

Energy analysis of membrane reactors

Gioele Di Marcoberardino Università degli Studi di Brescia







This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 869896.

Introduction: Hydrogen application

Small scale (< 5 Nm³/h)

 Micro-CHP system for distributed or off-grid generation



Medium scale (< 50-100 Nm³/h)

- \circ $\,$ Automotive, Fuelling stations $\,$
- Industrial applications (Glass or Steel industry)



Large scale (>100 Nm³/h)

- Chemicals
- Oil Refinery
- Ammonia Production















SR:	$CH_4 + H_2O \leftrightarrows CO + 3H_2$	endott
WGS:	$CO + H_2O \leftrightarrows CO_2 + H_2$	exoî

- **Ox:** $CH_4 + 2O_2 = CO_2 + 2H_2O$ exoft
- Structure: Fixed bed vs Fluidized bed
 Fixed bed
- ▲ Semplicity
- Structured Catalyst
- Pressure drop not negligible
- Temperature profile
- Difference between bulk and wall

Fluidized bed

- Reduce concentration polarization losses
- Reduce temperature and concentration gradients
- ▲ Improve heat transfer
- Gas velocity (control) and particle size







SR:	$CH_4 + H_2O \leftrightarrows CO + 3H_2$	endott
WGS:	$CO + H_2O \leftrightarrows CO_2 + H_2$	exoî
Ox:	$CH_4 + 2O_2 \leftrightarrows CO_2 + 2H_2O$	exoff

• Heat supply: ATR vs SR

ATR-MR

- ▲ Smaller (compact) and cheaper unit
- ▼ High H₂ dilution in the products

<u>SR-MR</u>

- \blacktriangle Less H₂ dilution in the products
- Heat transfer section arrangement and source (see next slides)







SR:	$CH_4 + H_2O \leftrightarrows CO + 3H_2$	endott
WGS:	$CO + H_2O \leftrightarrows CO_2 + H_2$	exoî
Ox:	$CH_4 + 2O_2 \leftrightarrows CO_2 + 2H_2O$	exoff

Permeate Side configurations

 \rightarrow H₂ partial pressure reduction

Parameter	Vacuum pump	Sweep gas
Reactor Design	++	
System complexity	++	-
Auxiliaries		++
System efficiency	-	+

In MACBETH project a fluidized bed ATR-MR with vacuum pump is selected!





MR-based system: performance

- Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for MR-based system and benchmark comparison
- Reference case models implemented in Aspen Plus/retrieved from literature

Reactor level

KPI	units	Definition
Conversion	-	$X_R = \frac{F_{R,0} - F_{R,1/2}}{F_{R,0}}$
Yield	-	$Y_{R,P} = \frac{F_{P,1} + F_{P,2} - F_{P,0}}{F_{R,0} + \nu_{R,\beta}F_{R,0}} \cdot \frac{ \nu_{R,\alpha} }{ \nu_{P,\alpha} }$
Selectivity	-	$S_{R,P} = \frac{Y_{R,P}}{X_R}$
Space Time Yield	kg/m³s	$STY_P = rac{\dot{M}_{P,1}}{V_{reactor}}$
a (Main re	action)	$\nu_{R,\alpha}R \leftrightarrow \nu_{P,\alpha}P$
β (Side re	action)	$\nu_{R,\beta}R \leftrightarrow \nu_{Q,\beta}Q$



System level









- ➤ To define the proper system layout and set of simulations
 → It is important to understand
 - Reactor requirements (operating conditions)
 - Reactor inputs/outputs
 - Relation between the streams

am	Flo	w	т	n		Com	positio	on (% r	nolar b	asis)	
Stre	Molar (mol/s)	Mass (g/s)	(°C)	(bar)	CH ₄	H ₂	CO	CO ₂	H ₂ O	O ₂	N_2
1	0.359	9.401	15	1	58.10	0	0	33.90	3.10	1.10	3.80
2	0.709	19.511	308.45	12	29.39	0	0	17.15	1.57	10.93	40.96
3	1.104	26.620	444.46	12	18.88	0	0	11.02	36.77	7.02	26.32
4	0.833	25.462	500	12	2.11	3.00	1.02	36.48	22.53	0	34.86
5	1.223	39.058	40	1	0	0	0	26.97	6.30	5.68	61.05
6	0.575	1.158	500	0.1	0	100	0	-	0	0	0













- System efficiency follows the trend of the HRF
- BUT the plateau is reached at a lower number of membranes since lower HRF is counterbalanced by an increase of heat recovery from the retentate
- Moreover minimum LCOH does not correspond to the maximum efficiency







Thermal integration (HX arrangement)

□ Tfeed lower than Treactor

- Right matching between exchanged thermal power and temperature levels
- □ Check HX area
- □ Better to avoid HX between H2 and air

$$\dot{Q} = \dot{m}c_p \Delta T$$
 $\dot{Q} = UA\Delta T_{ml}$
To calculate To calculate
stream energy HX area
content

- User defined solutions
 PINCH analysis? (can be analysis)
 - PINCH analysis? (can be performed by Aspen tools)







Thermal integration (HX arrangement)

□ Tfeed lower than Treactor

- Right matching between exchanged thermal power and temperature levels
- □ Check HX area
- □ Better to avoid HX between H2 and air

$$\dot{Q} = \dot{m}c_p \Delta T$$
 $\dot{Q} = UA\Delta T_{ml}$
To calculate To calculate
stream energy HX area
content

- ♦ User defined solutions
 ♥ PINCH analysis? (can l
 - PINCH analysis? (can be performed by Aspen tools)





12

Tube bandles inside the reactor

Exhaust gases from the combustion of the retentate (and aux fuel)









MR-based system: examples of layout

Small scale BIOGAS Autothermal reforming (ATR-MR): 100 kg_{H2}/day







- > Why is membrane reactor modelling important?
 - CAPEX calculation
 - Definition of membrane area and catalyst amount (& their reliability)
 - Improve accuracy on Opex (BG cost and electric consumptions, membrane and catalyst cost)
 - DIFFERENT LEVELs for a process simulation
 - > 0D model to check MR potentiality



- ✤ 2 reactors and 1 separator
- Membrane model can be included for Area calculation



Ovidation or Pre



- > Why is membrane reactor modelling important?
 - CAPEX calculation
 - Definition of membrane area and catalyst amount (& their reliability)
- Improve accuracy on Opex (BG cost and electric consumptions)
- DIFFERENT LEVELs for a process simulation
 - > 1D simplified model to check the concentration profile and required duty



- MR is discretized in a series of 10 reactors and separators
- Each reactor is set to equilibrium conversion by Gibbs free energy minimization
- In the separators, hydrogen is extracted (infinite perm-selectivity is assumed) according to the permeation expression
- Membrana area calculation





- > Why is membrane reactor modelling important?
 - CAPEX calculation
- Definition of membrane area and catalyst amount (& their reliability)
- Improve accuracy on Opex (BG cost and electric consumptions)
- DIFFERENT LEVELs for a process simulation
 - > 1D model to design the reactor and its building blocks (in ACM)



The steady state overall (bubble and emulsion phases) component mass conservation equations and the total volume balance (to calculate the excess velocity) have been formulated, taking chemical transformations in the emulsion phase and a net gas production due to the chemical reactions and gas removal via membranes into account.





- > Why is membrane reactor modelling important?
 - CAPEX calculation
- Definition of membrane area and catalyst amount (& their reliability)
- Improve accuracy on Opex (BG cost and electric consumptions)
- DIFFERENT LEVELs for a process simulation
 - ID model to design the reactor and its building blocks (in ACM)





gas feed

emulsion phase

- Reactor geometry
- Reaction kinetics
- Film layer model for concentration polarization losses
- Both sweep gas and vacuum configuration
- Wake description
- Both steam reforming and autothermal reforming
- Dusty Gas Model for permeation in membrane support



Ovidation or Pre



- > Why is membrane reactor modelling important?
 - CAPEX calculation
- Definition of membrane area and catalyst amount (& their reliability)
- Improve accuracy on Opex (BG cost and electric consumptions)
- DIFFERENT LEVELs for a process simulation
 - ID model to design the reactor and its building blocks (in ACM)



Integration of the ACM model in the overall system Aspen Plus model has two significant effects:

- (i) evaluation of the influence of kinetic and transport phenomena in fluidization on hydrogen recovery factor (or reactor efficiency)
- (ii) definition of the main reactor design parameters such as reactor diameter (D reactor), average membrane distance (Mem. Dist.) or required membrane area



Ovidation or Pre-



Analysis at fixed geometry and fixed operating conditions



Increasing the H2 production (BG1) leads to a HRF reduction





Analysis at fixed geometry and fixed operating conditions

-400 °C -450 °C -500 °C -525 °C -550 °C -2% -5% -10% -20% -50% -100%100% 100% 80% 80% 1.3 60% 60% HRF (-) HRF (-) HRF (-) 40% 0.87 40% и 1.820% u $\max - = 5$ $\min - = 1.5$ u_{mf} kmol u_{mf}

0%

0

20

> Loading effect: catalyst over total solid particles





10

30

50

70

hydrogen production (kg/day)

90

0%

> Reactor temperature effect

110

130



> Analysis at fixed geometry and fixed operating conditions







- Membrane installation (Total Membrane Area Fixed)
 - Reactor with longer membranes and lower Diameter
 - →Higher gas velocity with the same reactants amount
 - →Increase HRF with lower H_2 production with the same trend of the reactor with 100 membranes







MR-based system: methodology







MR-based system: methodology

> Assumptions

Parameter	Value	Units
SCR	3 (Macbeth) 4 (Reference)	-
Hydrogen production	100	kg/day
Hydrogen delivery pressure	20	bar
Ambient temperature	15	°C
Controller consumption (% of total auxiliary consumption)	10	%
Average electric efficiency of the power generating park	45	%
Water pump hydraulic / mechanical efficiency	0.7/0.9	-
Compressors isentropic / mechanical efficiency	0.7/0.85	-
Vacuum pump isentropic / mechanical efficiency	0.7/0.85	-
Minimum ΔT in heat exchangers	25	°C
Heat transfer coefficient gas/gas	60	W/(m² [·] K)
Heat transfer coefficient gas/liquid-two phase	70	W/(m² [·] K)



Parameter	Value	Units
Distance distributor to membranes (H _d)	5	cm
Reactor active height (with membranes) (H_m)	45	cm
Reactor freeboard height (H _{fb})	50	cm
Reactor total height	1	m
Fluidization (u/u_{mf}) range	1.5 ÷ 2	-





H₂ from biogas: benchmark

- Steam reforming of Biogas modelled in Aspen Plus (100 kg_{H2}/day)
- SMR+2WGS steps and separation with VPSA system



Parameter	units	
Reforming temperature	°C	800
Reforming pressure	bar	14
HT/LT WGS temperature	°C	350/200
H2 delivery pressure	bar	20
KPIs reactor	Refcase	
Reactor Conversion	%	92.63
Reactor Yield	%	83.65
Reactor Selectivity	%	90.30
KPIs system	n Refcase	
System efficiency	%	51.92
Specific Energy Consumption	kWh/kg _{H2}	63.61
GHG specific emissions (direct) ^a	kg _{CO2eq} /kg _{H2}	17.03
GHG specific production (total) ^b	kg _{CO2eq} /kg _{H2}	18.19
СОР	€/kg _{H2}	6.011





H₂ from biogas: ATR-MR-based system



	5	Flo	w	т	n	Composition (% molar basis)						
Stre	Ŭ J D	Molar (mol/s)	Mass (g/s)	(°C)	(bar)	CH_4	H ₂	CO	CO ₂	H ₂ O	O ₂	N_2
1	L	0.359	9.401	15	1	58.10	0	0	33.90	3.10	1.10	3.80
2	2	0.709	19.511	308.45	12	29.39	0	0	17.15	1.57	10.93	40.96
3	3	1.104	26.620	444.46	12	18.88	0	0	11.02	36.77	7.02	26.32
4		0.833	25.462	500	12	2.11	3.00	1.02	36.48	22.53	0	34.86
5	5	1.223	39.058	40	1	0	0	0	26.97	6.30	5.68	61.05
6	5	0.575	1.158	500	0.1	0	100	0	-	0	0	0





H₂ from biogas: ATR-MR-based system

Preliminary results



molar fractions (%)	Biogas
CH ₄	58.1
CO ₂	33.9
N ₂	3.8
0 ₂	1.1
H ₂ O	3.1
LHV (MJ/kg)	17.8
MM (kg/kmol)	26.215

- ↔ LHV_{H2} is equal to 120 MJ/kg
- W_{aux} is the sum of the electric consumptions of the system auxiliaries (i.e. compressors, pumps, control system)
- \checkmark $\eta_{el,rif}$ is set equal to 45%, as the average electric efficiency of the power generating park





H₂ from biogas: ATR-MR-based system

- > 36 combinations with different reactor operating conditions are simulated
 - Sensitivity analysis on relevant parameters
 - Reactor temperature
 - Feed pressure
 - Permeate pressure
 - Steam-carbon-ratio
 - Number of membranes

Parameter	Units	Base case	Range
Reactor temperature, T_R	°C	500	475-500-525
Feed pressure, P _{feed}	bar	12	9-12-15
Permeate pressure, P _{perm}	bar	0.1	0.1-0.3
S/C ratio at the beginning of the membranes	-	3	3-4
N membranes	-	147	100-200

For each combination,

Nmem has been varied taking into account few constraints:

i) minimum membrane diameter pitch

ii) fluidization regime

iii) maximum temperature for BG and air mixture and reactor feed streams and iv) minimum ΔT in the heat exchangers





Winter school - Eindhoven Membrane Reactors in Chemical Industry

Thank you for your attention!

gioele.dimarcoberardino@unibs.it



