



CAES or Batteries?

Many people have suggested that batteries are a viable way forward for grid-scale electricity storage, and some have cast doubt on whether there is a role for Compressed Air Energy Storage (CAES).

However CAES, batteries and the other storage technologies are very different technologies, for different scales, durations and duty cycles. There is a role for all of them, with each having its optimal niches. Therefore we consider them under the following headings, which are the headings of this report:

1. Power
2. Capacity
3. Response Time, Duty Cycles, Ancillary Services

There are also additional considerations, such as:

4. Cost, Lifetime and Efficiency
5. Environmental Considerations
6. Cost and Performance Summary
7. Global Potential
8. Other Analysts' Views

The final section looks at the quantity of storage required, and how the different technologies fit together.

Power

Energy storage is required at a number of different scales. We divide them into five bands, as follows:

Scale	Power	Technologies Best Suited
Domestic	<100 kW	Batteries, supercapacitors, flywheels
Local	<1 MW	Batteries, supercapacitors, flywheels, cryogenic
Area	<10 MW	Cryogenic, heat, poss. large batteries, poss. CAES
Regional	<100 MW	CAES, pumped hydro, poss. Heat
Grid	>100 MW	CAES, pumped hydro

The largest battery currently installed anywhere (or, to our knowledge, planned anywhere) is 65MW. These are used to alleviate local and domestic line capacity constraints, and to provide a small amount of time-shifting of energy, i.e. making it available at a time other than when it was generated.

It is possible to increase batteries' rated power cheaply, though this would entail reducing their capacity (duration of output at full power) proportionately. Thus a 20MWh battery could produce 10MW for 2 hours or 40MW for 30 minutes, assuming that the electrical circuits and signal conditioning can take it.

Grid-scale electricity storage
using an innovative form of
Compressed Air Energy Storage



Although there have been start-ups offering small-scale CAES, Storelectric and most other CAES companies believe that it is best suited to large-scale applications, of 100MW or more. Storelectric offers efficient solutions rated above 100MW, with the potential for smaller ratings either in the future or with decreasing efficiency and cost-effectiveness. Power is determined by the design, specification and cost of all the surface systems, and is therefore the main driver behind the cost of a CAES plant – though the cost per MW of power decreases rapidly as size increases. A good rule of thumb is that whereas batteries increase in cost by ~85% when doubling either their power rating (at constant duration) or their duration, Storelectric's CAES increases by ~1/3.

Capacity

Energy storage is required at a number of different scales, which we define thus:

Scale	Capacity	Technologies Best Suited
Domestic	<250 kWh	Batteries, supercapacitors, flywheels
Local	<5 MWh	Batteries, supercapacitors, cryogenic
Area	<50 MWh	Cryogenic, heat, poss. large batteries, poss. CAES
Regional	<500 MWh	CAES, pumped hydro, poss. Heat
Grid	>500 MWh	CAES, pumped hydro

All grid-connected batteries to date have had a storage capacity of between 1 and 2 hours' output at full rated power. Therefore they are best suited to application that require such durations of output, or (better) less: if less, then they can produce output on multiple occasions between charges.

Doubling the capacity of a grid-connected battery costs at least 80% of the original cost, as twice the number of batteries is needed, and other system elements (such as air conditioning) need to be (approximately) doubled. Capacity is the main cost driver for batteries.

The total output of Tesla's Gigafactory (under construction) is 35GWh p.a. by 2020. A single CAES plant could have this capacity.

Although there have been start-ups offering CAES storing energy in cylinders, Storelectric believes that such technologies are unlikely to be cost-effective in the near future. Geological storage is much larger scale and cheaper.

Storelectric can store its air in salt caverns now. Salt caverns are solution mined, a slow but relatively cheap process, depending on geology and geography: the geology must offer salt and mudstone strata sufficiently deep, and the geography must offer a source of water, and a destination (either industry or the sea) for brine. With these caveats, the cost of capacity is ~\$6/kWh, or \$6m/GWh, to use the same surface equipment.

Grid-scale electricity storage
using an innovative form of
Compressed Air Energy Storage



Notably, there are salt basins across the world; in Europe there are sufficient to store a week's worth of the continent's total energy demand; similar amounts could also be stored in North America, North Africa, the Middle East and elsewhere.

In future it will be able to store air in six other geologies, which would open up virtually the entire planet to CAES. Most of these are in porous rock (e.g. aquifers, depleted hydrocarbon wells) and therefore offer much larger scale storage, much more cheaply.

Response Time, Duty Cycles, Ancillary Services

Response Time

Batteries have a very rapid response time: they can usually be operational and synchronised with the grid within a second. They can also remain on standby with low energy consumption. Only supercapacitors and flywheels are faster, and these have much lower capacity (duration). The “virtual storage” derived from Demand Side Response can also match it, provided permission is not required before use.

CAES and Pumped Hydro are rather slower. They can respond with 30 seconds, though a smaller plant (of either type) optimised for speed of response could respond within 10 seconds if kept spinning and synchronised: CAES would do this using the generator (without load) as a motor, and therefore consuming little power.

Duty Cycles

Batteries are best suited to duty cycles that last from minutes to half an hour or more, repeating in order to provide levelling for intermittent generation, and to satisfy demand spikes without burdening the remainder of the grid.

CAES is best suited to duty cycles from minutes to entire peak periods or even days, though can be optimised for quicker response times. This provides (with zero or very low emissions) the system back-up and resilience that is currently being provided by gas-fired peaking plants at great cost and with substantial emissions.

Other Ancillary Services

CAES, Pumped Hydro and flywheels offer another valuable service that batteries and supercapacitors cannot: inertia to increase loss-of-infeed tolerance and short circuit level. This is the immediate inertial response of a system to rapid faults, which grid operators value very highly. Indeed, if they deem there to be insufficient inertia on the system (for example, excessive proportions of power coming from non-synchronous sources such as wind turbines, solar panels and interconnectors), they will invest millions to build plants solely to provide inertia. They also offer reactive load, and can help suppress voltage dips and harmonics.

Cost, Lifetime and Efficiency

Cost

Grid-scale electricity storage using an innovative form of Compressed Air Energy Storage




According to Lazard's analysis (www.lazard.com/insights), comparing the costs of various power sources in America (where planning, construction, gas and coal prices are all cheap), CAES is much cheaper per MWh of power than batteries. Indeed, Storelectric's CAES is cheaper than an equivalent sized gas-fired peaking plant (OCGT), based on a plant generating 500MW and a capacity of 6-21GWh.

LAZARD'S LEVELIZED COST OF ENERGY ANALYSIS—VERSION 8.0

Unsubsidized Levelized Cost of Energy Comparison

Certain Alternative Energy generation technologies are cost-competitive with conventional generation technologies under some scenarios; such observation does not take into account potential social and environmental externalities (e.g., social costs of distributed generation, environmental consequences of certain conventional generation technologies, etc.) or reliability-related considerations (e.g., transmission and back-up generation costs associated with certain Alternative Energy generation technologies)



- Source: Lazard estimates.
Note: Here and throughout this presentation, unless otherwise indicated, analysis assumes 60% de-rated capacity factor for gas and coal plants and natural gas price of \$4.50 per MMBtu.
† Denotes distributed generation technology.
(a) Analysis excludes integration costs for intermittent technologies. A variety of studies suggest integration costs ranging from \$2.00 to \$10.00 per MWh.
(b) Low end represents single-axis tracking. High end represents fixed-tilt installation. Assumes: 10 MW system in high insolation jurisdiction (e.g., Southwest U.S.). Not directly comparable for baseload. Does not account for differences in heat coefficients, balance-of-system costs or other potential factors which may differ across solar technologies.
(c) Diamonds represent estimated implied levelized cost of energy in 2017, assuming \$1.25 per watt for a single-axis tracking system.
(d) Low end represents concentrating solar towers with 10-hour storage capability. High end represents concentrating solar towers with 10-hour storage capability.
(e) Estimates per National Action Plan for Energy Efficiency, actual cost for various initiatives varies widely. Estimates involving demand response may fail to account for opportunity cost of foregone consumption.
(f) Indicative range based on current stationary storage technologies; assumes capital costs of \$300 – \$750/kWh for 6 hours of storage capacity, \$60/MWh cost to charge, one full cycle per day (full charge and discharge), efficiency of 75% – 85% and fixed O&M costs of \$22.00 to \$27.50 per kWh installed per year.
(g) Diamonds represent estimated implied levelized cost for "best generation" storage in 2017, assumes capital costs of \$300/kWh for 6 hours of storage capacity, \$60/MWh cost to charge, one full cycle per day (full charge and discharge), efficiency of 75% and fixed O&M costs of \$5.00 per kWh installed per year.
(h) Low end represents continuous operation. High end represents intermittent operation. Assumes diesel price of \$4.00 per gallon.
(i) High end incorporates 90% carbon capture and compression. Does not include cost of transportation and storage.
(j) Represents estimate of current U.S. new IGCC construction with carbon capture and compression. Does not include cost of transportation and storage.
(k) Does not reflect decommissioning costs or potential economic impact of federal loan guarantees or other subsidies.
(l) Represents estimate of current U.S. new nuclear construction.
(m) Based on advanced supercritical pulverized coal. High end incorporates 90% carbon capture and compression. Does not include cost of transportation and storage.
(n) Incorporates 90% carbon capture and compression. Does not include cost of transportation and storage.

2 | LAZARD


Copyright 2014 Lazard.

Grid-scale electricity storage using an innovative form of Compressed Air Energy Storage



Capital Cost Comparison

While capital costs for a number of Alternative Energy generation technologies (e.g., solar PV, solar thermal) are currently in excess of some conventional generation technologies (e.g., gas), declining costs for many Alternative Energy generation technologies, coupled with rising long-term construction and uncertain long-term fuel costs for conventional generation technologies, are working to close formerly wide gaps in electricity costs. This assessment, however, does not take into account issues such as dispatch characteristics, capacity factors, fuel and other costs needed to compare generation technologies



Source: Lazard estimates.

- (a) High end represents single-axis tracking. Low end represents fixed-axis tracking.
- (b) Diamond represents estimated capital costs in 2017, assuming 10-hour storage capability.
- (c) Low end represents concentrating solar tower with 10-hour storage capability. High end represents concentrating solar tower with 18-hour storage capability.
- (d) Represents estimated midpoint of capital costs for offshore wind, assuming a capital cost range of \$3.10 - \$5.50 per watt.
- (e) Indicative range based on current stationary storage technologies.
- (f) High end incorporates 90% carbon capture and compression. Does not include cost of transportation and storage.
- (g) Represents estimate of current U.S. new IGCC construction with carbon capture and compression. Does not include cost of transportation and storage.
- (h) Represents estimate of current U.S. new nuclear construction.
- (i) Based on advanced supercritical pulverized coal. High end incorporates 90% carbon capture and compression. Does not include cost of transportation and storage.

11 | LAZARD

Copyright 2014 Lazard.

Note that there is no comparison of storage capacity. For batteries, a storage capacity of 1-2 hours' duration at peak load is assumed. The figures for CAES are for between 12 and 42 hours' duration.

Lifetime

Depending on the temperatures and duty (load) cycles to which a battery is subjected, the average lifetime of a grid-connected battery is usually quoted as 5-8 years, Lithium chemistries being 5 years and lead-acid 8 years.

In contrast, the lifetime of a CAES installation is expected to be 40 years for the top-side equipment (with a mid-life overhaul) and over 100 years for the caverns. Huntorf was upgraded in 2006, aged 38 years, and is still operating – at a higher capacity (321MW versus 290MW as first built) than originally.

Efficiency

CAES has various quoted levels of efficiency. Storelectric's is much better:

- Huntorf (traditional OCGT-based CAES): 42%
- McIntosh (traditional CCGT-based CAES): 54%
- Dresser Rand's SmartCAES (an evolution of McIntosh): up to 60%
- Storelectric, with thermal energy storage: 68-70%

Grid-scale electricity storage using an innovative form of Compressed Air Energy Storage



Battery advocates often quote efficiencies of 85%-97%, but these are battery-only performances with small-scale installations. Large installations require huge parasitic / ancillary loads, especially air conditioning. Northern Power Grid's Customer-Led Network Revolution, which concluded in December 2014, measured the actual round trip efficiency of battery systems at the beginning of their life¹:

	2.5kVA, 5MWh	100kVA, 200kWh	50kVA, 100kWh
Cost excl. installation	£3.76m	£406k	£331k
£/MWh	£752k	£2,030k	£3,310k
Cost inc. Installation	£4.62m	£490k	£422k
£/MWh	£924k	£2,450k	£4,110k
Nominal efficiency	83.2%	83.2%	83.2%
Measured efficiency	69.0%	69.0%	69.0%
Average parasitic load	29.5 kW	29.5 kW	29.5 kW

In a recent public presentation, a senior manager of Belectric stated "it is well known that" a 5-year-old grid connected battery requires three times as much air conditioning load as an otherwise identical 1-year-old installation, due to the rate of deterioration of the battery. However there is little literature on this because the rate of deterioration depends on the temperatures and duty (load) cycles to which a battery is subjected.

Cost and Performance Summary

The various technologies can be summarised (excluding durations) as follows:

Technology	Type	Size (up to)				Grid Support				Efficiency	LCOE	Capex	
		10 MW	100 MW	1 GW	>1 GW	FFR	FR	SU	LT	%	\$ /MWh	\$k /kW	\$ /kWh
Storelectric	CAES									68-70	100	1	116
Dresser Rand ¹	CAES									54 ¹	125	4.7	586
Pumped Hydro	PHES									75-82	185	5.8	725
Highview	Cryogenic									65?	210	1.36	340
Li-ion	Battery									41-75	125	6	5454
Va Redox ²	Flow Batt.									60-70	460	6.5	1300
Flywheels	Flywheels						3			85-95	380	4.2	1700

Notes

1. Dresser Rand has 50-60% of the natural gas burn (and emissions) of an equivalent sized CCGT
2. Vanadium Redox flow battery
3. Flywheels' normal duration is 5-15 mins

Key: Grid Support

- FFR Fast frequency response
FR Frequency Response
SU Start-up (e.g. back-up to wind)
LT Long term (weekly or more)

Data sources for costs:

¹ <http://www.networkrevolution.co.uk/project-library/electrical-energy-storage-cost-analysis/>

Grid-scale electricity storage using an innovative form of Compressed Air Energy Storage



Storelectric	Storelectric Ltd, based on a 500MW, 6GWh plant after the first 3-5 plants when capex costs will have stabilised
Dresser Rand installations	DoE (American Department of Energy) www.sandia.gov/ess/publications/SAND2013-5131.pdf Brayton
Highview	Highview Power Cost Estimator, http://www.highview-power.com/market/#calc-jumper using their default values (100MW, 4 hours, standalone system). Levelised cost from http://cleanhorizon.com/images/slides/20140916_CleanHorizon_white_paper_3.pdf
Pumped Hydro	DoE (American Department of Energy) www.sandia.gov/ess/publications/SAND2013-5131.pdf
Lithium Ion	Costs: DoE (American Department of Energy) www.sandia.gov/ess/publications/SAND2013-5131.pdf , taking the three batteries with duration >1 hour (the remainder had durations of 0.25 hours), averaging them at \$6000/kWh for a 1.1 hr battery
Lithium Ion	Efficiencies: http://www.networkrevolution.co.uk/project-library/electrical-energy-storage-cost-analysis/ . Best efficiency is 69% including parasitic loads (bottom of p6) for a 5MW system; the figures in the table assume that efficiencies increase with size.
Va Redox	DoE (American Department of Energy) www.sandia.gov/ess/publications/SAND2013-5131.pdf
Flywheels	DoE (American Department of Energy) www.sandia.gov/ess/publications/SAND2013-5131.pdf

Environmental Considerations

Batteries need to be mined, refined, transported, manufactured, replaced every 5-8 years, and then recycled or disposed of. They all use elements and compounds that are toxic, explosive or both, and most use raw materials of which there would be a major shortage if exploited for global grid balancing (see next section).

Pumped hydro-electric schemes flood two valleys (unless using the sea, a lake or a river as the lower reservoir, an unusual set-up), are usually remote from major generation and consumption (hence require very long transmission lines, with their losses and visual blight) and are open to large-scale evaporation (and are therefore not suited to hot climates). They also require a very special topography, which is not common – and even less so if one excludes areas of outstanding natural beauty or environmental importance.

Storelectric stores its power underground, invisibly. Its surface footprint is comparable with a gas-fired power station of equivalent size, and its subterranean footprint is of the order of a square kilometre per plant. The caverns are so deep that many activities (especially farming) can continue above them. The pressure at which the air is stored is determined by the weight of the rock above, which is therefore not in tension but is being kept in balance by the air pressure within. And air is benign, almost completely safe to store and to use, unlike the natural gas that is currently stored in these same geologies at the same pressures.

Global Potential

According to David Mackay's book "Sustainable Energy – Without the Hot Air" <http://www.withouthotair.com/> (David was Chief Scientific Officer for the British Government's Department of Energy and Climate Change), there is enough lithium in the ground (excluding the very low-grade stocks in the sea) globally to power either the world's cars or the world's grids – and that's without the world's portable devices. And this assumes that:

1. We use lithium twice as efficiently as today, per MWh of storage;
2. We can extract it all cost-effectively;
3. There are no other uses for Lithium;
4. Every battery lasts forever, whereas their true life is 5 years;

Grid-scale electricity storage using an innovative form of Compressed Air Energy Storage






5. No battery is ever wasted or destroyed, anywhere;
6. Only today's number of vehicle-miles are driven, and only today's amounts of electricity are consumed, which disadvantages developing countries as well as preventing the electrification of heating (e.g. by heat pumps), industry and transportation;
7. We ignore the scarcity of the other elements (manganese, cobalt, nickel, and alloying metals) that form an essential part of a modern lithium battery.

Clearly none of these assumptions is remotely sustainable, except the first which may be achievable in 10-20 years. The only reason why lithium prices are dropping is because extraction technologies are still improving faster than demand: if demand were to grow to such global levels, scarcity pricing would soon start.

In contrast, salt basins alone offer enormous potential for CAES:



Grid-scale electricity storage using an innovative form of Compressed Air Energy Storage



Note that global salt basins are:

- On a scale that only shows one of the 10 UK basins;
- Only shown in countries that divulge their geology publicly; and
- Coincident with areas explored for petrochemicals: nobody seeks salt basins, they find them by accident.
- Therefore there are many more, often undiscovered as yet: we know of one three times the size of the Cheshire basin located west of New Delhi, India, and another in Queensland, Australia.

Moreover, the other six geologies in which CAES can be built (following minor R&D) extend potential areas globally, without necessarily having any impact on resources that people would otherwise use. These geologies are all currently used safely for storing methane:

- Saline and sweet water aquifers (deeper than used for drinking water);
- Depleted oil fields;

Grid-scale electricity storage using an innovative form of Compressed Air Energy Storage



- Depleted gas fields;
- Chalk;
- Gypsum;
- Limestone.

Other Analysts' Views

We select a small number from among the hundreds of reports that have analysed a variety of storage technologies for their “sweet spots”. Almost without exception, they support the above analysis. Note that none of them was aware of Storelectric’s particularly high-potential technology when undertaking these analyses, and therefore base all their evaluations on Huntorf and McIntosh.

Chinese paper on combined pumped hydro and CAES²

Table 1. Capital cost of installed storage plants.

Type	Storage Capital Cost (\$/kWh)	Plant Capital Cost (\$/kW)	Storage Capital (MWh)	Efficiency (%)	Operation and maintenance cost (\$/kW/yr)	Hours (full power)	Power (MW)
CAES	>3	>425	5–100,000	>70	1.35	1–10 min	0.5–2700
Pumped Hydro	>10	>600	>20,000	>70	4.3	10 s–4 min	300–1800
Flywheel	300–25,000	280–360	0.0002–500	90–93	7.5	<1s	0.001–1
Superconducting Magnet	500–72,000	300	0.0002–100	95	1	<1s	0.001–2
Battery Storage	1–15	500–1500	0.0002–2	59	-	<1s	0.01–3

The following four graphs provide different ways of looking at storage:

1. By cost and technology maturity;
2. By power output and energy stored;
3. By power rating and discharge time (another view of the previous graph);
4. By capital cost per unit energy.

All four show CAES comparable with pumped hydro, fulfilling similar functions, and therefore not competing with the other technologies. To compare with pumped hydro, one must consider proximity to electricity supply and demand, topography / geology, and environmental footprint as well as capital and revenue costs.


KIC InnoEnergy, Thematic Field: Smart Grids and Electric Storage, Strategy and Roadmap 2014 [KIC = Knowledge and Innovation Community.]³

“Electricity storage is identified as a key technology priority in the development of the European power system, in line with the 2020 and 2050 EU energy targets. Power storage has gained high political interest in the light of the development of renewables and distributed generation, as a way to reduce carbon emissions, to improve grid stability and to control the fluctuations of variable resources.”


² <http://www.mdpi.com/1996-1073/6/3/1554> linking to <https://www.mdpi.com/1996-1073/6/3/1554/pdf>

³ <http://cip2014.kic-innoenergy.com/thematic-roadmaps/>

Grid-scale electricity storage using an innovative form of Compressed Air Energy Storage





(Next graph⁴)



⁴ <http://www.sc.ehu.es/sbweb/energias-renovables/temas/almacenamiento/almacenamiento.html>

Grid-scale electricity storage using an innovative form of Compressed Air Energy Storage





How Much From Each Technology?

According to the UK Government's Technology Innovation Needs Assessment (TINA) 2015 main projection, by 2050 the UK needs 27.4GW, 128GWh storage⁵. This is in a range of needs that extends to 59.2 GW, 286 GWh.

Taking the main projection, these can be satisfied as follows, according to reasonable estimates of the potential of each:

Technology	Power (GW)	Capacity (GWh)
Pumped Hydro	2 GW	20 GWh
Batteries	2-3 GW	2-3 GWh
Interconnectors	8-12 GW	n/a
Demand Side Response	2-3 GW	2-3 GWh
Unmet need for storage	7.4-13.4 GW	102-104 GWh

Storelectric's CAES is one of the only technologies capable of meeting this unmet need⁶ – and certainly the only one to meet it cost-effectively and minimising environmental effects.

About Storelectric

⁵ http://www.lowcarboninnovation.co.uk/working_together/technology_focus_areas/electricity_networks_storage/

⁶ Basis of these figures:

- **Pumped Hydro:** 2,828MW, 9GWh current storage capacity. Total current projects: 1,960MW. Therefore 6GW, 12GWh represents Storelectric's assessment of the reasonable maximum available in the UK, given that each installation floods two valleys. Current projects are (maximum sizes only):
 - Sloy 60MW conversion from hydro-electric
 - Coire Glas 600MW
 - Balmacraan 600MW
 - Cruachan 600MW increase from current 440MW
 - Glyn Rhonwy 100MW
- **Batteries:** assumes wide-scale roll-out of grid connected batteries with 1-2 hours' duration. Average size of current such batteries is under 1MW (ref. REA Energy Storage in the UK report 2016).
- Current **interconnectors** are 4GW, with projects in planning to increase this to 9GW. But this includes the Norwegian interconnector (~5x our cost per MW) and the Icelandic one (>10x) – and interconnectors cannot be relied upon to deliver power exactly when needed, at reasonable prices.
- **Demand Side Response:** Assumes that there are 4-6GW (6-10% of peak demand) available at any time, that each call on resources continues for 30 minutes, and that any given resource cannot be called upon twice in quick succession. Therefore for 1 hour's usage, only half the power rating can be used at any time.

Grid-scale electricity storage
using an innovative form of
Compressed Air Energy Storage



Storelectric (www.storelectric.com) is developing truly grid-scale energy storage using an innovative form of Compressed Air Energy Storage (CAES). This uses existing, off-the-shelf equipment to create installations of 500MW, 6-21GWh with zero or low emissions, operating at 68-70% round trip efficiency, at a cost of £350m (€500m) (estimated for 3rd – 5th plant), and a levelised cost cheaper than that of gas-fired peaking plants (OCGT). Capex is one-third that of pumped hydro per MW and 1/75th per MWh; similar to 10-year target prices of batteries per MW and less than 1/1,000th per MWh. There is potential in the UK to store the entire continent's energy requirements for over a week; potential in mainland Europe and the USA is greater still, with global roll-out planned.

The next stage is to build a 20MW, >100MWh pilot plant with over 60% efficiency, using scale versions of the same technology, for which Storelectric is currently raising funds. Construction will take 2-3 years from funding, and the first full-scale plant a further 3-4 years. The consortium includes global multinationals who cover all the technologies involved, their installation, financial and legal aspects.