



Using Critical Thinking to Imagine Sustainable Energy Futures

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer Europa-Universität Flensburg

Yangon, Myanmar, September 3rd, 2019

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



Structure of the presentation



- Futures thinking and energy a special case
- Energy futures: sustainable or not?
- Sustainable energy target scenarios versus a business-as usual future
- Which sustainable energy target scenario should we choose?
- The use of backcasting from to find transition pathways
- Guiding transition pathways by policy
- Take home messages





FUTURES THINKING AND ENERGY A SPECIAL CASE

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



Futures Thinking and Energy The possibility cone



The typical cone of possible futures





Futures Thinking and Energy – A Special Case



Possible energy futures with growing demand:



- More fossil fuels
- More nuclear energy
- Fossil fuels with CCS

(Carbon Capture and

Storage)

- More renewable energy
- Energy savings / less use of energy
- Combinations of the above



Futures Thinking and Energy – A Special Case



Not every possible energy future is sustainable!



- Fossil fuels cause climate change and pollution
- Nuclear energy causes long term waste problems and catastrophic accidents
- Bioenergy may compete with food production
- Hydropower may have severe environmental





ENERGY FUTURES SUSTAINABLE OR NOT?

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



What is sustainable development?



Definition of the Brundtland Commission (WCED 1987):

'A development satisfying the needs of the present generation without impairing the needs of future generations.'





- Don't exceed the assimilative capacity of the ecosystems
- Don't exceed the regenerative capacity of the renewable resources
- Keep the functional stock of resource capital constant



The world economy as subsystem of the global ecosystem





Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer

Where do the management rules apply?





ZNES



Much more solar energy than needed













ZNES

ZENTRUM FÜR NACHHALTIGE ENERGIESYSTEME

CHULE UNIVERSITÄT FLENSBUR



Massive temperature rise because of human GHG emissions





By today + 1.0° warming compared to preindustrial levels

Additional warming of 0.2° per decade at present emission rates

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



Long temperature rise of 8 degrees by 2300 with high fossil fuel use





Source: IPCC 2013, p.17



Components of climate change (radiative forcing)





Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



IPCC emission pathways to stay within the 1.5° target agreed at COP 23 in Paris 2018



Global CO₂ emissions need to decline to net zero by 2040 to 2055!





The share of CO₂ from fossil fuels The example of Germany (2000)





97% of all CO₂ emissions from energy conversion processes!

Fossil fuels represent 85% of the problem

Share of GHGs in the FRG in 2000:

1%

0.25%

- CO₂: 87%
- CH4: 6%
- N2O: 6%
- HFCS/PFCS:
- SF6:

The future use of fossil fuels is not sustainable!

Source: BMU 2003, S. 32 und

UBA 2002, S. 31



Nuclear Energy



- Substantial risk of large scale accidents (e.g. Harrisburg, Chernobyl, Fukushima)
- Long term safety of nuclear waste deposits is still unclear
- Massive global use of nuclear energy carries massive risk of nuclear weapons technology proliferation
- In many industrialized societies nuclear energy is faced with massive problems of public acceptance

Nuclear energy is not a sustainable energy option







Not every energy future is sustainable



Only sustainable energy futures are acceptable!



Source: https://thevoroscope.com/2017/02/24/the-futures-cone-use-and-history/

Components of non sustainable energy futures:

- Coal, oil, gas
- Nuclear energy

Components of partially sustainable energy futures:

- Hydropower
- Bioenergy
- Components of fully sustainable energy future:
- Solar, wind, geothermal and ocean energy
- Energy savings, energy efficiency



Which sustainable energy future should we pick?



Which sustainable energy futures/scenarios can we design for a country?



Source: https://thevoroscope.com/2017/02/24/the-futurescone-use-and-history/

How much of which component can we envisage?

- energy savings
- energy efficiency

- geothermal
- ocean energy
- Hydropower
 - Bioenergy





SUSTAINABLE TARGET SCENARIOS VERSUS BUSINESS AS USUAL



What do we need to look at for sustainable future energy scenarios?



- The likely future energy demand
- The factors driving the future energy demand
 - Economic growth
 - Population growth
 - Energy efficiency improvements
- The possible contributions of different renewable energy sources
- Storage possibilities of a country





- Economic growth
 - In a first approximation energy consumption will grow at a similar path as the economic production (GDP)
- Population growth
 - Strong population growth can lead to even higher growth rates of the energy demand
- Energy efficiency improvements
 - Energy efficiency can lead to a decoupling of energy and economic growth



Possible future energy demand Economic growth as the main driver





Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



Possible future energy demand CO₂ emissions 1:1





Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



Possible future energy demand with autonomous improvements in energy efficiency











Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



Energy efficiency alone can't do the trick





Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer







WHICH SUSTAINABLE TARGET SCENARIO SHOULD WE CHOOSE?

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer







How to design sustainable energy scenarios for a country

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer Europa-Universität Flensburg

Yangon, Myanmar, September 4th, 2019

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer







HOW TO BUILD A SUSTAINABLE TARGET SCENARIO?

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer




A CLOSER LOOK AT ENERGY DEMAND

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



The structure of energy demand The example of German



Mechanical energy Stationary Mobile Heat High Temperature Low Temperature Cooling Lighting Information Technology







The structure of energy demand by energy service



- Mechanical energy
 - Stationary
 - Mobile (Transport)
- Heat
 - High Temperature
 - Low Temperature
- Cooling
- Lighting
- Information Technology





The structure of energy demand as flow chart





Sectors of final demand

- Industry
- Transport
- Households
- Service sector



The structure of energy demand as flow chart



Energy Flow Chart for the Federal Republic of Germany in 2017 Energy Unit Petajoule (PJ)*



Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



Projected future energy demand of Myanmar until 2050





A sevenfold increase in electricity demand will need to be met by 2050

Source: IES and MKE 2017

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer





A CLOSER LOOK AT RENEWABLE ENERGY SOURCES

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



Analyse the national renewable energy potentials



- Size (GW) and quality (cost per kWh) of the renewable resources of the country?
 - Solar energy (PV and solar thermal)
 - Wind energy (onshore and offshore)
 - Geothermal energy (deep and shallow)
 - Ocean energy (wave, tidal, ocean currents)
 - Hydropower
 - Bioenergy (waste and energy crops)



• In the first round of scenario building rough estimates will suffice.





A CLOSER LOOK STORAGE

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



Analyse the national storage potentials



- Size (GW) and quality (cost per kWh) of the storage options of the country?
 - Pump hydro storage
 - Compressed air storage
 - Power to gas to power storage
 - Battery storage







CHOOSING THE TARGET SCENARIO

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



Simulate possible target scenarios





Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



Compare results and select possible target scenarios (Barbados 2017)



| Scenario | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|-----|---|--------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | Scenario | LCOE | | | | | | | | |
| | No. | Name | | | | | | | | | |
| | (11 | 100% RE / Wind / PV / Solid waste combustion | 0.3883 | | | | | | | | |
| | 7 | 100% RE Wind and PV plus storage | 0.3999 | | | | | | | | |
| | 13 | 100% RE / Wind / PV / King Grass / WTE combustion | 0.4004 | | | | | | | | |
| | 6 | 100% RE Wind and storage alone | 0.4013 | | | | | | | | |
| | 17 | 100% RE / Wind / PV / King Grass / Bagasse / WTE combustion | 0.4128 | | | | | | | | |
| | 14 | 100% RE / Wind / PV / Bagasse / WTE combustion | 0.4143 | | | | | | | | |
| | 12 | 100% RE / Wind / PV / King Grass / WTE gasification | 0.4209 | | | | | | | | |
| | 8 | 100% RE / Wind / PV / King Grass | 0.4212 | | | | | | | | |
| | 9 | 100% RE / Wind / PV / Bagasse | 0.4233 | | | | | | | | |
| | 10 | 100% RE / Wind / PV / WTE gasification | 0.4356 | | | | | | | | |
| | 18 | 100% RE / Wind / PV / King Grass / Bagasse / WTE gasification /WTE combustion | 0.4361 | | | | | | | | |
| | 13a | 100% RE / Wind / PV / King Grass / WTE combustion | 0.4386 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | New diesel only (base line) | 0.4495 | | | | | | | | |
| | 16 | 100% RE / Wind / PV / King Grass / Bagasse / WTE gasification | 0.4584 | | | | | | | | |
| | 15 | 100% RE / Wind / PV / Bagasse / WTE gasification | 0.4614 | | | | | | | | |
| | 2 | Bagasse and river tamarind only | 0.4810 | | | | | | | | |
| | 3 | King grass gasification only | 0.4886 | | | | | | | | |
| | 5 | 100% RE PV and storage alone | 0.5100 | | | | | | | | |
| | 4 | Waste to energy gasification only | 0.5126 | | | | | | | | |

A multi-criteria decision process



Source: Hohmeyer 2017, p.17 and 19

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer





USE OF BACKCASTING TO FIND TRANSITION PATHWAYS

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



Moving from today to sustainable future scenarios and backcasting the way to the future





Source: https://www.pinterest.de/pin/49757745 8821892421/



Figure 4.9: Construction of a scenario with its pathway in a sequence of development rounds

Source: Maas 2014, p. 129



Example of a simple transition pathways for a selected target scenario (Barbados), Part 1



| | | | | | | | Instal | ed capac | tiies an | d annua | l genei | ration | | |
|---------|---------------------------------|------|---------------------------|-------------|-----|-----------|--------|-----------|------------|-----------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| S | Scenario (Wind year 2011 | Year | Annual power demand | LCOE | Wi | nd | Ρ | v | King Grass | | Bag and tam coml | gasse I river harind bustion | Soli comb | d wate oustion |
| No · | Name | | | BBD/ kWh | MW | GWh/ a | MW | GWh/ a | MW | GWh/ a | MW | GWh/ a | MW | GWh/a |
| | | 2015 | 950 | | 0 | | 10 | 19 | | | | | 0 | |
| | 100% RE / Wind / PV / WTE | 2020 | 1050 | 0.3664 | 25 | 114 | 55 | 113 | | | | | 5 | 34 |
| 11 | | 2025 | 1150 | 0.3002 | 105 | 481 | 125 | 258 | | | | | 11 | 74 |
| | combustion | 2030 | 1250 | 0.3123 | 185 | 847 | 195 | 403 | | | | | 11 | 74 |
| | | 2035 | 1350 | 0.3883 | 265 | 1213 | 265 | 547 | | | | | 11 | 74 |

Source: Hohmeyer 2017, p.22

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



Example of a simple transition pathways for a selected target scenario (Barbados), Part 2



Transition pathway Installed capacities and annual generation Stora Scenario / Wind year 2011 Total Annual Diesel/ ge Storage Storage Year power LCOE Share of RE overproduct **Biodiesel** volu generation pumping demand ion me No. Name **BBD**/ MW GWh/ **MWh** MW GWh/ MW GWh/ % GWh/a kWh а а а 2015 950 239 950 2020 1050 0.3664 140.9 789 24.9 % 0 100% RE / Wind / PV / WTE 2025 1150 0.3002 148.8 354 3000 150.5 60 90 69.2 % 17 80 11 combustion 2030 1250 0.3123 162.2 118 5000 186.3 176 220.7 202 90.6 % 192 2035 0.3883 1350 166.7 50 5000 196.8 205 307 238 96.3 % 400 Target scenario 11

Source: Hohmeyer 2017, p.23

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



Backcasting simple transition pathways for four selected target scenarios (Barbados)



| | | | | | | | Instal | lled capa | cities an | id annua | l gene | ration | | | | | | | | | | | Installed | l capaciti | es and a | nnual ge | neration | | | |
|------------------------------|--|-----------|---------------------------|-------------|-----|-----------|--------|-----------|------------|-----------|--|-----------|-----------------------|-------|---------|--|------|---------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-----------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Scenario / Wind year 2011 | | d Year | Annual power demand | LCOE | Wi | /ind PV | | ٩V | King Grass | | Bagasse and river tamarind combustion | | Solid wate combustion | | : | Scenario / Wind year 2011 | Year | Annual power demand | LCOE | Diesel/ Biodiesel | | Stora ge volu me | a Storage u generatio | | Stor pum | rage iping | Share of RE | Total overproduct ion | | |
| 1 | No Name | | | BBD/ kWh | MW | GWh/ a | MW | GWh/ a | MW | GWh/ a | мw | GWh/ a | MW | GWh/a | No. | Name | | | BBD/ kWh | MW | GWh/ a | MWh | MW | GWh/ a | MW | GWh/ a | % | GWh/a | | |
| - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2015 | 950 | | 239 | 950 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 2015 | 950 | | 0 | | 10 | 19 | | | | | 0 | | | | 2020 | 1050 | 0.3664 | 140.9 | 789 | | | | | | 24.9 % | 0 | | |
| | 100% RE | 2020 | 1050 | 0.3664 | 25 | 114 | 55 | 113 | | | | | 5 | 34 | 11 | 100% RE / Wind / PV / WTE combustion | 2025 | 1150 | 0.3002 | 148.8 | 354 | 3000 | 150.5 | 60 | 90 | 80 | 69.2 % | 17 | | |
| (| 11 Wind / PV WTE | 2025 | 1150 | 0.3002 | 105 | 481 | 125 | 258 | | | | | 11 | 74 | | | 2030 | 1250 | 0.3123 | 162.2 | 118 | 5000 | 186.3 | 176 | 220.7 | 202 | 90.6 % | 192 | | |
| | combustio | 2030 | 1250 | 0.3123 | 185 | 847 | 195 | 403 | | | | | 11 | 74 | | | 2035 | 1350 | 0.3883 | 166.7 | 50 | 5000 | 196.8 | 205 | 307 | 238 | 96.3 % | 400 | | |
| | | 2035 | 1350 | 0.3883 | 265 | 1213 | 265 | 547 | | | | | 11 | 74 | | | 2015 | 950 | | 230 | 950 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % | 0 | | |
| | | 2015 | 950 | | 0 | 0 | 10 | 19 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | 100% RE / Wind / P\/ / King | 2013 | 4050 | 0.0000 | 233 | 300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % | 0 | | |
| | 100% RE | 2020 | 1050 | 0.3696 | 20 | 92 | 65 | 134 | 2 | 5 | | | 5 | 34 | | | 2020 | 1050 | 0.3696 | 140.2 | 765 | | | | | | 25.2 % | 0 | | |
| (| Wind / PV 13 King Grass | 2025 | 1150 | 0.3253 | 90 | 412 | 120 | 248 | 10 | 30 | | | 11 | 74 | 13 | Grass / WTE combustion | 2025 | 1150 | 0.3253 | 148 | 422 | | | | | | 63.3 % | 36 | | |
| | combustio | 2030 | 1250 | 0.3161 | 160 | 733 | 175 | 361 | 18 | 75 | | | 11 | 74 | | | 2030 | 1250 | 0.3161 | 155.6 | 164.4 | 5000 | 178 | 142 | 162.8 | 163 | 86.8 % | 157.4 | | |
| | | 2035 | 1350 | 0.4004 | 232 | 1062 | 232 | 479 | 26 | 120 | | | 11 | 74 | | | 2035 | 1350 | 0.4004 | 144.8 | 50 | 5000 | 172.9 | 163 | 253.4 | 190 | 96.3 % | 435 | | |
| | | 2015 | 950 | | 0 | | 10 | 19 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | | | 2015 | 950 | | 239 | 950 | | | | | | 0.0 % | | | |
| | 1000/ DE | 2020 | 1050 | 0.3749 | 20 | 92 | 50 | 103 | 2 | 5 | | | 5 | 34 | | 100% RE / Wind / PV / King Grass / WTE combustion | 2020 | 1050 | 0.3749 | 140.2 | 816 | | | | | | 22.3 % | 0 | | |
| 1 | Wind / PV King Grass | 2025 | 1150 | 0.3354 | 80 | 366 | 100 | 206 | 14 | 45 | | | 11 | 74 | 13 a | | 2025 | 1150 | 0.3354 | 140.5 | 469 | | | | | | 59.2 % | 10 | | |
| | WTE combustio | י 2030 | 1250 | 0.3451 | 140 | 641 | 150 | 310 | 27 | 150 | | | 11 | 74 | | | 2030 | 1250 | 0.3451 | 135.3 | 168 | 5000 | 156 | 97 | 131.5 | 110 | 86.6 % | 93 | | |
| | | 2035 | 1350 | 0.4331 | 200 | 916 | 200 | 413 | 40 | 300 | | | 11 | 74 | | | 2035 | 1350 | 0.4331 | 131.6 | 50 | 5000 | 156.8 | 129 | 199.8 | 151 | 96.3 % | 403 | | |
| | 100% RE / | 2015 | 950 | | 0 | 0 | 10 | 19 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 100% RE / Wind / PV / | 2015 | 950 | | 239 | 950 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % | 0 | | |
| | Wind / PV / Bagasse / W combustion | 7E 2020 | 1050 | 0.3807 | 20 | 92 | 65 | 134 | | | 25 | 169 | 5 | 34 | | Bagasse / WTE combustion | 2020 | 1050 | 0.3807 | 121.7 | 621 | | | | | | 40.9 % | 0 | | |
| | 14 | 2025 | 1150 | 0.3452 | 85 | 389 | 120 | 248 | | | 25 | 169 | 11 | 74 | 14 | | 2025 | 1150 | 0.3452 | 129.9 | 286 | 5000 | 138.4 | 56 | 85.3 | 75 | 75.1 % | 16 | | |
| 1 | | 2030 | 1250 | 0.3609 | 170 | 778 | 175 | 361 | | | 25 | 169 | 11 | 74 | | | 2030 | 1250 | 0.3609 | 139.4 | 133 | 5000 | 165 | 157 | 181.4 | 181 | 89.4 % | 265 | | |
| | | 2035 | 1350 | 0.4143 | 219 | 1003 | 219 | 452 | | | 25 | 169 | 11 | 74 | | | 2035 | 1350 | 0 4143 | 151.9 | 50 | 5000 | 180.6 | 176 | 248.3 | 205 | 96.3 % | 308 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2000 | 1000 | 0.4140 | 101.5 | | 0000 | 100.0 | | 240.0 | 200 | | - 390 | | |

Source: Hohmeyer 2017, p.22/23

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer





Different scenarios may need to build storage at different times

| | | | | | | Installed | I capaciti | | | | | | |
|-----|--|------|---------------------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| : | Scenario / Wind year 2011 | Year | Annual power demand | LCOE | Die Biod | sel/ iesel | Stora ge volu me | Sto gener | rage ration | Stor | age ping | Share of RE | Total overproduct ion |
| No. | Name | | | BBD/ kWh | MW GWh/ a | | MWh | MW GWh/ a | | MW GWh/ a | | % | GWh/a |
| | | 2015 | 950 | | 239 | 950 | | | | | | | |
| | 100% RE / Wind / PV / WTE combustion | 2020 | 1050 | 0.3664 | 140.9 | 789 | | | | | | 24.9 % | 0 |
| 11 | | 2025 | 1150 | 0.3002 | 148.8 | 354 | 3000 | 150.5 | 60 | 90 | 80 | 69.2 % | 17 |
| | | 2030 | 1250 | 0.3123 | 162.2 | 118 | 5000 | 186.3 | 176 | 220.7 | 202 | 90.6 % | 192 |
| | | 2035 | 1350 | 0.3883 | 166.7 | 50 | 5000 | 196.8 | 205 | 307 | 238 | 96.3 % | 400 |
| | | 2015 | 950 | | 239 | 950 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % | 0 |
| | | 2020 | 1050 | 0.3696 | 140.2 | 785 | | | | | | 25.2 % | 0 |
| 13 | 100% RE / Wind / PV / King Grass / WTE combustion | 2025 | 1150 | 0.3253 | 148 | 422 | | | | | | 63.3 % | 36 |
| | | 2030 | 1250 | 0.3161 | 155.6 | 164.4 | 5000 | 178 | 142 | 162.8 | 163 | 86.8 % | 157.4 |
| | | 2035 | 1350 | 0.4004 | 144.8 | 50 | 5000 | 172.9 | 163 | 253.4 | 190 | 96.3 % | 435 |
| | | | | | | | | | | \mathbf{k} | \mathcal{N} | | |

Source: Hohmeyer 2017, p.23

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer





GUIDING TRANSITION PATHWAYS BY POLICY

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



Where to find information on national renewable energy potentials



- Size (GW) and quality (cost per kWh) of the renewable resources of the country?
 - Solar energy (PV and solar thermal)
 - Wind energy (onshore and offshore)
 - Geothermal energy (deep and shallow)
 - Ocean energy (wave, tidal, ocean currents)
 - Hydropower
 - Bioenergy (waste and energy crops)



Source: IRENA Global Atlas for Renewable Energy (3TIER Global Solar Dataset)



- Markets don't steer towards sustainable energy futures due to massive externalities (climate, health, environment), which are not included in market prices!
- Policy has to set the guardrails / framework for markets to steer towards sustainable energy futures



Guiding the transition: The policy framework



- Prohibit the use of non sustainable energy sources (phase out):
 - Phase out of nuclear energy by set target year in many countries after Fukushima
 - Phase out of coal in a number of countries to reach climate targets
- Mandate the use of sustainable energy sources (phase in)
 - Renewable energy quota (portfolio standards) in different countries
- Make non sustainable energy sources very expensive (taxes or emission charges)
 - CO₂ taxes in some countries
 - CO₂ emission rights in trading systems
- Make sustainable energy sources cheap (subsidies)
 - Feed-in tariffs
 - Investment subsidies





TAKE HOME MESSAGES

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer





- Energy futures need to fulfill sustainability criteria
- Energy is the main cause and solution of global warming
- Projecting past trends into the future will not lead to a sustainable energy future
- A sustainable energy future has three main components:
 - Energy efficiency to decrease demand
 - 100% renewable energy supply
 - Storage to allow time shift of electricity from wind and solar production to times of demand
- Every country will have its own sustainable energy future
- Policy needs to set the framework to guide the transition





How to design sustainable energy scenarios for a country

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer Europa-Universität Flensburg

Yangon, Myanmar, September 4th, 2019

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



What do we need to look at for sustainable future energy scenarios?



- The likely future energy demand
- The factors driving the future energy demand
 - Economic growth
 - Population growth
 - Energy efficiency improvements
- The possible contributions of different renewable energy sources
- Storage possibilities of a country





A 100% renewable energy supply A chance for Myanmar?

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer Europa-Universität Flensburg

Langon, Myanmar, October 9th, 2017

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer





Results of a first 100% RE study on Myanmar



Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer Europa-Universität Flensburg

Langon, Myanmar, October 9th, 2017

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



Myanmar has very good wind and solar energy resources





Source: IES and MKE 2017

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



Myanmar's hydropower resource is excellent and biomass can contribute substantially



Table 5Summary of Estimated Renewable Energy Potential (Compiled from Various
Sources and Analysis)

| Myanmar | Potential (MW) | Source and comments | | | | | | |
|---------------|--------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Hydro (Large) | 46,000 | See Section 3.4 | | | | | | |
| Hydro (Small) | 231 | See Section 3.4 | | | | | | |
| Pump Storage | 0 | Lack of studies available | | | | | | |
| Solar | 26,962 MW | Renewable Energy Developments and Potential in the Greater Mekong Subregion (ADB, 2015) | | | | | | |
| Wind Onshore | 33,829 | Renewable Energy Developments and Potential in the Greater Mekong Subregion (ADB, 2015) | | | | | | |
| Wind Offshore | No information available | Lack of studies available | | | | | | |
| Biomass | 6,899 | IES projections based on data from Renewable Energy Developments and Potential in the Greater Mekong Subregion (ADB, 2015) | | | | | | |
| Biogas | 4,741 | IES projections based on data from Renewable Energy Developments and Potential in the Greater Mekong Subregion (ADB, 2015) | | | | | | |
| Geothermal | 400 | See Section 3.7 | | | | | | |
| Ocean | 1,150 | Ocean renewable energy in Southeast Asia: A review (2014), based on 5kW/m wave potential, 2300km coastline, 10% efficiency | | | | | | |

Source: IES and MKE 2017

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



The seasonality of solar, wind and hydropower fits very well together





Source: Consultant analysis

Source: IES and MKE 2017

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



A sevenfold increase in electricity demand will need to be met by 2050





Source: IES and MKE 2017

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



Increased efficiency may reduce power demand by about 20%





Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



In the business-as-usual case coal is supposed to cover about 60% of the future power demand





Source: IES and MKE 2017

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer



A mix of solar, wind, biomass and hydropower can supply 100% RE





Source: IES and MKE 2017

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer


A mix of solar, wind, biomass and hydropower can supply 100% RE



| Table 16 | Myanmar Generation by Fuel (SES, GWh) | | | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Generation | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| Coal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CCS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diesel | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fuel Oil | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gas | 1,678 | 5,233 | 6,502 | 6,174 | 2,923 | 0 |
| Nuclear | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hydro | 5,263 | 8,099 | 15,308 | 23,125 | 20,402 | 23,362 |
| Onshore Wind | 0 | 0 | 2,435 | 10,980 | 22,981 | 27,800 |
| Offshore Wind | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Biomass | 0 | 0 | 1,441 | 8,445 | 22,522 | 27,187 |
| Biogas | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Solar | 0 | 0 | 3,836 | 17,501 | 38,141 | 53,640 |
| CSP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,381 | 10,525 | 21,085 |
| Battery | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hydro ROR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4,415 | 5,925 | 7,358 |
| Geothermal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 333 | 1,651 | 2,304 |
| Pump Storage | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 317 |
| Ocean | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132 | 526 |
| Off-grid | 0 | 2 | 112 | 1,268 | 725 | 716 |

Source: IES and MKE 2017

Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer

Using Critical Thinking to Imagine Sustainable Energy Futures



Figure 88 Myanmar LCOE for Generation



Prof. Dr. Olav Hohmeyer

Using Critical Thinking to Imagine Sustainable Energy Futures



Conclusions



- Myanmar can shift to 100% RE without higher costs
- Myanmar will benefit by higher jobs and less pollution
- International climate money can pave the way
- A 100% RE strategy will help mitigate global climate change
- A 100% RE strategy can avoid substantial future payments for CO₂ emission charges
- We know how to do it and how to get the funding and financing
- 100% RE power supply may be an interesting option for Myanmar





Thank you very much for your attention





Thank you very much for your attention