



Master Thesis: A Life Cycle Cost Analysis of Marine Scrubber Technologies

Presenter: Shih-Tung(Luke) SHU Supervisor: Prof. Robert Bronsart Company of Internship: Lloyd's Register







2015 : 1.00%S → **0.10**%S (Emission Control Area) 2020*: $3.50\%S \rightarrow 0.50\%S$ (Global)



Emission Control Areas (ECAs)





*image courtesy of Lloyd's Register

Current ECA-SOx the Baltic and the North Sea, North American

Future ECA-SOx 2014 US Caribbean



3











Traditio et Innovatio

Wet Scrubber (1/3)

Seawater Open-loop

- Pros: seawater scrubbing (no chemical needed)
- Cons: wash water discharge, alkalinity limit



Wet Scrubber (2/3)



Freshwater Closed-loop

- Pros: zero discharge mode, removal efficiency
- Cons: NaOH dosing, fresh water





Wet Scrubber (3/3)

Hybrid (Open/Closed-loop)

- Pros: mode switching
- Cons: complex system



Dry Scrubber



Pros: dry scrubbing - Ca(OH)₂, no temperature drop Cons: bulky scrubber unit





*image courtesy of Couple System



Scrubber Comparison



- ► Total engine power: 10MW
- Sulphur content: 3.5%
- Continuous operation: 1 day (24hrs)

Total weight loss = Scrubber unit weight + Consumable weight



Scrubber – Installation Impacts

Economical

- capital investment
- operational and maintenance
- end-of-life cost

Technical

- back pressure
- extra power consumption
- space and weight
- chemical usage
-

Environmental

- wash water discharge
- sludge disposal
- end-of-life hazardous wastes



*image courtesy of Alfa Laval









Economical

-1. Capital investment

- acquisition
- installation
- engineering design
- ..

-2. Operational and maintenance

- extra fuel and power
- chemical consumables
- sludge disposal
- cargo loss
- ...
- -3. End-of-life cost
 - inventory of hazardous material
 - hazardous wastes removal



Scrubber – Life Cycle Cost Analysis (1/2)





Scrubber – Life Cycle Cost Analysis (2/2)







Fuel price sensitivity

Seawater open-loop scrubber (**16**MW) Total fuel consumption: **11,300** tons/year

	100 %	4yrs4ms	2yrs0ms	1yrs4ms	12ms	9ms	8ms
Time in ECAs (%)	90 %	4yrs11ms	2yrs3ms	1yrs6ms	1yr1ms	10ms	9ms
	80 %	5yrs7ms	2yrs7ms	1yrs8ms	1yr3ms	12ms	10ms
	70 %	6yrs6ms	2yrs11ms	1yr11ms	1yr5ms	1yr1ms	11ms
	60 %	7yrs8ms	3yrs5ms	2yrs3ms	1yr8ms	1yr4ms	1yr1m
	50 %	9yrs6ms	4yrs2ms	2yrs8ms	1yr12ms	1yr7ms	1yr4ms
	40 %	12yrs5ms	5yrs4ms	3yrs5ms	2yrs6ms	1yr12ms	1yr8ms
	30 %	never	7yrs5ms	4yrs8ms	3yrs5ms	2yrs8ms	2yrs2ms
	20 %	never	11yrs11ms	7yrs4ms	5yrs3ms	4yrs1ms	3yrs5ms
	10 %	never	never	never	11yrs8ms	8yrs11ms	7yrs3ms
		100 USD	200 USD	300 USD	400 USD	500 USD	600 USD

Price spread between HFO/MGO

Universität Rostock





► Discussions:

- 1.Seawater open-loop: lowest Net Present Cost
- 2.ECA operation profile
 - days of operation
 - time in ECA
 - continuous operation days
- 3.Return of investment in 3 years
 - minimum 40% of ECA-SOx time
 - over 5000 tons of fuel used

Conclusions:

- 1.MARPOL Annex VI, 2015: 0.1%S in ECA-SOx
- 2. Understanding of Scrubber Technology
- 3. From cradle to grave: Life-cycle costing

