organisation of the Eastern Caribbean States
- 27 OPEX: Operating expenditure
- 28 ORC- Organic Rankine cycle
- 29 PEM- Polymer Electrolyte Membrane
- 30 RE – Renewable Energy
- 31 SDG- Sustainable Development Goals

- 1 SIDS- Small Island Developing States
- 2 TAC- Total Annualised Cost
- 3 UN - United Nations
- 4 UNESCO- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
- 5 USD- US dollar
- 6 VC- Variable Costs
- 7

## 8 **1. Introduction**

9 The global demand for energy to satisfy social and economic development has significantly  
10 increased in the last decade- cumulatively affecting earth’s climate and fossil fuel reserves. This  
11 has sparked interest in cleaner alternative fuel sources. Access to sustainable energy plays a  
12 fundamental role in the development of Small Island Developing States (SIDS)- allowing  
13 economic growth, social progress, and increased standard of living for billions [1].The United  
14 Nations (UN) Sustainable Energy for All initiative aims to ensure universal access to affordable,  
15 reliable and sustainable electricity by 2030[2]; with an estimated 60% of energy growth occurring  
16 within developing nations possessing abundant, untapped renewable energy (RE) resources [3,4].  
17 The Eastern Caribbean region provides one such example, where substantial untapped renewable  
18 potential can be realised owing to its geography and geology [5]; however, all of the islands are  
19 electrically isolated with high fossil fuel dependence and little local resources aligned to energy  
20 production [6,7].

21 The Organisation of the Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) is an intergovernmental association  
22 comprising nine SIDS of the eastern Caribbean region with objectives including, but not limited  
23 to, accelerating regional trade and promoting economic, environmental, and social resilience [8].  
24 Thus, reinforcement of long-term use of renewable energy is of utmost importance for the OECS  
25 in achieving these objectives. This is especially important given the islands’ vulnerability to the  
26 effects of climate change such as rising sea levels and intense weather systems [9-11] coupled with  
27 the longstanding issue of high and volatile oil prices on the global market leading to expensive  
28 power generation at low production capacities [12-14]. Furthermore, these islands lack significant  
29 energy security dominated by isolated grids with a sole electricity provider, constrained by aging

1 infrastructure [6,9]. In the face of natural disasters, the vulnerability of the aging energy sector is  
2 most evident, as countries often experience power outages for long periods of time, putting a strain  
3 on its reliant sectors such as healthcare and transport [13].

4 While the current growing global energy demand is indicative of increased economic growth  
5 in developed parts of the world, the current pattern of energy use is unsustainable -highly  
6 dependent on finite, diminishing fossil fuels and unprecedented levels of greenhouse gases (GHGs)  
7 [8,15]. These anthropogenic emissions are responsible for global warming with its negative effects  
8 being most threatening to SIDS [11]. To initiate transformation of the global energy production  
9 and infrastructure, the international community ratified the Paris Agreement with the goal of  
10 limiting global warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius, compared to pre-industrial levels [15]. Therein  
11 lies the challenge of emerging economies and SIDS- to fulfil a growing energy demand for an  
12 expanding population while simultaneously transitioning to low-carbon energy systems [16]. The  
13 deployment of RE is a global trend that responds to the emerging paradigm of sustainable energy  
14 development [17]. However, the selection of viable technologies for harnessing RE are dependent  
15 upon several factors, with the most critical being geographical and geological factors [8,10].

16 Geographically located in the Caribbean, the OECS region is endowed with many forms of  
17 renewable energy (RE) such as wind, solar and hydroelectric power. These systems are however,  
18 largely intermittent in supply and are affected by seasonal and daily fluctuations, and thus need to  
19 be fully consolidated with other dispatchable power systems to maintain reliability [18].  
20 Geologically, the region is situated in an active region around the Caribbean plate, creating ideal  
21 geological situations where geothermal energy can be harboured [5]. Geothermal energy is  
22 independent of weather and climatic situations and most suitable for scale-up, proving to be the  
23 most reliable RE resource for the region [19]. Also, they offer the added advantages of higher  
24 capacity factors and lower environmental impact potential, having underground storage [20,21].  
25 Islands such as Guadeloupe with (15 MW installed capacity) [22] and Dominica (up to 1390 MW  
26 potential) [5] have begun exploring geothermal energy with ambitions to reduce annual avoided  
27 GHG emissions to 0.30 million tonne CO<sub>2</sub>/yr by 2027 [5]. Additionally, its abundance in  
28 Dominica, which surpasses the national demand, allows for an interconnected grid via subsea  
29 transmission- wherein power can be traded with nearby islands encouraging economically viable  
30 large scale deployment of geothermal energy since neighbouring islands have much higher power

1 needs [23]. Furthermore, with increased geothermal energy potential, energy storage platforms can  
2 be considered from excess power generation-promoting energy security among the region [24].

3 Six of the nine OECS/SID nations involved in the Paris Agreement have opted to aim for 100%  
4 RE grid power by 2050 [22]. However, the region lacks guidance in understanding the various  
5 pathways in achieving full sustainable energy transformation. Thus, our study examines the use of  
6 multiple decision criteria using techno-economic and environmental assessments, to inform and  
7 guarantee sustainable operations of the OECS power sector through a case study approach. Herein,  
8 we propose case-specific options for the nation of Dominica in fulfilling its GHG commitments  
9 while supporting reliable RE integration across the eastern Caribbean region. By disseminating  
10 evidence-based results, solutions can be provided to aid OECS nations in achieving their RE  
11 targets and promoting sustainable development through the deployment of clean, modern and  
12 affordable energy according to Sustainable Development Goal 7 (SDG 7) [24].

## 13 **2. Literature Review**


### 14 **2.1. Background**

15 The OECS makes up an 11-member group of islands that form a continuous archipelago consisting  
16 of the Lesser Antilles within the easternmost region of the Caribbean Sea (**Figure 1**). The majority  
17 of the Lesser Antilles extend in the north as the Leeward islands and in the south as the Windward  
18 islands. Within the Leeward and Windward islands, these sections comprise approximately 26  
19 islands, of which 21 are volcanic in nature- many of which are permanently inhabited and within  
20 close proximity to one another [25]. These islands are located in the southeast Caribbean, with a  
21 tropical climate containing diverse plants and animals. Most of the expanse of the Leeward and  
22 Windward islands is located over the Lesser Antilles volcanic arc that stretches over a subduction  
23 zone formed due to the collision of the North and South American plate margins and minor parts  
24 of the Caribbean Plate as shown in **Figure 1** [26].

25 This presents a geothermal themed opportunity as several volcanic islands on the oceanic crust of  
26 the Caribbean Plate are active. The majority of the islands are primarily composed of igneous rocks  
27 and weathered igneous products, and the geological age of the islands are Miocene to Holocene (5  
28 million years ago – present) and considered to be geologically young. Along the Lesser Antilles

1 volcanic arc, tectonic plates are continuously shifting slowly, which triggers volcanic activity,  
2 earthquakes and other potential geo-hazards [27].

3 Among the 11 OECS member states (**Figure 1**), the six islands of Dominica, St. Vincent and the  
4 Grenadines, Montserrat, Grenada, St. Kitts and St. Lucia have initiated geothermal development  
5 through governments and international agencies since their thermal gradients have been suggested  
6 to be higher than average compared to other islands, thus demonstrating a great source of  
7 geothermal energy potential [28,29].



8  
9 **Figure 1: Global geothermal activity map with snapshot of the OECS region of the Caribbean**  
10 **community.**  
11

## 1   **2.2.   Types of Geothermal plants**

2   Geothermal energy is the thermal energy stored within the Earth's body, facilitated by the Earth's  
3   layered structure. The lithosphere promotes the eventual mobility of tectonic plates due to the  
4   forces exerted by the convecting mantle which promotes different thermal responses at the Earth's  
5   surface [30,31]. Such responses include the creation of mountain belts, mid oceanic ridges, and  
6   sites of volcanic activity which are all associated forms of hydrothermal activity worldwide  
7   **(Figure 1)**. Focusing on the formation of volcanoes, deep below the earth's surface the magma is  
8   a source of heat to trapped fluids. In some instances, heated water comes to the surface in hot  
9   springs or geysers. This heat which continually rises from the magma to water trapped under the  
10   surface as geofluid is the origin of what is called geothermal energy [32].

11   Three common types of geothermal power plants used for electricity production include flash  
12   steam, dry steam and binary cycle [33]. Globally most geothermal energy is produced in high-  
13   enthalpy fields that reach high temperatures at shallow depths. The electricity is generated in dry  
14   steam and flash steam power plants [31]. These power plants of high enthalpy fields function as  
15   open system geothermal installations. The systems use steam produced by decompressing the  
16   thermal heat transfer fluid to drive turbines for electrical production. The minimum operation  
17   temperature in flash-steam plants is 175 °C. The turbine converts geothermal energy into  
18   mechanical energy that is converted to electrical energy by a generator [34-35]. Apart from this,  
19   electrical energy is consumed by pumps and other machinery of the power plant; the net power is  
20   fed onto the grid. One major disadvantage of high enthalpy fields is their limited occurrence in  
21   volcanic and tectonically active areas along plate boundaries [36]. Dry steam and flash steam  
22   systems are currently installed in the following countries: USA, Philippines, Mexico, Indonesia,  
23   Italy, Iceland, Russia, Kamchatka Islands, Azores Islands and Guadeloupe [18,31,37].

24   Electrical energy production from binary cycle power plants are associated with low enthalpy  
25   systems and has been installed in few locations worldwide, although suitable locations are far more  
26   frequent than high-enthalpy fields. Conversion of heat to electrical energy within binary cycle  
27   power plants based on the Organic Rankine Cycle (ORC), is possible if the produced water is  
28   above 80°C. ORC plants work with an organic heat transfer fluid with a relatively low boiling  
29   temperature [33]. There is an enormous potential for future development and expansion of deep

1 low-enthalpy systems [36]. Countries generating geothermal power using binary cycle power  
2 plants include USA, Philippines, Indonesia, Mexico, Italy, New Zealand, Iceland, Japan, El  
3 Salvador, Kenya, Azores Islands, Cook Islands and Guadeloupe [18,38]. Recently, geothermal  
4 energy supported multi generation systems have been explored and designed for a cleaner and  
5 sustainable future [39-41]

### 6 **2.3. Study sites- Dominica and Martinique**

7 All of the islands highlighted within the Lesser Antilles encompass a territory within the Caribbean  
8 identified by the United Nation (2019) as SIDS. The relevance of advancing the potential for  
9 geothermal integration throughout suggested Caribbean islands presents the primary advantage of  
10 energy security through the reduction of dependence on fossil fuels to generate security [42].

11 Sea-level rise aligned to climate change is considered a significant threat to SIDS. Although  
12 greenhouse gas emissions from SIDS are considered negligible on a global scale, these islands will  
13 be among the first affected by changing climatic conditions [43-45]. Therefore, SIDS are a primary  
14 focus group due to their high vulnerability and on-going global commitment to climate change  
15 mitigation [46,47]. Policy and regulatory framework for RE deployment in Caribbean islands have  
16 been well documented during the past twenty years [48]. Though Caribbean islands contribute less  
17 than 1% of total GHG emissions, these islands can position themselves to be leaders in energy  
18 transition by providing successful examples of RE penetration [47,49]. Acknowledging this,  
19 Dominica is among several islands that have pledged to meet 100% of energy needs with  
20 renewables by 2030 [50].

21 Currently geothermal development in Dominica is small compared to the potential resources.  
22 Dominica's geothermal plant is being constructed within the Rosseau Valley, historically referred  
23 to as Grande Soufriere. This region of the island is the most thermally active and is characterized  
24 by multiple hot springs and fumaroles with temperatures ranging 40-96°C [25]. Dominica has nine  
25 active volcanoes with the Morne Diablotins found in the northern area of the island having the  
26 highest elevation at 1447 m. The island of Dominica is located near Martinique to the south-  
27 southwest [26]. While 60% of Dominica's land is classified by the United Nations Educational,  
28 Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) as a World Heritage site, the island has significant  
29 potential to change its current power generation mix and eventually reduce the cost of electricity

1 prices. Dominica’s geothermal resource has been extensively investigated by the government and  
 2 international agencies during the past 15 years [51].

3 Martinique’s energy outlook of being self-sufficient by relying on RE by 2030 was partially  
 4 achieved in 2019 with the 14MW Grand Rivere wind park in the northern mountainous part of the  
 5 island. Future wind projects are being planned for several communities to produce an installed  
 6 capacity of 36MW [52-54]. While the northern area of the island is dominated by mountains,  
 7 volcanoes both active and extinct are covered with rainforest. The south features a more easily  
 8 traversed geographic region [26].

9 As shown in **Table 1**, the gross domestic product (GDP), population density, average power  
 10 consumption and carbon dioxide emission [55] is presented to give a current outlook in each  
 11 country.

12 **Table 1: Current country level outlook for Dominica and Martinique.**

Country	GDP (\$US)	Population Density (number per square km)	Average Power Consumption (MW)	Carbon Dioxide emission (metric tons per capita)
Dominica	1.02 billion	97.8	16.8	2.52
Martinique	9.8 billion	332.8	235	6.17

13 Despite considerable renewable resources and progress of the OECS region, islands have been  
 14 slow to RE deployment. There are many economic, political and social barriers that can be  
 15 identified as challenges for RE implementation. These challenges have been linked directly to the  
 16 need for new policies and regulatory regimes to each island’s specific context. While the region  
 17 has untapped geothermal potential to enable a large energy supply across the wider Caribbean,  
 18 further collaboration and support is needed to reduce the challenges aforementioned. Thus, in this

1 study, we seek to propose the relevance of aligning the geothermal potential of Dominica and the  
2 promotion of sustainable energy deployment among neighbouring OECS nations.

### 3 **3. System Description**

4 Our modelling framework for this study was guided by the renewable potential of OEC states. In  
5 particular, the small island nation of Dominica was studied due to its potential for geothermal  
6 energy deployment and exportation. Thus, our evaluation considers environmental and techno-  
7 economic assessments aligned to conceptual process design, life cycle impacts and economic  
8 viability across several case studies. The basis of our calculations stem from mass and energy  
9 balances aligned to input-output inventory flows, which were used to guide decision-making in  
10 transitioning towards greater sustainable power generation.


11

#### 12 **3.1. Country Level Overview: Business as Usual (BAU)**

13 The power sector of Dominica has been heavily dependent on conventional fossil resources- with  
14 2019 available data indicating a 63% share for fossil fuels (diesel) and 37% for hydropower [50]  
15 (**Figure 2**). Dominica's initial commitment to RE projects include small-scale wind (0.23 MW  
16 installed out of a 30 MW potential) and solar (6.6MW installed out of a 45MW potential) [56]  
17 which currently accounts for < 1% towards the RE input [50]. Martinique's electricity generation  
18 mix includes (75.1%) fossil fuel (diesel), (16.4%) biomass, (5.5%) solar and (3.0%) wind [54].  
19 The installed RE capacity accounts for 24% of the current energy mix.

20 Despite considerable abundant renewable resources, like many Caribbean islands both Dominica  
21 and Martinique have been slow to adopt RE even though there are existing policies and regulatory  
22 frameworks in place [50]. Dominica, a formal member of the Caribbean Community CARICOM  
23 and Martinique which falls within the Government of the French Republic, has ratified the Paris  
24 Agreement to reduce 45% of GHG emissions by 2030 [57].

25



1  
2  
3  
4

**Figure 2: Case-specific system boundary definitions for country level overview (BAU), Dominica 2030 outlook (Case 1) and geothermal energy exportation (Case 4).**

### 3.2. Dominica 2030 Outlook: 100% RE Deployment (Case 1)

Owing to the island's geographic position in the volcanic arc of the Caribbean region [28], Dominica can realise more than 20 times its projected power demand by utilising its untapped geothermal resource solely. The island boasts the highest geothermal potential among OECS nations in the eastern Caribbean [5]. Geothermal energy is considered dispatchable since it meets the following requirements: controllable, firm, flexible [58], and capable of reliably replacing power from fossil fuels. Furthermore, the World Bank's Model for Electricity Technology Assessment (META) reinforces the benefits of low operating and management costs associated with geothermal energy in the long term as well as the economic stability it offers in comparison to the nation's present-day diesel-powered power plants [58]. Thus, in Case 1 (**Figure 2**) we explore the feasibility of utilising a fraction of Dominica's geothermal potential to fulfil 67% of local demand (27MW) while power from existing hydroelectric plants constitutes 37% of the grid.

### 3.3. Energy Storage Platforms: MeOH and NH<sub>3</sub> Production (Case 2 and 3)

In examining the potential for energy exportation, we consider the sustainable production of methanol (MeOH) and ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>) through electrochemical H<sub>2</sub> production from excess geothermal energy. Hydrogen supply chains for each power-to-fuel process are considered polymer electrolyte membrane (PEM) electrolysis, mainly due to its maturity and utilization at industrial scale [59, 60]. A 100MW electrolysis system was proposed, producing an average of 1,721 kg/hr of H<sub>2</sub>, with an assumed current stack lifetime of 85,000 hours (**Eq 1**). Furthermore, the influence of electrolyser system efficiency (%) on productivity and economic viability was also investigated over the range of 63%-78% [61].

#### 3.3.1 MeOH Production (Case 2)

Renewable MeOH production through CO<sub>2</sub> hydrogenation was designed using Aspen Plus V10 in accordance with past studies by some of us [62-64] (**Figure 3**). Given the lack of major industrial activity in Dominica, CO<sub>2</sub> was supplied DAC [65]. The DAC sub-system consisted of a closed loop KOH-CaO scrubbing and stripping process, producing 12,521 kg/hr of CO<sub>2</sub> for MeOH operations. The mixed synthesis gas (H<sub>2</sub>: CO<sub>2</sub> molar ratio- 3:1) was compressed to 50 bars, preheated to 240°C and reacted over a non-isothermal plug flow reactor, using Cu-ZnO-Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (**Eq**

1 **2-3**) catalyst and kinetics derived by Vanden Busshe and Froment [64]. The exit crude MeOH  
 2 (3.17% mol) was cooled to 40°C using cooling water, depressurized to 2 bar and distilled to  
 3 99.99% (mol) MeOH using two distillation columns. Purge gas (purge gas/recycle gas split ratio  
 4 = 3%) combustion and the exothermic heat from MeOH synthesis was integrated into the  
 5 production of saturated steam (48 bar) which added some support to distillation heat duties. The  
 6 refining distillation column bottoms, with a composition of >99.99%(mol) water, was recycled to  
 7 the electrolysis sub-system as a resource circular feedstock.


8



9

### 10 3.3.2 NH<sub>3</sub> Production (Case 3)

11 The NH<sub>3</sub> process model (**Figure 4**) considered the traditional Haber process flowsheet designed  
 12 using Aspen Plus V10 [66-67], whereby NH<sub>3</sub> is produced from reacting N<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub> over an iron  
 13 catalyst (**Eq 4**). Here, 7,920 kg/hr of N<sub>2</sub>- manufactured from cryogenic air separation, is mixed  
 14 with H<sub>2</sub> in a 1:3 ratio, compressed to 141 bar and preheated to 450°C for NH<sub>3</sub> synthesis. The  
 15 synthesis sub-unit consisted of a 4-bed adiabatic cascade unit-with heat integration and medium  
 16 pressure steam generation, effectively removing the exothermic heat of reaction. Reactivity data  
 17 in accordance with Temkin and Pyzhev [68,69] was imported into Aspen Plus and used to simulate  
 18 NH<sub>3</sub> synthesis. Finally, the NH<sub>3</sub> effluent (20.1% mol) was chilled to -33°C through refrigeration  
 19 and flash separated at 1 bar to yield 100% NH<sub>3</sub> product. The steam generated from heat integration  
 20 coupled with energy recovered from boil-off NH<sub>3</sub> vapor combustion, was utilized for power  
 21 generation within the process system.



23




Figure 3: Process flow diagram and system boundary definition for MeOH production (Case 2).




Figure 4: Process flow diagram and system boundary definition for NH<sub>3</sub> production (Case 3).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

### **3.4. Geothermal Energy Exportation: Martinique 2030 Outlook (Case 4)**

Dominica’s abundance of geothermal energy gives the nation an opportunity, not only to provide clean, reliable energy domestically, but also to neighbouring islands [58]. Dominica has a relatively small projected demand (27MW) in 2030. This small demand affects the economic feasibility of domestic projects [28] as realising profits may be difficult at small-scale production. Martinique, a neighbouring island, having a projected demand of 407MW is a candidate for partnership, interconnection and trade for the benefit of both parties. Thus, Case 4 (**Figure 2**) explores the practicability of Dominica fulfilling their projected power demand by employing geothermal energy, while simultaneously exporting the full demand of Martinique through sub-sea cable transmission.

## **4. Analysis**

### **4.1. Economic Assessment**

The economic feasibility was assessed by computing the levelized cost of electricity (LCOE) for all four cases as well as the Total Annualized Cost (TAC) (on a kilogram basis) for NH<sub>3</sub> and MeOH produced from excess energy storage (Cases 2 and 3).

#### **4.1.1. Levelized Cost of Electricity (LCOE)**

The LCOE for each case was determined by using **Eq (4)** where P<sub>ij</sub> represents the energy (MWh) derived from technology j, and LCOE<sub>j</sub> is the fixed LCOE (USD/MWh) associated with technology j.

$$LCOE = \frac{\sum_j^n (P_{ij} \times LCOE_j)}{\sum_j^n P_{ij}} \tag{4}$$

#### **4.1.2. Total Annualised Cost (TAC)**

Total Annualized Cost (TAC) was computed by firstly estimating the capital costs (CAPEX) and operating costs (OPEX) associated with MeOH and NH<sub>3</sub> operations. CAPEX was calculated using bare module costing parameters based on equipment attributes [70], with purchased equipment

1 costs extrapolated for the cost year 2020 using Chemical Engineering Plant Cost Index (CEPCI)  
 2 [71]. For packaged units such as air separation and electrolyzer sub-systems, scaling factors were  
 3 incorporated using current literature [72]. OPEX was estimated from fixed costs (FC) using cost  
 4 allocations [73] and variable costs (VC) such as raw material prices based on current and future  
 5 market analysis. TAC scores were subsequently compiled using **Eq 6**, whereby the annualized  
 6 fixed costs (AFC) were calculated using the annual capital cost ratio (**Eq 5**) [74] and a 330 day  
 7 yearly on-stream factor. To account for the sensitivities in raw material price, geothermal energy  
 8 as well as electrolyzer efficiency and CAPEX, variable cost factors were included in estimating  
 9 future TAC scores in 2030 for both technologies. A detailed overview of costs factors and  
 10 allocations used in estimating CAPEX and OPEX are given below.

$$11 \quad AFC = FCI \times \frac{(1+i)^n \times i}{(1+i)^n - 1} \quad (5)$$

12 Where, FCI -Fixed Capital Investment (CAPEX), interest rate  $i = 7\%$  [75] and the designated plant  
 13 lifetime,  $n = 20$  years

$$14 \quad TAC = \frac{AFC + OPEX}{\text{Yearly production rate}} \quad (6)$$

15 A detailed overview of costs factors and allocations used in estimating CAPEX and OPEX are  
 16 given below.

17

#### 18 **4.1.2.1. Bare Module Cost**

19 Bare module costing [70] was used for specific  $\text{NH}_3$  and MeOH unit operations (**Eq 7**). The CEPCI  
 20 for the year 2020 [71] were utilised in the extrapolation of the purchased equipment costs (**Eq 8**).  
 21 All major equipment (reactor, heat exchanger, pump, compressor, heater and cooler) were cost  
 22 utilizing equations and design parameters from **Tables 7 and 8** along with cost factors from R.K.  
 23 Sinnott [73].

$$24 \quad C_{BM_i} = C_{p_i}^0 \times (B_1 + B_2 \times F_M \times F_P) \times \text{CEPCI ratio} \quad (7)$$

25

1 Where:  $C_{BM}$  is the bare module cost,  $C_p^0$  is the cost to purchase the equipment under the base  
 2 conditions,  $B_x$  is the bare module factors,  $F_M$  is the material factor,  $F_P$  is the pressure factor and  
 3 CEPCI ratio [72] is:

$$4 \quad CEPCI \text{ ratio} = \frac{CEPCI \ 2020}{CEPCI \ 2002} = \frac{600.6}{397} = 1.51 \quad (8)$$

#### 5 **4.1.2.2. Capital Costs (CAPEX)**

6 The fixed capital investment (FCI) for the entire plant comprises direct plant costs (PPC), indirect  
 7 plant costs (IPC) as well as the capital costs of package units: electrolyser (Cases 2 and 3), air  
 8 separation unit (ASU, Case 3) and the steam turbines (Case 3). The variability in the CAPEX of  
 9 the electrolyser unit was taken from literature sources [76,77] (**Table 6**), with an assumed stack  
 10 lifetime of 85000 h (approximately 10 years). In addition to the capital cost for the electrolyser, a  
 11 replacement stack cost of 40% of the capital cost was taken into consideration for a plant life of  
 12 20 years.

13 The PPC and IPC were estimated by the Lang factor approach considering the PEC shown in **Eqs**  
 14 **9-11**:

$$15 \quad PPC = (1 + f_1 + f_2 + f_3 + f_4) \times PEC \quad (9)$$

16 Where  $f_1 = 0.1$ ,  $f_2 = 0.5$ ,  $f_3 = 0.05$ ,  $f_4 = 0.15$  which represent the Lang factors of Electrical,  
 17 Utilities [70], Site developments and Ancillary Buildings respectively.

$$18 \quad PEC = \sum_{i=1}^n C_{BM_i} \quad (10)$$

19 Where PEC is the total purchased equipment cost, n is the total amount of equipment.

$$20 \quad IPC = (f_5 + f_6) \times PPC \quad (11)$$

21 Where  $f_5 = 0.2$ ,  $f_6 = 0.05$  which represent the Lang factors of design and engineering and  
 22 contingency respectively

23

24 Package units (**Table 2**) are specific unit operations that fall outside the specific process operations  
 25 such as utilities, and are cost based on scale factors as shown in **Eqs 12 and 13** below:

$$26 \quad Capex \ (MM) = C_0 \times \left(\frac{S}{S_0}\right)^{sf} \quad (12)$$

27 where  $C_0$  is the base case capital cost, S is the cost flow basis and  $S_0$  is the base case flow.

$$28 \quad Final \ Capex \ (2020) = Capex \ (MM) \times CEPCI \ ratio \quad (13)$$

1 where the *CEPCI ratio* =  $\frac{CEPCI\ 2020}{CEPCI\ 2016} = \frac{600.6}{536.4} = 1.12$

2 **Table 2: Scale Factors for Package Units.**

	C <sub>o</sub>	sf	S <sub>0</sub>	S	Capex (MM)	Final Capex (MM)
Air Separation Unit (ASU) [72]	230.77	0.50	145	0.28 (kg/s O <sub>2</sub> )	10.01	11.21
Steam Turbine [72]	61.47	0.67	136	1.78 MW	3.37	3.76

3  
 4 FCI was calculated by summing the PPC, IPC and packaged unit costs, while the total capital  
 5 investment (TCI) was estimated by assuming a working capital (WC) of 15% FCI; given in **Eqs**  
 6 **14 and 15** below:

7  
 8  $FCI = PPC + IPC$  (14)

9  $TCI = WC + FCI$  (15)

10

11 **4.1.2.3. Operating Costs (OPEX)**

12 OPEX was estimated from variable (VC) and fixed costs (FC) shown in **Tables 3 and 4** below  
 13 [73]. Electricity costs derived from geothermal energy was taken from Lazard’s latest annual  
 14 Levelized Cost of Energy Analysis (LCOE 14.0.) [78]. The variability of raw material costs (**Table**  
 15 **5**) was considered based on market analysis and current cost projection. The operating labour cost  
 16 (**Eqs 16 and 17**) was estimated by quantifying the number of operators required for a single  
 17 process and the hourly rate-which is paid at USD 8.44/hr [70].

18  $Operators/shift = (6.29 + 31.7P^2 + 0.23N_{np})^{0.5}$  (16)

19 Where P is the quantity of particulate processing steps, N<sub>np</sub> is the quantity of non-particulate  
 20 processing steps.

21  $Cost\ of\ Labour = 31\ operators \times \$8.44 \times 7920\ hours\ per\ year = \$2,072,188.80$  (17)

22

1

**Table 3: Fixed Costs Allocation obtained from R.K. Sinnott [73].**

<b>Fixed Costs</b>	
Maintenance	5% of FCI
Operating Labour	-
Laboratory Costs	21.5% of Operating Labour
Supervision	20% of Operating Labour
Plant Overheads	50% of Operating Labour
Capital Charges	10% of Operating Labour
Insurance	1% of TCI
Royalties	1% of TCI

2

3

**Table 4: Fixed Utilities Cost [79].**

<b>Utilities</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Unit</b>
Process Water	1.52	\$/MT
Cooling Water	0.378	\$/GJ

4 For Case 4, the transmission cost of power to Martinique was found as a function of the sub-sea  
5 distance between the substation in Dominica to the electricity substation in Martinique (approx:  
6 104.24 km) according to **Eq 18**.

$$7 \text{ Cost (million USD/year)} = 1.21 \times (1.36 D + 366.78) \quad (18)$$

8 where D is the subsea distance between the two substations.

1 **4.1.2.4. Projections for 2030**

2 All cases were analysed using 2019 LCOE prices as the benchmark. Cases 1-4 were further  
3 analysed using a forecasted LCOE for geothermal energy in 2030. Projected electrolyser costs  
4 and increased stack lifetime for 2030 were also considered based on expected technological  
5 advancements. These projections are shown in **Table 6**.

6  
7

**Table 5: Variable Costs.**

Unit Cost				
	Low	Average	High	Unit
Electricity (Geothermal) 2019 [77]	59	80	101	\$/MWh
Electricity (Geothermal) 2030 [77]	38	57	76	\$/MWh
Diesel Power [77]	197	239	281	\$/MWh
Hydropower [77]	20	45	70	\$/MWh
CO <sub>2</sub> (From DAC) [80]	94	163	232	\$/tonne
Natural Gas [77]	2.12	2.66	3.38	\$/MMBTU

8  
9

1

**Table 6: Capital cost of electrolyser based on 1kW.**

	Unit Cost (USD/kW)			Stack Lifetime(h)
	Low	Average	High	
2019 [76]	682	777	886	85000
2030 [77]	200			10000-20000

2

3

4

**Table 7: Equipment Design Parameters for MeOH**

Equipment	Design Parameter	Characteristic Range	Unit
Methanol Reactor <sup>a</sup>	Volume	7.47	m <sup>3</sup>
	Heat Transfer Area	671.04	m <sup>2</sup>
Purge Boiler	Duty	5.06	MW
HEX	Heat Transfer Area	2-782	m <sup>2</sup>
Topping Column	Volume	247-300	m <sup>3</sup>
	Dimensions	Diameter: 0.73, Height: 29.26	m
Refining Column	Volume	77.10	m <sup>3</sup>
	Dimensions	Diameter: 1.25, Height: 62.2	m
Flash Drums	Volume	0.01-16.79	m <sup>3</sup>
Pump	Power	0.45-80.05	kW
Compressor	Power	356-728	kW
Storage Tank	Volume	2534.49	m <sup>3</sup>

5

6

7

8

<sup>a</sup>Reactor cost is based on both volume for methanol synthesis and heat exchanger (HEX) surface area for MP steam production.

1

**Table 8: Equipment Design Parameters for NH<sub>3</sub>**

<b>Equipment</b>	<b>Design Parameter</b>	<b>Characteristic Range</b>	<b>Unit</b>
Ammonia Reactor	Volume	40	m <sup>3</sup>
Purge Boiler	Duty	1.04	MW
HEX	Heat Transfer Area	0.65-269.36	m <sup>2</sup>
Flash Drums	Volume	203.81	m <sup>3</sup>
Pump	Power	2-16	kW
Turbines	Power	1860-1999	kW
Compressor	Power	126-1755	kW

2

3

4

5

## **4.2. LCA Framework**

6 An LCA was carried out considering a cradle-to-power generation gate as outlined in **Figures 2-**  
7 **4**, in accordance with the ISO 14040:2006 methodology [81]. Our study considers several cases  
8 for which the total national power consumption for the island of Dominica was considered the  
9 main product; thus, the FU used for each case was the production of 1 MWh of energy.  
10 Subsequently, case specific LCI were established based on mass and energy balances for each  
11 individual case, normalized to the FU (**Table 9**). Major inputs and outputs include electrical  
12 production from deep geothermal wells, hydroelectric run-of-river, petrol/oil, biomass, solar and  
13 wind supply chains, deionized water, natural gas (heating purposes) and flue gas emissions  
14 (MeOH/NH<sub>3</sub> process). For the purposes of this study, impacts associated with  
15 commissioning/construction phases were neglected [66,67]- mainly since these impacts are  
16 negligible when compared to the operating phase of the process [82-84].

17 Inventories linked to raw materials and other inputs as well as embedded fugitive emissions were  
18 retrieved from Ecoinvent v3.4 databases attached to the SimaPro software platform. Case-specific  
19 environmental burdens were characterized in the life cycle impact assessment (LCIA) stage at the  
20 midpoint level, using the ReCiPe 2016 hierarchist method [62-64, 66, 67], comprising 18 impact  
21 categories as detailed in the **Results and Discussion Section**. For Cases 2-4 where multiple

1 products were generated (MeOH/NH<sub>3</sub> production and energy export to Martinique), a substitution  
2 allocation approach was used to distribute environmental burdens among co-products. In  
3 accordance with ISO 14040:2006 methodology, the substitution allocation approach allows for  
4 burdens associated with marketable products to be displaced by the production of cleaner, greener  
5 co-products [82,85,86]. Here, the burdens linked to traditional “business-as-usual” processes are  
6 subtracted from the overall burdens of the multifunctional systems (Cases 2-4). Ecoinvent  
7 databases linked to traditional products were used to assess the avoided burden. Finally, in the  
8 interpretation stage of the LCA framework, environmental benefits were evaluated, providing  
9 evidence supporting the transition towards greater sustainable power generation.

**Table 9: Case-specific life cycle inventories for each sub-system boundary normalized to 1MWh energy produced on Dominica/Martinique power grid.**

Inputs	Process System										
	Dominica (BAU- 2019)	Dominica (BAU- 2021)	Dominica (BAU- 2023)	Dominica (BAU- 2025)	Dominica (BAU- 2027)	Dominica (BAU- 2030)	Martinique (BAU- 2030)	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4
Electricity (Diesel)/ MWh	0.558	0.579	0.579	0.615	0.632	0.673	0.857	-	-	-	-
Electricity (hydroelectric)/MWh	0.442	0.421	0.421	0.384	0.368	0.327	-	0.327	0.327	0.327	0.327
Electricity (wind-onshore)/MWh	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.010	-	-	-	-
Electricity (photovoltaic - mounted)/MWh	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.048	-	-	-	-
Electricity (biomass)/MWh	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.085	-	-	-	-
Electricity (geothermal)/ MWh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.673	4.459	3.918	15.74 6
CaCO <sub>3</sub> /kg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.890	-	-

Water/kg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1522.084	1037.315	-
Natural gas/ m <sup>3</sup>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.395	-	-
<b>Outputs</b>											
MeOH/kg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	294.438	-	-
NH <sub>3</sub> /kg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	316.877	-
Electricity (Dominica)/ MWh	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	-	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Electricity (Martinique)/ MWh	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.000	-	-	-	15.07 4
Flue gas (CO <sub>2</sub> )/kg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	75.493	-	-


1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## 5. Results and Discussion

Here, we present our findings linked to both environmental and economic performance of each case proposed. For each scenario investigated, a system boundary was proposed and evaluated using mass and energy balances. These calculations were further utilized to size and cost unit operations, utilities and raw materials as well as identify environmental burdens and benefits that exist within case-specific process operations. Through the understanding of both performance indicators- aligned to multiple decision criteria, our analysis identifies favourable options for both Dominica and Martinique to symbiotically achieve their 2030 sustainability goals.

### 5.1. Environmental Performance.

In considering the country level analysis for Dominica as it pertains to its current energy consumption, the island nation requires a peak demand output of 20MW; for which diesel constitutes 63% [50] of its grid capacity while hydroelectric power maintains the other 37%. The energy sector is dependent on imported fossil fuels at an annual cost of 27 million USD (5% of Dominica's GDP [5]). The BAU case assumes that while power generation from existing hydroelectric power plants remains at capacity [87] due to hindrances such as seasonal fluctuations and changing precipitation patterns associated with climate change, diesel generation increases to satisfy the growing energy demand in subsequent years-up to 2030. Ultimately, fuel imports are forecasted to increase accompanied by an increase in GHG emissions. Our LCA results indicate (**Figure 5**) that currently (2019), national life cycle GHG emission quotas stood at 90,366 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub> eq/year- with diesel emissions dominating the total GHG contributions at >99%. Furthermore, GHG emissions are expected to increase to 146,831 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub> eq/year in 2030 to fulfil the projected demand of 27MW. This shows a 62% increase in life cycle GHG emissions if the transition to more sustainable, climate smart energy integration does not take precedence. Additionally, this transition is essential for Dominica to honour its INDC to global climate change mitigation under the Paris Agreement [15] and Climate Action aligned to UN SDG 13 [88], wherein the nation aims to reduce GHG emission quotas by 44.7% by 2030 [89].



**Figure 5: Case-specific life cycle GHG emission quotas (tonne CO<sub>2</sub>-eq/year) for Dominica as a function of net energy demand over the period 2019-2030. GHG contributions are given with respect to technology grid share (BAU 2019-2030; Case 1) as well as avoided burdens (Cases 2-4).**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

1

2 In promoting options towards sustainable power generation, Case 1 explores the deployment of  
3 geothermal energy to completely substitute diesel generation by 2030. Although geothermal  
4 energy dominates the total GHG emissions arising (>99%) from Case 2, the technology provides  
5 cleaner energy, supporting a decline in total emission quotas to 734 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub> eq/year- allowing  
6 Dominica to achieve its intended GHG mitigation commitments. Furthermore, Cases 2 and 3  
7 explore opportunities for excess energy storage in the form of MeOH and NH<sub>3</sub>. As shown in  
8 **Figure 5**, both cases were found to achieve negative carbon emissions through avoided burdens-  
9 with MeOH and NH<sub>3</sub> production avoiding 36,871 and 149,013 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>-eq/year respectively.  
10 Ultimately, high levels of avoided emissions are attainable when traditionally used fossil fuels are  
11 replaced partially or completely by more sustainable energy sources. Hence, avoided burdens were  
12 mainly attributed to lower fossil fuel utilization- through the absence of conventional energy  
13 intensive steam methane reforming for hydrogen production (33.4% and 100% avoided emission  
14 contributions for MeOH and NH<sub>3</sub> respectively), as well as CO<sub>2</sub> utilization through direct air  
15 capture (DAC) operations (67.6% avoided emissions). Furthermore, synthesis of these fuels is  
16 energy intensive, with the electrolysis process accounting for the largest energy share. Our life  
17 cycle GHG emission data indicates that an appreciable higher GHG avoidance is realized in Case  
18 3 owing mainly to: higher energy efficiency of NH<sub>3</sub> synthesis (56%) over MeOH production (42%)  
19 and complete avoidance of fossil fuels relying solely on renewable grid power. This subsequently  
20 leads to an overall decrease of 304% in life cycle GHG emissions compared to Case 2.

21 Lastly, Case 4 investigates the option of a RE export supply chain from Dominica to Martinique-  
22 wherein excess geothermal energy is harnessed to fulfil both countries' peak demand in 2030. Our  
23 results indicate, for Case 4, a consolidated avoided life cycle GHG emission quota of 2.5 million  
24 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>-eq- the highest amongst all scenarios investigated. Thus, Case 4 can significantly  
25 contribute to GHG emission reduction efforts for both countries under the Paris Agreement [15].  
26 Currently in 2019, fossil fuels accounted for 82% of Martinique's energy share. Through  
27 geothermal energy integration onto the national grid, emissions can be curtailed to guarantee 40%  
28 reduction in GHG emission quota by 2030. Furthermore, by promoting full geothermal penetration  
29 accounting for 100% energy share, Martinique can accomplish and surpass France's mandate to  
30 increase renewable electricity potential by 32% in 2030 [89].

31

1


## 2           **5.2. LCA Comparison**

3   The midpoint approach (ReCiPe 2016 Midpoint (H) V1.01) [64-66,68,69] based on a cradle to  
4   gate LCA with a functional unit of 1 MWh of energy was utilized to assess the case-specific  
5   environmental burdens across the following impact categories: global warming; stratospheric  
6   ozone depletion; ionizing radiation; ozone formation human health; particulate matter formation;  
7   ozone formation terrestrial ecotoxicity; terrestrial acidification; freshwater eutrophication; marine  
8   eutrophication; freshwater ecotoxicity; marine ecotoxicity; human carcinogenic toxicity; human  
9   non-carcinogenic toxicity; land use; mineral resource scarcity, fossil resource scarcity and water  
10   consumption.

11   The cases were compared in terms of their specific environmental impact across all eighteen (18)  
12   impact categories, shown in **Figure 6**. Considering all cases investigated, the BAU process  
13   produces the largest environmental burdens. This was mainly attributed to emissions consolidated  
14   through fossil fuel combustion as well as fossil fuel extraction- which led to toxic elements such  
15   as Hg, Pb and Ni as well as GHGs such as CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emitted from input process  
16   operations. These gave high contributions across impact categories, ranging from 79.3%-100% of  
17   the total normalized environmental impact. Compared to the BAU process, the transition to  
18   renewable power integration within Cases 1-3 showed favourable reduction of up to 67% in  
19   environmental burden - with contributions of 33.9% - 99.7% across impact categories.  
20   Furthermore, largely negative burdens associated with excess energy export to Martinique  
21   contributed the least (0% - 46%) to the normalized environmental impact- mainly due to the  
22   avoided burdens associated with reduced fossil fuel resource utilization across both countries.  
23   Thus, among all cases considered, Case 4 proves to be the most environmentally sustainable  
24   option.

25   In promoting the transition towards greater GHG mitigation, it should be noted that burden shifting  
26   was observed- that is collateral damage that arises from geothermal energy deployment. From  
27   **Figure 6**, burden shifting exists mainly within ionizing rad, freshwater eutroph, marine eutroph,  
28   freshwater ecotox, marine ecotox, human carcino and non-carcino toxicities and mineral scarcity.  
29   Among cases, MeOH production was the worst performing within ionizing rad, marine and  
30   freshwater ecotox and human non-carcino toxicity-mainly. Furthermore, geothermal power  
31   exportation proved to be particularly damaging within freshwater and marine eutroph, human

1 carcino toxicity and mineral scarcity. These damaging impacts were mainly associated with active  
 2 geothermal extraction operations which released toxic chemicals such as Co-60, C-14, Fe,  
 3 benzene, and Ba from deep within the earth's surface. Although these impacts should not be  
 4 overlooked in understanding the overall environmental sustainability of each case, our results  
 5 indicate for Case 4 in particular, that the incurred benefits outweigh the risks in achieving set  
 6 emission reduction targets by 2030.



7  
 8  
 9 **Figure 6: LCA comparison illustrating normalized % contributions for model cases across impact**  
 10 **categories (Method-ReCiPe 2016 Midpoint (H); FU- 1MWh of energy produced)**

11  
 12 **5.3. Economic Performance**

13 Here in this section, we examine the economic feasibility of all cases considered by utilizing  
 14 current and future LCOE data for each technology as well as energy storage potential in the form  
 15 of MeOH and NH<sub>3</sub> grassroots operations. For the BAU case, the LCOE for Dominica increases

1 from 153 USD in 2019 to 175 USD/MWh in 2030 due to a 35% increase in power demand (from  
2 20MW to 27MW) as shown in **Figure 7**. This is mainly attributed to the increase in diesel share  
3 contribution from 87% in 2019 to 92% in 2030. Diesel generation is further conditioned by the  
4 volatile market price of diesel oil to be imported into the country which stood at 61.4 USD/bbl  
5 with an expected increase to 70 USD/bbl in 2030 [90]. Although hydropower maintains less than  
6 50% of the grid (44% in 2019), it accounts for 13% of the LCOE- 431% cheaper than diesel  
7 generation. In spite of being a less expensive and cleaner alternative for power generation, the  
8 technology is constrained by high reliance on the natural water cycle which is being intensified in  
9 the face of global warming and extreme climate events [91]. This impedes on its potential for  
10 dispatchable power generation- leading to a likely decrease in energy share to 33% in 2030.

11 Now, examining the potential for geothermal deployment across Cases 1-3, our results show a  
12 drastic decrease in LCOE for Dominica. For Case 1, a 62% decrease in LCOE to 69 USD/MWh  
13 is attributed to the complete substitution of diesel power generation by geothermal energy. This  
14 case represents a 100% renewable grid; with 67% of the demand fulfilled by geothermal  
15 integration, contributing to 72% of the LCOE. The high contribution of geothermal power to the  
16 consolidated LCOE is owing to its individual average LCOE<sub>2019</sub> (80 USD/MWh) being 77% higher  
17 than that of hydropower (45 USD/MWh). However, advancements in geothermal technology  
18 coupled with high learning rates [92,93] are expected to decrease LCOE in 2030 to an average 53  
19 USD/MWh- leading to an overall decrease of 70% compared to the BAU case.

20 Upon considering the economics of energy storage potential in the form of MeOH and NH<sub>3</sub>  
21 production, Cases 2 and 3 were analysed using TAC as a key performance indicator. The TAC  
22 score takes into consideration the total CAPEX and OPEX for both technologies. **Figure 8**  
23 describes the respective current and future economic feasibility for each power-to-fuel scenario.  
24 Results illustrate TAC ranges for MeOH and NH<sub>3</sub> from 1.22 to 2.07 USD/kg<sub>MeOH</sub> and 1.07 to 1.61  
25 USD/kg<sub>NH<sub>3</sub></sub> respectively. Thus, our data shows MeOH production to be the more expensive of the  
26 two scenarios-mainly attributed to energy and capital-intensive operations surrounding electrolysis  
27 and DAC. Overall, cost contributions to TAC for each process show major expenses attributed to  
28 geothermal electricity utilization (48%-51%) - with fixed and capital costs giving 9%-31% and  
29 21%-22% respectively. Furthermore, DAC operations accrued up to 16% of the total TAC for  
30 MeOH production. Comparing current prices for both MeOH and NH<sub>3</sub> markets, associated green  
31 production routes utilizing geothermal energy can be regarded as uncompetitive - with 75-80%  
32 higher costs compared to fossil-based technologies at 0.2-0.4 USD/kg<sub>MeOH</sub> and <0.4USD/kg<sub>NH<sub>3</sub></sub>  
33 [69,79]. However, taking future electrolyser capital costs, stack lifetime and lower geothermal


1 energy prices into consideration, our results reveal an overall 26% - 38% decrease in TAC- ranging  
2 from 0.82-1.21 USD/kg<sub>MeOH</sub> and 0.79-1.18 USD/kg<sub>NH<sub>3</sub></sub> respectively. Furthermore, it should be  
3 noted that TAC scores are particularly sensitive to the efficiency of the electrolyser sub-system.  
4 Thus, enhancing the reliability of the electrolysis process can lead to marked improvements in the  
5 economic feasibility of both energy storage systems. Future market outlook for the period 2040-  
6 2050 for both processes show reduced prices within 0.25 - 0.77 USD/kg [79,94], and thus aligns  
7 well with our results at lower LCOE<sub>2030</sub> and high electrolyser stack lifetime-with optimistically  
8 competitive future prices within the range of 0.79-0.85 USD/kg for both MeOH and NH<sub>3</sub>  
9 production from geothermal energy.

10 Lastly, the economic feasibility of Dominica's RE export capacity was assessed through Case 4.  
11 Apart from achieving 100% RE penetration for both Dominica and Martinique by exporting  
12 434MW of geothermal power, the projected LCOE<sub>Mar</sub> (**Figure 7**) was found to be 259 USD/MWh-  
13 11% lower than the current consumer price for the island (\$292USD/MWh) [89]. Furthermore,  
14 with lower geothermal costs expected in the future, a further decrease in LCOE<sub>Mar</sub> to 236  
15 USD/MWh in 2030 is anticipated- 20% lower than current price projections. Among the case-  
16 specific cost contributions, subsea transmission accounts for 75% of the LCOE<sub>Mar</sub> while  
17 geothermal energy generation accounts for the remaining 25%. Notwithstanding high transmission  
18 costs, Dominica can expect to earn in excess of 925 million USD/year in revenue from export  
19 sales. Even with higher MeOH and NH<sub>3</sub> capacities (>100MW), economic viability would still  
20 favour energy exportation as significant energy is currently lost during the electrolysis process  
21 compared to direct transmission. Regardless, given that the projected geothermal energy potential  
22 of Dominica surpasses the total deployment covered in this study (Proven potential = 1390 MW),  
23 the nation can realize increased economic advantages while promoting sustainable operations from


24

25

1 coupled exportation and energy storage activities in the future- aligned to geothermal energy  
 2 deployment for the provision of affordable energy (SDG 7) [24].



41 **Figure 7: Case-specific LCOE as a function of net energy demand over the period 2019-2030.**  
 42 **LCOE contributions are given with respect to technology grid share.**



**Figure 8: Current-2020 (A) and future-2030 (B) TAC for MeOH (blue) and NH<sub>3</sub> (green) production as a function of LCOE (geothermal power), electrolyser efficiency, capital cost and stack lifetime.**

**Costs associated with the category other are natural gas fuel, process water, wastewater and catalyst charges.**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

## 6. Conclusion

The shift to sustainable forms of energy takes precedence as the Caribbean region faces several challenges due to the on-going impact of climate change. Through the utilization of multiple decision criteria, techno-economic and environmental assessments were carried out to guide the island of Dominica. To this end, several cases were explored utilizing current LCOE data, TAC projections and LCA to determine the most sustainable options for Dominica to utilize its geothermal energy potential.

Our results illustrate for the BAU case, a 62% increase in life cycle GHG emission quotas due to increased energy demand from 20MW in 2019 to 27MW in 2030. The impact is further consolidated in an increase in LCOE<sub>2030</sub> of up to 35% at 175 USD/MWh. However, through 100% geothermal integration, life cycle GHG emissions can be reduced by 99.5% - allowing Dominica to meet its GHG commitments under the Paris Agreement and provide 70% cheaper energy with a LCOE<sub>2030</sub> of 53 USD/MWh. Additionally, energy storage can promote negative GHG quotas as fossil-based MeOH and NH<sub>3</sub> production are avoided through the utilization of cleaner supply chains- with avoided emissions as high as 149 kilo-tonne CO<sub>2</sub>-eq/year observed. Despite this, both processes were found to be 75-80% more expensive compared to current fossil-based technologies- with a TAC range of 1.07-2.07USD/kg, and thus were deemed financially uncompetitive. Nonetheless, with future market growth shifting towards greener processes with higher learning rates, renewable MeOH and NH<sub>3</sub> production costs are expected to reduce by 26-38% to a more competitive price range of 0.79-0.85 USD/kg. While energy storage provides major economic and environmental incentives in the future, Case 4 proved to be the most sustainable- avoiding 2.5 million tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>-eq/year and producing 20% cheaper power with a LCOE<sub>Mar</sub> of 236 USD/MWh in 2030.

Although the cases outlined in this study accompany high capital commitments and project costs coupled with associated burden shifting consolidated in energy extraction activities, the overall financial and environmental benefits are obvious with geothermal energy promoting affordable and clean energy both nationally and internationally among OECS nations.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

## References

- [1] Atteridge A, Savvidou G. Development aid for energy in Small Island Developing States. *Energ Sustain Soc* 2019;9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13705-019-0194-3>.
- [2] The World Bank, Global Tracking Framework: Sustainable energy for all, <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2013/05/17765643/global-tracking-framework> (accessed May 2021).
- [3] Holm D, McIntosh J. Renewable energy – the future for the developing world. *Renew. Energy Focus* 2018; 9(1):56–61. doi:10.1016/s1471-0846(08)70027-1
- [4] Georgsson LS et al. UNU Geothermal Training Programme in Iceland: Capacity Building for Geothermal Energy Development for 36 Years. In *Proceedings World Geothermal Congress 2015*. [accessed 7 July, 2021] <https://www.geothermal-energy.org/pdf/IGAstandard/WGC/2015/09010.pdf>
- [5] Koon Koon R, Marshall S, Morna D, McCallum R, Ashtine M. A Review of Caribbean Geothermal Energy Resource Potential. *WIJE*. 2020;42(2):37-43.
- [6] Manijean L, Saffache P. Geothermal energy slowly makes its entrance in the caribbean region. *Dynenviron* 2016:108–19. <https://doi.org/10.4000/dynenviron.695>.
- [7] National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), Energy Policy and Sector Analysis in the Caribbean 2010-2011, [http://www.oas.org/en/sedi/dsd/Energy/Doc/11.\\_Energy\\_Policy\\_and\\_Sector\\_Analysis\\_in\\_the\\_Caribbean\\_2010-2011.pdf](http://www.oas.org/en/sedi/dsd/Energy/Doc/11._Energy_Policy_and_Sector_Analysis_in_the_Caribbean_2010-2011.pdf) .
- [8] Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS), OECS Strategic Objectives, <https://www.oecs.org/en/who-we-are/strategic-objectives> (Accessed June, 2021).
- [9] International Renewable Energy Agency, Small Island Developing States: Renewable Ambition in Pursuit of Climate Change Adaptation. <https://irena.org/newsroom/articles/2019/Dec/SIDS-Renewable-Ambition-in-Pursuit-of-Climate-Change-Adaptation> (accessed July, 2021).
- [10] Rhiney K. Geographies of Caribbean Vulnerability in a Changing Climate: Issues and Trends. *Geogr. Compass* 2015;9:97–114. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12199>.
- [11] Mimura NL et al. Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Press, Cambridge, UK 2007: 687-716.

- 1 [12] Atteridge A, Savvidou G. Development aid for energy in Small Island Developing  
2 States. *Energy Sustain Soc* 2019;9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13705-019-0194-3>.
- 3 [13] A. Flores, L. Peralta. The enhancement of resilience to disasters and climate  
4 change in the Caribbean through the modernization of the energy sector: Studies and  
5 Perspectives series. ECLAC 2020. (LC/TS.2019/118-LC/CAR/TS.2019/7)
- 6 [14] Ahuja D, Tatsutani M. Sustainable energy for developing countries. *S.A.P.I.EN.S*  
7 2009; 2(1). <http://journals.openedition.org/sapiens/823>
- 8 [15] United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, The Paris  
9 Agreement, [https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-](https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement)  
10 [agreement](https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement). (Accessed May 2021).
- 11 [16] Ahmad T, Zhang H, Yan B. A review on renewable energy and electricity  
12 requirement forecasting models for smart grid and buildings. *Sustain. Cities and Soc.*  
13 2020;55:1020-52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2020.102052>.
- 14 [17] Solaun K, Cerdá E. Climate change impacts on renewable energy generation. A  
15 review of quantitative projections. *Renew. Sust. Energ. Rev.* 2019;116:109415.  
16 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2019.109415>.
- 17 [18] Joseph EP. Geothermal Energy Potential in the Caribbean Region. Retrieved July  
18 4, 2021, from  
19 [https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/3339energy\\_joseph.pdf](https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/3339energy_joseph.pdf)
- 20 [19] Wang Y, Li C, Zhao J, Wu B, Du Y, Zhang J, et al. The above-ground strategies  
21 to approach the goal of geothermal power generation in China: State of art and future  
22 research. *Renew. Sust. Energ. Rev.* 2021;138:110557.  
23 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.110557>.
- 24 [20] The World Bank, Opportunities and Challenges for Scaling up Geothermal  
25 Development in LAC.  
26 [https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/173681539626591426/pdf/128045-](https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/173681539626591426/pdf/128045-ESMAP-REVISED-PUBLIC.pdf)  
27 [ESMAP-REVISED-PUBLIC.pdf](https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/173681539626591426/pdf/128045-ESMAP-REVISED-PUBLIC.pdf) (Accessed July 2021)
- 28 [21] Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States, Energy Issues and Options (2006).,  
29 [https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/17975/esm3170PAPER00](https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/17975/esm3170PAPER00ECS0energy01PUBLIC1.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)  
30 [ECS0energy01PUBLIC1.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/17975/esm3170PAPER00ECS0energy01PUBLIC1.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)
- 31 [22] Savaresi A. The Paris Agreement: a new beginning? *J. Energy Nat. Resour. Law*,  
32 34;1:16-26. DOI: [10.1080/02646811.2016.1133983](https://doi.org/10.1080/02646811.2016.1133983).

- 1 [23] Kalair A, Abas N, Saleem MS, Kalair AR, Khan N. Role of energy storage  
2 systems in energy transition from fossil fuels to renewables. *J. Energy Storage* 2020;3.  
3 <https://doi.org/10.1002/est2.135>.
- 4 [24] United Nations, Goal 7: Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and  
5 modern energy for all, <https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal7>.
- 6 [25] Lindsay JM, Smith AL, Roobol MJ, Stasiuk MV. Volcanic hazard atlas of the  
7 Lesser Antilles: Dominica. The Seismic Research Unit, UWI; 2005.
- 8 [26] Smith AL, Roobol MJ, Mattioli GS, Fryxell JE, Daly GE, Fernandez LA. The  
9 Volcanic Geology of the Mid-Arc Island of Dominica, Lesser Antilles—The Surface  
10 Expression of an Island-Arc Batholith. *Geol Soc Am*; 2013.  
11 <https://doi.org/10.1130/2013.2496>.
- 12 [27] Hutterer G, Joseph L. Country update for Eastern Caribbean Nations- Proceedings  
13 World Geothermal Congress, Melbourne 2015. (accessed July 7 2021)  
14 <https://pangea.stanford.edu/ERE/db/WGC/papers/WGC/2015/01015.pdf>
- 15 [28] Ochs A, Mark K, Auth K, Musolino E, Killeen P. Caribbean Sustainable Energy  
16 Roadmap and Strategy (C-SERMS) Baseline Report and Assessment 2015.  
17 <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.4351.1922>.
- 18 [29] Stewart, I. Shuttle radar topography mission, Caribbean volcanoes [July 06, 2021]  
19 [www.caribbeanvolcanoes.com/srtm.htm](http://www.caribbeanvolcanoes.com/srtm.htm)
- 20 [30] Gupta HK, Roy S. Geothermal energy: an alternative resource for the 21st  
21 century. Amsterdam: Elsevier; 2007.
- 22 [31] Stober I, Bucher K. History of Geothermal Energy Use. *Geothermal Energy*,  
23 Springer Berlin. Heidelberg; 2013.p. 15–24
- 24 [32] Pambudi NA. Geothermal power generation in Indonesia, a country within the  
25 ring of fire: Current status, future development and policy. *Renew. Sust. Energ. Rev.*  
26 2018; 81:2893–2901.
- 27 [33] Stober I, Bucher K. Geothermal energy: from theoretical models to exploration  
28 and development. Cham: Springer; 2021.
- 29 [34] Goldstein B, Hiriart G, Tester J, Gutierrez-Negrin L, Bertani R, Bromley C.  
30 Geothermal Energy, Nature, Use, and Expectations. *Encyclopedia of Sustainability*  
31 *Science and Technology*, Springer New York; 2012: 4190–201.
- 32 [35] Osinski GR, Kring DA. Geothermal Energy: An Important Resource. *Geol Soc*  
33 *Am*; 2016.
- 34 [36] Dinçer İ, Öztürk M. Geothermal energy systems. Amsterdam: Elsevier; 2021.

- 1 [37] Weir T. Renewable energy in the Pacific Islands: Its role and status. Vol. 94,  
2 Renew. Sust. Energ. Rev. Elsevier Ltd; 2018. p. 762–71.
- 3 [38] Salameh Z. Renewable Energy System Design. Renewable Energy System  
4 Design 2014.
- 5 [39] Yilmaz, F. Performance and environmental impact assessment of a geothermal-  
6 assisted combined plant for multi-generation products. Sustainable Energy Technologies  
7 and Assessments. 2021;46;101291. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seta.2021.101291>.
- 8 [40] Delpisheh M, Haghghi MA, Mehrpooya M, Chitsaz A, Athari H. Design and  
9 financial parametric assessment and optimization of a novel solar-driven freshwater and  
10 hydrogen cogeneration system with thermal energy storage. Sustainable Energy  
11 Technologies and Assessments. 2021;45;101096  
12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seta.2021.101096>.
- 13 [41] Yilmaz C, Koyuncu I. Thermoeconomic modeling and artificial neural network  
14 optimization of Afyon geothermal power plant. Renewable Energy. 2021;163;1166-1181  
15 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2020.09.024>.
- 16 [42] Chen AA, Stephens AJ, Koon Koon R, Ashtine M, Mohammed-Koon Koon K.  
17 Pathways to climate change mitigation and stable energy by 100% renewable for a small  
18 island: Jamaica as an example. Renew. Sust. Energ. Rev. 2020;121:109671.
- 19 [43] Martyr-Koller R, Thomas A, Schleussner C-F, Nauels A, Lissner T. Loss and  
20 damage implications of sea-level rise on Small Island Developing States. Current  
21 Opinion in Environmental Sustainability 2021; 50:245–59.
- 22 [44] Betzold C. Adapting to climate change in small island developing states. Climatic  
23 Change 2015; 133:481–9.
- 24 [45] United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Climate change:  
25 small island developing States. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate  
26 Change [http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/publications/cc\\_sids.pdf](http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/publications/cc_sids.pdf).; [accessed 7 July 2021].
- 27 [46] Ourbak T, Magnan AK. The Paris Agreement and climate change negotiations:  
28 Small Islands, big players. Reg Environ Change 2017; 18:2201–7.
- 29 [47] Soomauroo Z, Blechinger P, Creutzig F. Unique Opportunities of Island States to  
30 Transition to a Low-Carbon Mobility System. Sustainability 2020; 12:1435.
- 31 [48] Kersey J, Blechinger P, Shirley R. A panel data analysis of policy effectiveness  
32 for renewable energy expansion on Caribbean islands. Energy Policy 2021; 155:112340.
- 33 [49] UN-OHRLLS. SIDS in Numbers Climate Change. [http://unohrlls.org/sids-in-](http://unohrlls.org/sids-in-numbers-climate-change-edition-2015/)  
34 [numbers-climate-change-edition-2015/](http://unohrlls.org/sids-in-numbers-climate-change-edition-2015/) ; 2015 [accessed 7 July 2021].

- 1 [50] U.S Department of Energy- Energy Transition Initiative, Energy Snapshot:  
2 Dominica, [https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/f79/ETI-Energy-Snapshot-](https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/f79/ETI-Energy-Snapshot-Dominica_FY20.pdf)  
3 [Dominica\\_FY20.pdf](https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/f79/ETI-Energy-Snapshot-Dominica_FY20.pdf) [accessed 7 July 2021].
- 4 [51] Brookes A, Kubale A, Gabriel P, Clarke B. ESIA Volume 5: Technical  
5 Appendices Dominica Geothermal Development-Environmental and Social Impact  
6 Assessment Document history and status Revision Date Description By Review  
7 Approved A April 2017 Draft Issue to MFAT for Review A Kubale ESIA Volume 5:  
8 Technical Appendices, [https://www.caribank.org/sites/default/files/publication-](https://www.caribank.org/sites/default/files/publication-resources/DGDC-ESIA-Volume5%28Technical-Appendices%29.pdf)  
9 [resources/DGDC-ESIA-Volume5%28Technical-Appendices%29.pdf](https://www.caribank.org/sites/default/files/publication-resources/DGDC-ESIA-Volume5%28Technical-Appendices%29.pdf); 2018 [accessed 7  
10 July 2021]
- 11 [52] GeoEnergy T. Potential geothermal development announced in Martinique,  
12 Caribbean. [https://www.thinkgeoenergy.com/potential-geothermal-development-](https://www.thinkgeoenergy.com/potential-geothermal-development-announced-in-martinique-caribbean/)  
13 [announced-in-martinique-caribbean/](https://www.thinkgeoenergy.com/potential-geothermal-development-announced-in-martinique-caribbean/); [accessed 7 July 2021].
- 14 [53] NewEnergy, Martinique makes strides towards energy self-sufficiency.  
15 <https://newenergyevents.com/martinique-makes-strides-towards-energy-self-sufficiency/>  
16 ; [accessed 7 July 2021].
- 17 [54] U.S Department of Energy- Energy Transition Initiative, Energy Snapshot:  
18 Martinique, [https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/f79/ETI-Energy-](https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/f79/ETI-Energy-Snapshot-Martinique_FY20.pdf)  
19 [Snapshot-Martinique\\_FY20.pdf](https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2020/09/f79/ETI-Energy-Snapshot-Martinique_FY20.pdf) [accessed 7 July 2021].
- 20 [55] The World Bank, CO2 emissions (metric tons per capita),  
21 [https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EN.ATM.CO2E.PC?end=2016&start=1960&view=c](https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EN.ATM.CO2E.PC?end=2016&start=1960&view=chart)  
22 [hart](https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EN.ATM.CO2E.PC?end=2016&start=1960&view=chart). [accessed 7 July 2021]
- 23 [56] Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, Sustainable Energy  
24 in the Caribbean: Reducing the Carbon Footprint in the Caribbean through the Promotion  
25 of Energy Technologies,  
26 [https://www.cepal.org/sites/default/files/publication/files/40460/S1600826\\_en.pdf](https://www.cepal.org/sites/default/files/publication/files/40460/S1600826_en.pdf).  
27 [Accessed June 2021].
- 28 [57] Masson M, Ehrhardt D, Lizzio V. Sustainable Energy Paths for the Caribbean.  
29 Inter-Development Bank. 2020.  
30 [https://publications.iadb.org/publications/english/document/Sustainable\\_Energy\\_Paths\\_f](https://publications.iadb.org/publications/english/document/Sustainable_Energy_Paths_for_the_Caribbean.pdf)  
31 [or\\_the\\_Caribbean.pdf](https://publications.iadb.org/publications/english/document/Sustainable_Energy_Paths_for_the_Caribbean.pdf).
- 32 [58] ESMAP, Helping Dominica Make the Shift to Geothermal Energy (2021),  
33 <https://esmap.org/node/4473> [accessed June 2021].

- 1 [59] Zhou J, Cao J, Zhang Y, Liu J, Chen J, Li M, et al. Overcoming undesired fuel  
2 crossover: Goals of methanol-resistant modification of polymer electrolyte membranes.  
3 *Renew. Sust. Energ. Rev.* 2021;138:110660. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.110660>.
- 4 [60] Lettenmeier P. Large Scale PEM Electrolysis for Industrial Applications. Meet  
5 Abstr 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1149/ma2019-02/37/1710>.
- 6 [61] González-Garay A, Frei MS, Al-Qahtani A, Mondelli C, Guillén-Gosálbez G,  
7 Pérez-Ramírez J. Plant-to-planet analysis of CO<sub>2</sub>-based methanol processes. *Energy*  
8 *Environ Sci* 2019;12:3425–36. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c9ee01673b>.
- 9 [62] Narine K, Mahabir J, Koylass N, Samaroo N, Singh-Gryzbon S, Baboolal A, et  
10 al. Climate smart process design for current and future methanol production. *J. CO<sub>2</sub> Util*  
11 2021;44:101399. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcou.2020.101399>.
- 12 [63] Mahabir J, Bhagaloo K, Koylass N, Boodoo MN, Ali R, Guo M, et al. What is  
13 required for resource-circular CO<sub>2</sub> utilization within Mega-Methanol (MM) production?  
14 *J. CO<sub>2</sub> Util* 2021;45:101451. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcou.2021.101451>.
- 15 [64] Mahabir J, Koylass N, Samaroo N, Narine K, Ward K. Towards resource circular  
16 biodiesel production through glycerol upcycling. *Energy Convers. Manag*  
17 2021;233:113930. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2021.113930>.
- 18 [65] Daggash HA, Patzschke CF, Heuberger CF, Zhu L, Hellgardt K, Fennell PS, et  
19 al. Closing the carbon cycle to maximise climate change mitigation: power-to-methanol  
20 vs. power-to-direct air capture. *Sustain. Energy Fuels* 2018;2:1153–69.  
21 <https://doi.org/10.1039/c8se00061a>.
- 22  
23
- 24 [66] Samaroo N, Koylass N, Guo M, Ward K. Achieving absolute sustainability  
25 across integrated industrial networks – a case study on the ammonia process. *Green*  
26 *Chem.* 2020;22:6547–59. <https://doi.org/10.1039/d0gc02520h>.
- 27
- 28 [67] Sadeek S, Lee Chan T, Ramdath R, Rajkumar A, Guo M, Ward K. The influence  
29 of raw material availability and utility power consumption on the sustainability of the  
30 ammonia process. *Chem Eng Res Des* 2020;158:177–92.  
31 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cherd.2020.03.020>.
- 32 [68] Temkin M, Pyzhev V. Kinetics of the synthesis of ammonia on promoted iron  
33 catalysts. *J Phys Chem* 1939;13:851-867

- 1 [69] Zhang H, Wang L, Van herle J, Maréchal F, Desideri U. Techno-economic  
2 comparison of green ammonia production processes. *Appl. Energy* 2020;259:114135.  
3 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.114135>.
- 4 [70] Turton R, Shaeiwitz JA, Bhattacharyya D, Whiting WB. *Analysis, Synthesis, and*  
5 *Design of Chemical Processes*, 5th ed. Prentice Hall: Philadelphia, PA; 2018.
- 6 [71] Chemical Engineering Online. Economic Indicators. *Chem. Eng.* 2019;126(4):60.
- 7 [72] Demirhan CD, Tso WW, Powell JB, Pistikopoulos EN. Sustainable ammonia  
8 production through process synthesis and global optimization. *AIChE Journal*. 2019 Jul  
9 1;65(7).
- 10 [73] Sinnott RK. *Coulson & Richardson's Chemical Engineering Design*, 4th ed.  
11 Elsevier - Coulson Richardson's Chem Eng Ser; 2005.
- 12 [74] Towler G, Sinnott RK. *Chemical Engineering Design: Principles, Practice and*  
13 *Economics of Plant and Process Design*. 2nd ed. Woburn, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann;  
14 2014.
- 15 [75] ExchangeRate.com - Dominica Central Bank Discount Rate Answers.  
16 [http://www.exchangerate.com/statistics-data/central-bank-discount-rate/The-central-](http://www.exchangerate.com/statistics-data/central-bank-discount-rate/The-central-bank-discount-rate-of-Dominica-is.html)  
17 [bank-discount-rate-of-Dominica-is.html](http://www.exchangerate.com/statistics-data/central-bank-discount-rate/The-central-bank-discount-rate-of-Dominica-is.html); [accessed 9 July 2021]
- 18 [76] Yates J, Daiyan R, Patterson R, Egan R, Amal R, Ho-Baille A, Chang NL.  
19 Techno-economic Analysis of Hydrogen Electrolysis from Off-Grid Stand-Alone  
20 Photovoltaics Incorporating Uncertainty Analysis. *Cell Rep. Phys. Sci.*  
21 2020;1(10):100209.
- 22 [77] International Renewable Energy Agency T.Green hydrogen cost reduction scaling  
23 up electrolyzers to meet the 1.5°C climate goal. [https://irena.org/-](https://irena.org/-/media/Files/IRENA/Agency/Publication/2020/Dec/IRENA_Green_hydrogen_cost_2020.pdf)  
24 [/media/Files/IRENA/Agency/Publication/2020/Dec/IRENA Green hydrogen cost 2020](https://irena.org/-/media/Files/IRENA/Agency/Publication/2020/Dec/IRENA_Green_hydrogen_cost_2020.pdf)  
25 [.pdf](https://irena.org/-/media/Files/IRENA/Agency/Publication/2020/Dec/IRENA_Green_hydrogen_cost_2020.pdf); 2020 [accessed 8 July 2021].
- 26 [78] Lazard's Levelized Cost of Energy and of Storage Analysis.  
27 <https://www.lazard.com/perspective/lcoe2020>; [accessed 7 July 2021]
- 28 [79] International Renewable Energy Agency and Methanol Institute, *Innovation*  
29 *Outlook: Renewable Methanol*, International Renewable Energy Agency, 2021; ISBN  
30 978-92-9260-320-5.
- 31 [80] Keith DW, Holmes G, Angelo D, Heidel K. A Process for Capturing CO<sub>2</sub> from  
32 the Atmosphere. *Joule*. 2018;2(8):1573–94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joule.2018.05.006>

- 1 [81] International Organization for Standardization, Environmental management -Life  
2 cycle assessment -Principles and Framework; ISO 14044:2006 c2006 [updated 2016;  
3 cited 2020 December].
- 4 [82] Rodríguez-Vallejo DF, Valente A, Guillén-Gosálbez G, Chachuat B. Economic  
5 and life-cycle assessment of OME 3–5 as transport fuel: a comparison of production  
6 pathways. *Sustainable Energy & Fuels*. 2021;5(9):2504–16.  
7 <https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2021/se/d1se00335f>
- 8 [83] Rodríguez-Vallejo DF, Guillén-Gosálbez G, Chachuat B. What Is the True Cost  
9 of Producing Propylene from Methanol? The Role of Externalities. *ACS Sustainable  
10 Chemistry and Engineering* 2020;8(8):3072–81.  
11 <https://dx.doi.org/10.1021/acssuschemeng.9b05516>
- 12 [84] Somoza-Tornos A, Gonzalez-Garay A, Pozo C, Graells M, Espuña A, Guillén-  
13 Gosálbez G. Realizing the Potential High Benefits of Circular Economy in the Chemical  
14 Industry: Ethylene Monomer Recovery via Polyethylene Pyrolysis. *ACS Sustainable  
15 Chemistry & Engineering*. 2020;8(9):3561–72.  
16 <https://dx.doi.org/10.1021/acssuschemeng.9b04835>
- 17 [85] Müller LJ, Kätelhön A, Bachmann M, Zimmermann A, Sternberg A, Bardow A.  
18 A Guideline for Life Cycle Assessment of Carbon Capture and Utilization. *Frontiers in  
19 Energy Research*. 2020;8:15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenrg.2020.00015>
- 20 [86] Müller LJ, Kätelhön A, Bringezu S, McCoy S, Suh S, Edwards R et al. The  
21 carbon footprint of the carbon feedstock CO<sub>2</sub>. *Energy Environ. Sci.* 2020;13(9):2979–92.  
22 <https://doi.org/10.1039/D0EE01530J>
- 23 [87] United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Intended  
24 Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) of the Commonwealth of Dominica,  
25 [https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/submissions/INDC/Published%20Documents/Dominica/1/  
26 Commonwealth%20of%20Dominica-  
27 %20Intended%20Nationally%20Determined%20Contributions%20\(INDC\).pdf](https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/submissions/INDC/Published%20Documents/Dominica/1/Commonwealth%20of%20Dominica-%20Intended%20Nationally%20Determined%20Contributions%20(INDC).pdf).  
28 (Accessed June, 2021)
- 29 [88] United Nations, Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), Goal 13: Take urgent  
30 action to combat climate change, [https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/climate-  
31 change/](https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/climate-change/) [Accessed May 2021]
- 32 [89] Energy Regulation Commission, 2017 Activity Report; ISSN: 1771-3188.
- 33 [90] World Bank, 2021 Commodity Markets.  
34 <https://www.worldbank.org/en/research/commodity-markets> (Accessed 7 July 2021).

- 1 [91] Stark G, Barrows C, Brinkman G, Carney S, Triana E. A Novel Framework for  
2 Hydropower Scheduling Under Uncertainty, EGU General Assembly 2020, Online, May  
3 2020; EGU 2020-12054. <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-egu2020-12054>, 2020.
- 4 [92] Soltani M, Moradi Kashkooli F, Souri M, Rafiei B, Jabarifar M, Gharali K, et al.  
5 Environmental, economic, and social impacts of geothermal energy systems. *Renew.*  
6 *Sust. Energ. Rev.* 2021;140:110750. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2021.110750>.
- 7 [93] Shen W, Chen X, Qiu J, Hayward JA, Sayeef S, Osman P, et al. A comprehensive  
8 review of variable renewable energy levelized cost of electricity. *Renew. Sust. Energ.*  
9 *Rev.* 2020;133:110301. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.110301>.
- 10 [94] Brown T, Industry report sees multi-billion ton market for green ammonia,  
11 Ammonia Energy Association 2021. [https://www.ammoniaenergy.org/articles/industry-](https://www.ammoniaenergy.org/articles/industry-report-sees-multi-billion-ton-market-for-green-ammonia/)  
12 [report-sees-multi-billion-ton-market-for-green-ammonia/](https://www.ammoniaenergy.org/articles/industry-report-sees-multi-billion-ton-market-for-green-ammonia/) (accessed June 2021).

13

14