



On the sustainability of CO₂ storage through CO₂ – Enhanced oil recovery

Farajzadeh, R.; Eftekhari, Ali Akbar; Dafnomilis, G.; Lake, L.W.; Bruining, J.

Published in:
Applied Energy

Link to article, DOI:
[10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.114467](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.114467)

Publication date:
2020

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)


Citation (APA):
Farajzadeh, R., Eftekhari, A. A., Dafnomilis, G., Lake, L. W., & Bruining, J. (2020). On the sustainability of CO₂ storage through CO₂ – Enhanced oil recovery. *Applied Energy*, 261, Article 114467. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.114467>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



On the sustainability of CO₂ storage through CO₂ – Enhanced oil recovery

R. Farajzadeh^{a,*}, A.A. Eftekhari^b, G. Dafnomilis^a, L.W. Lake^c, J. Bruining^a

^a Delft University of Technology, the Netherlands

^b Technical University of Denmark, Denmark

^c The University of Texas at Austin, United States



HIGHLIGHTS

- The net storage efficiency of carbon capture projects is maximally 6–56%.
- The CO₂ capture and storage process re-emits 0.43–0.94 kg of CO₂ per kg of CO₂ stored.
- Exergy recovery factor of CO₂ enhanced oil recovery depends on CO₂ utilization factor.
- 30–50% of fossil fuel energy is required to capture released CO₂ from its combustion.

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

CO₂-EOR
CO₂ utilization factor
Exergy analysis
CO₂ storage
Climate change

ABSTRACT

This work uses pilot examples of CO₂ enhanced oil recovery to analyze whether and under which circumstances it is exergetically favorable to sequester CO₂ through enhanced oil recovery. We find that the net storage efficiency (ratio between the stored and captured CO₂) of the carbon capture and storage (CCS)-only projects is maximally 6–56% depending on the fuel used in the power plants. With the current state of technology, the CCS process will re-emit a minimum of 0.43–0.94 kg of CO₂ per kg of CO₂ stored. From thermodynamics point of view, CO₂ enhanced oil recovery (EOR) with CCS option is not sustainable, i.e., during the life cycle of the process more energy is consumed than the energy produced from oil. For the CCS to be efficient in reducing CO₂ levels (1) the exergetic cost of CO₂ separation from flue gas should be reduced, and/or (2) the capture process should not lead to additional carbon emission. Furthermore, we find that the exergy recovery factor of CO₂-EOR depends on the CO₂ utilization factor, which is currently in the low range of 2–4 bbl/tCO₂ based on the field data. Exergetically, CO₂ EOR with storage option produces 30–40% less exergy compared to conventional CO₂ enhanced oil recovery projects with CO₂ supplied from natural sources; however, this leads to storage of > 400 kg of extra CO₂ per barrel of oil produced.

1. Introduction

It is currently perceived that the elevated concentration of carbon dioxide (CO₂) in the atmosphere (caused by anthropogenic or human activities) is a major contributor to global temperature rise or climate change. Despite major investments in renewable energy, with (ever) increasing global energy demand, the energy supply will largely originate from fossil fuels in the next few decades [1,2], the burning of which emits more than 25Gt of CO₂ every year [3]. To avoid or at least mitigate long-term climate changes, it is therefore prudent to consider measures to reduce CO₂ emissions into the atmosphere. CO₂ capture and its subsequent storage (CCS) in subsurface formations is a means of mitigating greenhouse-gas effects [4]. However, with the current state of technology CCS appears to be costly, which necessitates utilizing CO₂

to cover part of the CCS cost (so-called CCUS or carbon capture, utilization, and storage).

CO₂ enhanced oil recovery (EOR) is a mature technology that has been successfully applied to extract oil from oil reservoirs [5,6]. CO₂ has excellent dissolution properties and above a relatively small pressure (called the minimum-miscibility pressure, MMP) becomes miscible with the in-situ oil and *drags* the oil out of pores through several mechanisms such as interfacial-tension reduction, viscosity reduction and oil swelling. This combined with the availability of the infra-structure and facilities in place, and the structural integrity of the oil reservoirs in containing fluids over very long times provides an opportunity to use CO₂ and store it permanently underground, because the produced hydrocarbons can compensate for part of the CCS cost and reduce the net emission of CO₂ [7,8]. Geographically, depleted oil and gas reservoirs

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: r.farajzadeh@tudelft.nl (R. Farajzadeh).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.114467>

Received 6 July 2019; Received in revised form 18 December 2019; Accepted 25 December 2019

0306-2619/© 2019 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

are spread all over globe [9]. However, it is doubtful that society will easily comply with the idea of the CO₂ storage in reservoirs that are under or close to residential areas. This implies that CO₂ must be transported to remote (far from CO₂ source) fields, which puts an additional cost on the CCS projects. In addition to economic incentives and increased oil production, the oil industry can benefit from carbon-tax and other socioeconomic incentives by implementing CCS through EOR.

As of 2014, there were more than 136 active CO₂ EOR projects in the US injecting more than three billion standard cubic feet (0.156Mt) of CO₂ [10–12], which is a tiny fraction with respect to the anthropogenic carbon dioxide emissions. However, a large fraction of the injected CO₂ comes from natural sources [12], which cannot contribute to reductions in anthropogenic CO₂ emissions into the atmosphere. The use of natural sources is mainly caused by the large cost of capturing CO₂ from fossil-fuel-fired power plants [13].

Several researchers have analyzed the entire life cycle of the CO₂-EOR projects and, depending on the selected cycle boundary, have estimated the amount of CO₂ emitted from these projects [14,15]. The most important parameter in evaluating the life-cycle of CO₂-EOR is the CO₂ utilization factor (mass or volume of CO₂ required to produce one incremental barrel of oil, (kg CO₂/bbl oil or Mscf CO₂/bbl oil) [16,17]. These studies typically assume an average CO₂ utilization factor and calculate the associated CO₂ footprint of the different (upstream and downstream) stages of CO₂-EOR [18,19]. As a result, these numbers become an average number over the lifetime of the projects and fail to consider that the CO₂ utilization factor will decrease with time and that it depends on the geological heterogeneity of the oil fields. Indeed, as time passes less oil is extracted per volume of CO₂ injected. Also, the amount of recovered oil decreases significantly as the reservoir heterogeneity (mainly spatial variations of the permeability field) increases. Nevertheless, these analyses confirm that the incremental oil produced from CO₂ EOR is a lower-carbon fuel [14]. The CO₂ capture rate and net utilization can be optimized to further decrease the carbon intensity of CO₂-EOR oil. Kwak and Jim [20] performed an economic evaluation of CO₂ EOR with consideration of CO₂ supply from external CO₂ sources. It was concluded the introduction of economic incentives can be a key design parameter for the economics of CO₂ EOR. This contradicts with the findings of Wang et al. [21] that sequestration is insensitive to the CO₂ subsidy at the level of individual projects. Also, oil price and surface and subsurface factors contributing to extra oil gain play important roles on the economics of CO₂ EOR development [22]. Jiang et al. [23] quantified the CO₂ emissions from different components of CCS-EOR system. According to these calculations petroleum combustion and the EOR process release about 67–71% and 14–19% of the total emissions, respectively. Only 5% of the total emission was attributed to the CO₂ capture part. However, the authors did not include the CO₂ arising from the capture process itself.

To the best of our knowledge, majority of the research papers dealing with the life-cycle assessment of CO₂ EOR, have focused on the technical and economic feasibility of the process. However, apart from the cost of the capture and compression, the high energy intensity of the CCS processes triggers the question whether CO₂ storage through EOR is thermodynamically sustainable. Also, it is important to realize that during capture of the CO₂ from power plants additional CO₂ is released, which should be captured if the process meant to be carbon-neutral. This can further question the practicality of the CCS process, especially when the source of the energy is coal. Therefore, the main objective of this paper is to establish a method for the analysis of CO₂ storage through EOR from an exergy-balance perspective [24]. Exergy is defined as the maximum work that can be obtained from an energy stream when it is brought to equilibrium with the environment or its surroundings [25]. The environment is assumed to be in a dead state, which means that it has no potential of creating useful work. Unlike energy, which is conserved through the first law of thermodynamics, exergy is not conserved and can be destroyed because of irreversibilities

and generation of entropy (second law of thermodynamics) [26].

Recently, we have established a workflow to perform an exergy balance (including the exergy destruction terms) for hydrocarbon-production systems. The workflow can be used to improve system's efficiency and/or reduce their carbon footprint [27,28]. These calculations introduce the concept of the exergy-zero recovery factor, which is the maximum fraction of oil in place that can be produced (before the exergy input for recovery exceeds the exergy of the produced hydrocarbon) with a minimum energy waste [27]. Beyond this recovery factor, the exergy gain from reservoirs is less than the invested exergy. The outcome of such an analysis can be used to optimize the energy systems. Moreover, the exergy recovery factor is a measure of sustainability of the hydrocarbon-production systems, which determines the fraction of energy consumed during the process [29].

Our objective is to perform an exergy analysis to assess whether and under which circumstances it is exergetically efficient to store CO₂ through EOR. The concept of exergy-zero time allows us to identify the exergetic break-even point for CO₂-EOR. We will use pilot examples of CO₂-EOR [30] in combination with the modified Koval [31,32] method to generate an estimate of the expected oil production history. We will then identify the main exergy streams that must be considered for CO₂ storage through EOR. This allows us to estimate the exergy recovery factor [13,27] of these processes and therefore identify the main parameters contributing to a positive exergy recovery factor. Moreover, we show that the exergy analysis can identify the bottlenecks, i.e., energy-intensive stages in the overall process, and quantify the scope of possible improvements and optimization of the processes.

2. System definition

Fig. 1 depicts a simple schematic of the system considered in this study. It includes the exergy analysis of the main stages of a CCS project that aims at using CO₂ to extract more oil from an already-producing oil field. The CO₂ source is obtained from power plants powered by fossil fuels. The oil field is assumed to be above its bubble-point pressure, i.e., there is no free gas in the reservoir. However, gas is dissolved in the oil, and its amount can be quantified through the value of the producing gas-oil ratio (GOR) at surface conditions. It is also assumed that the oil field has been already flooded by water, and therefore, CO₂ is injected as a tertiary recovery method. CO₂ is captured from its source (e.g. a power plant), compressed to an initial pressure, and then transported to the oil field. On the field site, the transported CO₂ is re-compressed and then injected into the reservoir. Often, the low viscosity and density of the injected CO₂ result in bypassing of much of the oil in place (OIP). A common practice is to inject alternating slugs of water and CO₂ to mitigate these shortcomings (referred to as WAG or water-alternating-gas scheme in the literature, see Fig. 2). Consequently, we consider water, its treatment, and pumping in our analysis. Usually, water sources are near the field and therefore we neglect water transport in our analysis. However, the water requires further treatment to meet the specifications imposed by the reservoir properties (mainly permeability to avoid pore plugging) and surface facilities and material. Injection of CO₂ and water leads to production of more oil. However, some of the injected fluids will also be produced. The produced fluids are separated at the surface in a separator, and the produced water is transferred to water-treatment facilities for re-injection.

The oil is pumped to a refinery for further processing, after which the final oil product (fuel) is obtained. The produced gas contains both CO₂ and the hydrocarbon gases released from oil. The produced CO₂ is normally re-injected into the reservoir. It is assumed that 50% of the injected CO₂ is retained in the reservoir and therefore there is always need for fresh CO₂ from the source, in accordance with the field applications of CO₂-EOR [30]. The hydrocarbon gas (considered to be methane, CH₄) can either be re-injected with the CO₂ or is used either onsite or offsite. The addition of CH₄ can increase the minimum-miscibility pressure (MMP) and reduce the oil production if CO₂ is meant to




Fig. 1. System definition: CO₂ EOR with the CCS option.




Fig. 2. Simple schematic of a CO₂ WAG process: CO₂ and water slug are injected alternately. The regions denoted by CO₂, water, and oil denote the regions where fractional-flow of the corresponding phase is the largest, i.e., in all three regions three-phase flow exists.

be injected under miscible conditions. In the base case (Scenario 1), we assume that only CO₂ is recycled and returned to the reservoir.

3. Exergy analysis

In this section, we describe the exergy streams and material relevant for the CO₂ storage through CO₂ EOR. The general concept and methodology are explained in Appendix A. To perform the exergy analysis, the exergy of the work and material streams should be first calculated for the defined system in Fig. 1.

3.1. Exergy streams

The main exergy streams of a CO₂ EOR project are shown in Fig. 1. In this section, we expand each stream and calculate its corresponding exergy. The streams can be broken down into *material* and *work* streams.

3.1.1. Material streams

The chemical exergy of crude oil depends on its composition and it is generally assumed to be its lower heating value (LHV). The following equation correlates the chemical exergy of oil to its specific gravity (SG)

[33]

$$LHV \left[\frac{MJ}{kg} \right] = 55.5 - 14.4SG \quad (1)$$

Assuming $SG = 0.70$, the exergy of the crude oil is 45.5 MJ/kg.

We assume that the gas released from oil is methane. The chemical exergy of CH₄ is $Ex_{CH_4}^{ch} = 831.65$ kJ/mol or 51.98 MJ/kg [34,35]. When CO₂ is injected into the reservoir the produced gas will contain CO₂. However, the chemical exergies of CO₂ and the produced water are neglected because their chemical exergy has a negligible impact on the final results; their exergy values are at least four factors of ten smaller than that for oil.

3.1.2. Work streams

We performed the calculation of the thermodynamic properties of the streams, unless stated otherwise, using the CoolProp freeware [36]. CoolProp calculates the thermodynamic and transport properties of industrially-important fluids and their mixtures. It uses a multi-parameter Helmholtz-energy-explicit-type formulation for thermodynamic properties and a variety of methods, including the extended corresponding states for transport properties. CoolProp is available at www.coolprop.org for multiple platforms and computational tools, including Excel. The exergy of work streams identified in Fig. 1 are provided in the following.

3.1.2.1. Exergy of CO₂ capture. The CO₂ capture methods (from mixtures containing carbon dioxide, methane, nitrogen) consume large amounts of energy [13,37–41]. For this study it is assumed that $Ex_{capture}^{pr} = 4000$ kJ/kg CO₂, which is the average exergy value required for separating CO₂ from flue gas in the chemical absorption of CO₂ using an aqueous solution of MEA (mono-ethanol-amine), today's predominant carbon-capture technology. Capture costs can be reduced by using membrane technology, but this is not widely used, being insufficiently mature.

3.1.2.2. Exergy of CO₂ transport, compression and injection. To calculate exergy of CO₂ transport, compression, and injection we followed the procedure explained by ref. [13]. We assume that CO₂ is transported




Fig. 3. Transport of CO₂ by pipeline and reservoir injection.

through a 200 km long pipeline system from a source power plant to the sink oil reservoir. The transport and injection layout system is shown in Fig. 3.

The captured CO₂ enters the transport compressor at a known temperature T_1 and pressure P_1 and leaves it at the elevated temperature T_2 and pressure P_2 . Compression is an isentropic (adiabatic) process or the entropy of the streams remain constant. Similarly, the CO₂ enters the injection compressor at a temperature T_3 and pressure P_3 and exits at the desired pressure P_4 .

The minimum exergy requirements of the two adiabatic compression stages are the enthalpy differences between the input and output streams at constant entropy, which we call the theoretical exergy of compression. For the practical exergy value, i.e., a state of the art compressor, the efficiencies of the compressor, electrical driver and the power plant should also be considered. Thus,

$$Ex_{CO_2}^{pr,trans} = \frac{Ex_{CO_2}^{th,comp1}}{\eta_{comp}\eta_{driver}\eta_{pp}} = \frac{H_2(S_1(T_1, P_1), P_2) - H_1(S_1(T_1, P_1), P_1)}{\eta_{comp}\eta_{driver}\eta_{pp}} \quad (2)$$

and

$$Ex_{CO_2}^{pr,inj} = \frac{Ex_{CO_2}^{th,comp2}}{\eta_{comp}\eta_{driver}\eta_{pp}} = \frac{H_4(S_1(T_1, P_1), P_4) - H_3(S_1(T_1, P_1), P_3)}{\eta_{comp}\eta_{driver}\eta_{pp}} \quad (3)$$

The total practical exergy of compression is the sum of the exergy of compression for transport and for injection, i.e.,

$$Ex_{CO_2}^{pr,comp} = Ex_{CO_2}^{pr,trans} + Ex_{CO_2}^{pr,inj} \quad (4)$$

The following steps are taken to calculate the exergy of CO₂ transport and injection

- Isentropic compression is assumed for all streams, i.e., $S_2 = S_1$ and $S_4 = S_3$.
- For stream 1, the values of enthalpy and entropy are calculated using CoolProp.
- The pressure drop in the pipeline is calculated using the Panhandle equation [42]; The pipe diameter is calculated by assuming a maximum allowable velocity for the gas stream (here a 20-inch diameter pipeline). All the transport properties are calculated with CoolProp.
- We assume a pressure for the gas stream at the outlet of the transport pipeline, e.g., $P_3 = 80$ bar. The pressure of stream 2 (P_2) is then $P_2 = P_3 + \Delta P_{pipe}$.

- For the calculation of the theoretical compression exergy, we consider a multistage compressor with inter-stage cooling where the pressure of the output stream from each stage is calculated using pressure ratio of typical compression processes ($P_2/P_1 = 3.0 - 4.5$ for a centrifugal compressor [13]). The input temperature to each stage is T_1 .
- The enthalpy of the output streams from each compression stage is calculated for the known pressure and entropy.
- The isentropic compression work for each case is the difference in enthalpy ΔH between the input and output streams.
- We use a typical current values for the compressor efficiencies and the power generating efficiencies, i.e., $\eta_{pp} = 0.40$, $\eta_{drive} = 0.90$, and $\eta_{comp} = 0.70$.

The injection pressure P_4 , as well as the CO₂ injection rate are taken to be 280 bar and $\sim 30,000$ m³/d (at reservoir conditions). The results of the compression exergy requirements in the transport and injection compressors are shown in Table 1.

3.1.2.3. Exergy of oil transport to the refinery. For the calculation of the exergy of oil transport, an average flow rate of 2.88 kg/s, diameter of pipeline 3 in., average flow speed of 0.8 m/s, an initial pressure of 200 bars, and a transporting distance of 200 km to the refinery were assumed.

Using the Darcy–Weisbach equation for fluid pressure drop in pipeline transportation, and taking into account that at the end of the pipeline the crude oil need only be at a slightly higher pressure than atmospheric, a pressure loss of $\Delta P = 196$ bar is calculated. The theoretical pumping exergy required for the pumps to transport the crude

Table 1
Compression exergy in the transport and injection of CO₂.

	Transport	Injection	Unit
P_{in}	1	80	bar
P_{out}	80	280	bar
Max pressure ratio	3	3	
η_{comp}	0.70	0.70	
η_{driver}	0.90	0.90	
$\eta_{powerplant}$	0.40	0.40	
$Ex_{CO_2}^{th,comp}$	354	59	kJ/kg CO ₂
$Ex_{CO_2}^{pr,comp}$	1405	235	kJ/kg CO ₂

oil under the above conditions is given as an approximation by:

$$Ex_{oil}^{th,trans} = Ex_{pump} = \dot{Q}\Delta P \quad (5)$$

where $\dot{Q} [\frac{m^3}{s}]$ stands for the flow rate of the crude oil through the pipeline and ΔP [Pa] is the pressure drop in the pipeline. The practical pumping exergy is calculated by including the mechanical efficiency of the pump (80%), and efficiency of the electrical driver (90%), and the power plant (45%), i.e.,

$$Ex_{oil}^{pr,trans} = \frac{Ex_{oil}^{th,trans}}{\eta_{pump}\eta_{driver}\eta_{pp}} = \frac{\dot{Q}\Delta P}{\eta_{pump}\eta_{driver}\eta_{pp}} \quad (6)$$

This amounts to a value of $Ex_{oil}^{pr,trans} = 2.6$ kJ/s, which in turn, normalized over the lifetime of the project and the total amount of oil transported amounts to 75.4 kJ/kg of oil transported.

3.1.2.4. Exergy of gas (CO₂/HC) separation. The separation of the gases from the liquid oil is assumed to take place in a gravity separator vessel; therefore there is no need to spend exergy in this step. The subsequent separation of the CO₂ from the hydrocarbons in the gaseous mixture is assumed to $Ex_{CO_2}^{pr,sep} = 2500$ kJ/kg of CO₂ captured.

3.2. Exergy recovery factor

We define the exergy recovery factor, Ex_{RF} , as the ratio of the produced exergy corrected for material and process exergy requirements for its extraction and to the gross exergy of the source, i.e.,

$$Ex_{RF} = \frac{Ex_{gained} - Ex_{invested}}{Ex_{fuel}} \quad (7)$$

Ex_{gained} is the exergy of the final product (within the selected boundary), $Ex_{invested}$ is the amount of exergy invested to produce hydrocarbons, and Ex_{fuel} is the amount of exergy stored in the hydrocarbon reservoir [27]. For the case considered here, i.e. a CO₂ EOR project with CCS option, Eq. (7) becomes

$$Ex_{RF} = \frac{(Ex_{oil}^{ch} + Ex_{CH_4}^{ch}) - (Ex_{CO_2}^{capture} + Ex_{CO_2}^{comp} + Ex_{CH_4}^{comp} + Ex_{water}^{treat} + Ex_{CO_2}^{sep} + Ex_{oil}^{trans})}{Ex_{oil}^{ch} + Ex_{CH_4}^{ch}} \quad (8)$$

4. Calculation of oil recovery

We follow the procedure developed by Walsh and Lake [8] to calculate oil recovery when CO₂ is injected alternately with water to displace oil in a 1-D porous medium. For simplicity, we ignore CO₂ dissolution in oil and water. This method requires construction of water-oil and water-solvent fractional-flow functions. The fractional-flow function of phase i displacing phase j is defined as

$$f_{ij} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{M_{ij}}} \quad (9)$$

where M_{ij} is the mobility ratio function between the displacing phase i and displaced phases j and is defined as

$$M_{ij} = \frac{k_{rk} \mu_j}{k_{rj} \mu_i} \quad (10)$$

k_{rk} the relative permeability of phase k , is calculated using a Corey-type model [6]. Fig. 4 shows examples of the fractional-flow curves calculated for the water-oil and the water-solvent pairs. Point J on the water-solvent fractional-flow curve is determined using volumetric ratio of water and CO₂ rates (WAG ratio), W_R :

$$f_{wJ} = \frac{W_R}{1 + W_R} \quad (11)$$

The specific velocity of CO₂ front, v_{cF} , is determined from the slope




Fig. 4. Graphical representation of solution of oil displacement by miscible CO₂ using WAG scheme. S_{OREM} stands for remaining oil saturation.

of the line connecting point $(1 - S_{OREM}, 1)$ to point J (injected composition/saturation) the extension of which intersects the water-oil fractional-flow curve at point B . The velocity of the oil bank, v_{oF} , is then the slope of the line connecting point B to point I (initial composition/saturation). The velocity of the water front, v_{wF} , is given by the slope of the line connecting point $(0,0)$ to point J . The optimal WAG ratio, in terms of oil recovery, is where point J is chosen such that $v_{cF} = v_{wF}$.

The upscaling of the results obtained from the analytical method is done using the modified Koval's method [31,32]. In this method both the oil-bank and solvent fronts are distorted because of the heterogeneity of the porous medium and/or the adverse mobility ratio and gravity effects. The extent of non-ideality or deviation from the results of the 1-D analytical method is quantified by two Koval factors, K_{OB} for the oil bank and K_S for the solvent bank, which are functions of the Dykstra-Parsons coefficient [43,44]. The main consequences of the non-ideal displacement are (much) earlier breakthrough of the oil and solvent banks, smaller oil cuts, and elongated production times (red curves in Fig. 5).

The production histories of several large-scale applications of CO₂ EOR have been matched to the modified Koval method and their corresponding K_{OB} and K_S values have been obtained. Based on these values, and using the reservoir and fluid properties in Table 2, we created three production histories shown in Fig. 6. It is noticeable that as the reservoir heterogeneity increases, the amount of oil produced by the injected CO₂ decreases. In other words, the CO₂ utilization factor (amount of injected CO₂ per amount of produced oil expressed in Mscf/bbl oil) increases with the increase in the reservoir heterogeneity (Koval factor). The production histories shown in Fig. 6 are a good representation of the large-scale results of 37 CO₂ EOR projects summarized in Ref. [30]. The recovery factors from these projects range between 5 and 25% of the initial oil in place, with an average recovery of about 13% after 3 pore volume of fluid injection (CO₂ and water).

5. Results and discussion

5.1. Exergy of CO₂ capture and storage

In the case of CCS only, CO₂ should be captured and transported to the subsurface formation for underground storage. We assume that the captured CO₂ is compressed to a sufficiently high pressure at the capture site so that no recompression is required in the storage site. Therefore, the *minimum* required exergy to store a unit mass of CO₂ (or specific exergy of the CCS expressed in J/kg) can be calculated from

$$e\dot{x} = e\dot{x}_{capture} + e\dot{x}_{compression} + e\dot{x}_{transport} \quad (12)$$




Fig. 5. Upscaling of the 1-D analytical results (green curves) using $K_{OB} = 10$ and $K_S = 5$ (red curves).

Table 2
Parameters used to construct the oil recovery histories in Fig. 6.

Parameter	Value	Description
$n_w (n_{ws})$	2	Water (water-solvent) Corey exponent
$n_o (n_{os})$	3.5	Oil (oil-solvent) Corey exponent
k_{rw}^c	0.325	Water end-point relative permeability
k_{ro}^c	0.66	Oil end-point relative permeability
S_{ori}	0.50	Initial oil saturation before CO ₂ injection
S_{orw}	0.30	“remaining” oil saturation to water
S_{ors}	0.20	“remaining” oil saturation to CO ₂
S_{wc}	0.20	Connate water saturation
μ_s	0.1	CO ₂ viscosity (cP)
μ_w	1	Water viscosity (cP)
μ_o	2	Oil viscosity (cP)
WAG ratio	2:1	CO ₂ :water
Reservoir pore volume	$1 \times 10^8 \text{ m}^3$	
Injection rate	0.1 PV/year	
B_o	1.2	




Fig. 6. History of the oil recovery factor (R_F) for the three cases considered in this study. The reservoir heterogeneity reduces the R_F .

For the case considered in this study, the specific exergy of CCS is calculated to be $\sim 5.5 \text{ MJ/kgCO}_2$ ($\sim 1.5 \text{ kWh/kgCO}_2$). This value does not consider material, wells, or any CO₂ loss during the project, which might occur in practice because of leaks (fugitive emissions), pigging (cleaning and checking pipe line condition), maintenance, etc. To estimate the amount of CO₂ generated during the CCS process, the source

of the electricity generation, i.e., the power plant fuel should be known. The fossil fuel CH_a can be natural gas (CH₄), oil (CH₂), or coal (CH) with estimated heating values of 800 kJ/mol (50 MJ/kg-CH₄), 600 kJ/mol (42.85 MJ/kg-CH₂)¹, and 500 kJ/mol (38.46 MJ/kg-CH), respectively.

5.1.1. Specific CO₂ emission

Methane: Without considering the CO₂ emitted from mining or extraction processes, burning of methane results in specific CO₂ emission of,

$$\frac{44 \text{ kg CO}_2}{16 \text{ kg CH}_4} \times \frac{1 \text{ kg CH}_4}{50 \text{ MJ}} = 0.055 \frac{\text{kg CO}_2}{\text{MJ} - \text{CH}_4} \quad (13)$$

Oil: Similar calculations provide specific CO₂ emission of 0.073 kgCO₂/MJ-CH₂ (44/14/42.85) for oil.

Coal: in the same way we obtain 0.088 kgCO₂/MJ-CH (44/13/38.46) for coal.

Therefore, if CO₂ is stored at the exergetic cost of 5.5 MJ/kg-CO₂:

5.1.2. Exergy of multistep CO₂ capture

Methane: $(5.5 \text{ [MJ-CH}_4/\text{kg-CO}_2] \times 0.055 \text{ [kg-CO}_2/\text{MJ-methane)}) \times 100 = 30.25\%$ of methane energy must be used for a single storage step. It is also needed to capture and store the carbon dioxide resulting from the energy loss. This means that in the cumulative sense we have to compensate for the exergy loss by producing CH₄, and compensate for the loss and thus multiply this number by

$$\Sigma(1 + 0.3025 + (0.3025 \times 0.3025) + \dots) = 1/(1 - 0.3025) = 1.433 \frac{\text{exergy CH}_4 \text{ multiple steps}}{\text{exergy CH}_4 \text{ single step}} \quad (14)$$

to account for storage of CO₂ when methane is used as the energy source. This implies that 43% of the produced energy will be used for storage in the case of methane combustion, which leads to total actual exergy investment of:

$$1.433 \frac{\text{exergy CH}_4 \text{ multiple steps}}{\text{exergy CH}_4 \text{ single step}} \frac{\text{actual MJ}}{\text{required MJ}} \times 5.5 \frac{\text{MJ}}{\text{kg CO}_2} = 7.88 \frac{\text{MJ}}{\text{kg CO}_2} \quad (15)$$

Oil: $(5.5 \times 0.073) \times 100 = 40.15\%$ of oil energy must be used for a single storage step. It is also needed to capture and store the carbon

¹ One bbl = 158.99 L 0.159 m³. Average density 850 kg/m³ → 1 bbl 135 kg. This corresponds to 135 kg × 42.85MJ/kg = 5791 MJ or 1608 kWh.

dioxide resulting from the energy loss. This means that in the cumulative sense we have to multiply this number by

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma(1 + 0.4015 + (0.4015 \times 0.4015) + \dots) &= 1/(1 - 0.4015) \\ &= 1.671 \frac{\text{exergy oil multiple steps}}{\text{exergy oil single step}} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

to account for storage of CO₂ when oil is used as the energy source. This implies that 67% of the produced energy will be used for storage in the case of oil combustion, which leads to total actual exergy investment of:

$$1.671 \frac{\text{exergy oil multiple steps}}{\text{exergy oil single step}} \frac{\text{actual MJ}}{\text{required MJ}} \times 5.5 \frac{\text{MJ}}{\text{kgCO}_2} = 9.19 \frac{\text{MJ}}{\text{kgCO}_2} \quad (17)$$

Coal (5.5 × 0.088) × 100 = 48.4% of coal energy must be used for a single storage step. It is also needed to capture and store the carbon dioxide resulting from the energy loss. This means that in the cumulative sense we have to multiply this number by

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma(1 + 0.484 + (0.484 \times 0.484) + \dots) &= 1/(1 - 0.484) \\ &= 1.937 \frac{\text{exergy coal multiple steps}}{\text{exergy coal single step}} \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

to account for storage of CO₂ when coal is used as the energy source. This implies that 93.7% of the produced energy will be used for storage in the case of coal combustion, which leads to total actual storage exergy investment of:

$$\begin{aligned} 1.937 \frac{\text{exergy coal multiple steps}}{\text{exergy coal single step}} \frac{\text{actual MJ}}{\text{required MJ}} \times 5.5 \frac{\text{MJ}}{\text{kgCO}_2} \\ = 10.65 \frac{\text{MJ}}{\text{kgCO}_2} \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

5.1.3. Full-cycle or total CO₂ emission

Methane. The value of 7.88 MJ/kg-CO₂ (see Eq. (15)) is the actual exergy required to store one kilogram of the original or net CO₂ released from a gas-fired power plant (this is referred to carbon-zero or carbon-neutral option). Additionally, for storage of the original CO₂ and the CO₂ generated in the subsequent stages, total CO₂ emission of

$$1.43 \frac{\text{exergy CH}_4 \text{ multiple steps}}{\text{exergy CH}_4 \text{ single step}} \times 0.055 \frac{\text{kgCO}_2}{\text{MJ} - \text{CH}_4} = 0.0788 \frac{\text{kgCO}_2}{\text{MJ} - \text{CH}_4} \quad (20)$$

is expected.

Oil: Similarly, for an oil-fired power plant the total specific CO₂ emission will be:

$$1.67 \frac{\text{exergy oil multiple steps}}{\text{exergy oil single step}} \times 0.073 \frac{\text{kgCO}_2}{\text{MJ} - \text{CH}_2} = 0.122 \frac{\text{kgCO}_2}{\text{MJ} - \text{CH}_2} \quad (21)$$

Coal: Finally, for when coal is combusted in the power plant, the total CO₂ emission will be

$$1.937 \frac{\text{exergy coal multiple steps}}{\text{exergy coal single step}} \times 0.088 \frac{\text{kgCO}_2}{\text{MJ} - \text{CH}} = 0.17 \frac{\text{kgCO}_2}{\text{MJ} - \text{CH}} \quad (22)$$

In summary, these numbers lead to a minimum additional release of 0.433, 0.671, and 0.937 kg of CO₂ per 1 kg of stored CO₂ for methane, oil, and coal, respectively. Therefore, the maximum net storage efficiency of the CCS projects are on average ~6–56% (100–93.7 via 100–67.1 to 100–43.3) of the captured CO₂ directly released from power plants, assuming a capture efficiency of 100% (which is not practical). With a practical capture efficiency of 90% (referred to as low-carbon option), cumulatively about 11% (1/0.9 = 1.11) of the CO₂ will be emitted directly to the atmosphere and therefore, the net storage efficiency reduces down to (56–11) = 45% for gas, and (33–11) = 22%

Table 3

Summary of the calculations for CCS case only, assuming specific CCS exergy of 5.5 MJ/kg CO₂.

	Gas (CH ₄)	Oil (CH ₂)	Coal (CH)
Estimated heating value, (MJ/kg)	50	42.85	38.46
Specific CO ₂ emission, (kgCO ₂ /MJ)	0.055	0.073	0.088
Fraction of energy used for CCS or energy penalty of CCS	0.30	0.40	0.48
Actual storage exergy, MJ/kg CO ₂	7.88	9.19	10.6
Total CO ₂ emission, kgCO ₂ /MJ-fuel	0.0788	0.122	0.170
Mass CO ₂ emitted/mass CO ₂ stored, kg/kg	0.433	0.671	0.937
Net CO ₂ storage efficiency, % of the stored CO ₂ directly released from the power plant (100% capture efficiency)	56	33	6
Net CO ₂ storage efficiency, % of the stored CO ₂ directly released from the power plant (90% capture efficiency)	45	22	< 0

for oil and negative for coal. Capture of CO₂ from coal power plants will result in net emission of more CO₂ to the atmosphere. Therefore, to reduce the negative impact of CO₂ on climate change through CCS, it is necessary to reduce the exergetic cost of CO₂ capture and/or to use greener (low-carbon) sources of energy during the process. These results are summarized in Table 3.

5.2. Exergy analysis of CO₂ EOR

In the analysis provided in this section, three scenarios were considered for the utilization of the produced gas. In the first scenario (denoted by S1 or Scenario 1), it was assumed that all the produced gas without separation is re-injected back into the reservoir and thus without consuming significant amount of exergy except for that associated with recompression. However, this comes at the cost of losing the exergy gain from the produced methane in Eq. (8). In Scenario 2 (S2), it was assumed that the produced methane is separated from the gas stream and only CO₂ is reinjected into the reservoir. In Scenario 3 (S3), it was assumed that fresh CO₂ is continuously supplied to the project (not a practical scenario).

The calculated exergy-recovery factors (EX_{RF}) corresponding to the oil-recovery histories (demonstrated in Fig. 6) and considering S1 for the produced gas are shown in Fig. 7. CO₂ is supplied from the captured CO₂ from an oil-fueled power plant. The exergy recovery factor decreases with time, indicating that more exergy is required to produce the oil as project lifetime increases. This is because of the combined effect of the decline in oil production (or exergy gain) and the increase in gas production (or exergy investment). Moreover, it appears from Fig. 7 that the exergy-recovery factor is a strong function of the heterogeneity of the reservoir and, for a given time, its value decreases with an increase in the reservoir heterogeneity. Above a certain time, the exergy recovery factor becomes negative. This time is referred to as exergy-zero time (shown with a red dot in Fig. 7a) is the time above which the exergy required to produce the oil becomes larger than the exergy gained from oil (Farajzadeh, 2019). From the thermodynamic point of view, beyond this time the project is no longer sustainable. At the exergy-zero time, the recovery factor in the field has reached the exergy-zero recovery factor (shown with a red dot in Fig. 7b), whose value increases with decreasing level of the rock heterogeneity.

An interesting feature of the analysis is shown in Fig. 8, where the exergy recovery factors of the three cases are plotted as a function of the (volumetric) gross CO₂ utilization factor, i.e., the gross volume of CO₂ required to produce a unit volume of oil. It appears that the exergy recovery factor is merely a function of the CO₂ utilization factor. As CO₂ utilization factor increases the exergy factor decreases, which is due to the larger quantity of the invested exergy in supplying the injected CO₂. For comparison, the exergy recovery factor of the cases with the natural source of CO₂ and the low-carbon option have also been plotted on the




Fig. 7. Exergy recovery factor as a function of time (a) and oil recovery factor (b) for the three oil recovery histories presented in Fig. 6. It was assumed that all the produced gas is reinjected back into the reservoir (S1). The CO₂ source is the captured CO₂ from an oil-fueled power plant.




Fig. 8. Exergy recovery factor as a function of gross CO₂ utilization factor for Scenario 1 (all the produced gas is reinjected back into the reservoir). The exergy recovery factor is independent of the reservoir heterogeneity. The dashed blue line considers CO₂ from natural sources (zero capture exergy) and the dashed black line assumes that 90% of the CO₂ generated during the CCUS cycle is captured and stored.

figure. For the case with natural source of CO₂ zero capture exergy has been assumed. For the low-carbon option, capture exergy of 9.19 MJ/kg CO₂ (see Table 3) with a capture efficiency of 90% have been considered. Utilization of the natural sources of CO₂ for extracting oil is a favorable process from exergy point of view; however, it will not be beneficial for negative emission or storage of CO₂. For the low-carbon option, where 90% of the CO₂ arising from the capture, transportation, and compression stages are also captured, the exergy recovery factor is smaller than the other cases. This eventually leads to a smaller exergy-zero gas utilization factor.

The CO₂ utilization factor depends on the petrophysical and thermodynamic properties of the oil-bearing reservoir. For example, highly heterogeneous reservoirs consume more CO₂ compared to the homogeneous ones to produce the same amount of oil. Also, because the surface expansion of CO₂ (expressed as formation volume factor, B_g) depends on the initial pressure of the reservoir, the CO₂ utilization varies with pressure. As a result, in some literature the utilization factor is expressed as the volume of oil per unit mass of injected CO₂ [bbl oil/kg CO₂]. Fig. 9 shows the exergy recovery factor as functions of mass CO₂ utilization factor (left) and pore volume injected (right). As

expected, the exergy recovery factor for the case with the natural source of CO₂ is larger than the other two cases. Also, with natural source of CO₂, the exergy recovery factor remains positive for all times, i.e., the exergy obtained from the hydrocarbons is always larger than the exergy invested to produce. For the low-carbon option the exergy recovery is smaller compared to the other cases. For example, for CO₂ utilization factor of 2 bbl oil/tonne CO₂, the exergy recovery factor drops from 87% to 41% (see Fig. 9a, green dashed to red dash-dot curve) when the gas source is switched from natural source to the CO₂ captured from power plants. In other words, about 60% of the exergy obtained from oil is consumed for the production of that oil. Furthermore, it appears from the right plot in Fig. 9 that shortly after start of the gas injection (about 0.5 pore volume), the exergy recovery factor becomes negative for the low-carbon option. This means that from thermodynamic point of view, utilization of CO₂ captured from power plants as an EOR agent is not sustainable.

Fig. 10 shows the amount of the emitted CO₂ per barrel of oil as a function of the (net and gross) mass of injected CO₂. An average value of 436 g CO₂/kWh (oil as the fuel in the power plant) has been assumed in the calculations. This figure also includes the CO₂ released from combustion of the oil, which is calculated to be 422.7 kgCO₂/bbl² for the case considered here. Fig. 10 indicates that CO₂ mass utilization factor has a considerable effect on the life-cycle analysis of the CO₂-EOR process, which agrees with the findings of Refs. [14–17]. The analysis of the results of 31 CO₂-EOR projects provides an average net mass CO₂ utilization factor of ~2 bbl oil/tonne CO₂ (with a range of 1.8–4.2 bbl oil/tonne CO₂). The large value of 4.2 bbl oil/tonne CO₂ applies to less than 10% of the published results [30]. Such an optimal result can occur when reservoir conditions are optimal. Optimal conditions are partly the consequence of fixed conditions and partly to conditions such as the mobility ratio that can be manipulated, by injection of foam or other gas thickeners.

It also appears from Fig. 10 that even though the exergy recovery factor of the case with natural source of CO₂ is large, so is its CO₂ footprint (480–550 kgCO₂/bbl for CO₂ utilization factor of 4–2 bbl oil/tonne CO₂). By using the CO₂ captured from power plants, CO₂-EOR process gives an average value of 114 kg CO₂ per barrel of produced oil for CO₂ utilization factor of 2 bbl oil/tonne CO₂. If the CO₂ utilization factor is increased to 4 bbl oil/tonne CO₂ the unit CO₂ emission of CO₂

² One bbl = 5791 MJ or 1608 kWh. With specific CO₂ emission of 0.073 kgCO₂/MJ-CH₂, one bbl of oil produces 5791 MJ × 0.073 kgCO₂/MJ-CH₂ = 422.7 kgCO₂.





Fig. 9. Exergy recovery factor as function of mass CO₂ utilization (left) and total pore volume injected (right).

EOR reduces to less than 80 kgCO₂/bbl. The difference between the two curves with open symbols in Fig. 10 is the amount of CO₂ stored in the CO₂ EOR process, when CO₂ is supplied from an anthropogenic source (or captured). In summary, with CO₂ coming from an anthropogenic source, on average 30–40% less exergy is extracted from oil compared to the case with natural source of CO₂; however, this leads to storage of more than 400 kg of extra carbon dioxide per barrel of oil produced, which can help mitigate the negative impacts of CO₂ on the climate change.

Fig. 11 shows the effect of gas separation on the exergy recovery factor. The oil recovery profile of Case 2 (medium heterogeneous) was used in the calculations. In Scenario 2, it was assumed that methane is separated from the gas stream and only CO₂ is reinjected into the reservoir. In Scenario 3, it was assumed that fresh CO₂ is continuously supplied to the project (not a practical case). Indeed, because gas separation is exergetically expensive (its specific exergy is assumed to be 2.5 MJ/kg methane), the separation of methane from the produced gas stream is not desirable. The highest exergy recovery factor is obtained for Scenario 1. Despite the large investment in CO₂ capture, transportation, and compression, injection of CO₂ leads to exergy gain because of high specific exergy of the crude oil. Fig. 12 shows that for the case considered here, the separation of methane from CO₂ accounts for more than 30% reduction in the exergy recovery factor (for the average mass




Fig. 11. Effect of gas separation on the exergy recovery factor calculated for Case 2 (medium heterogeneous case).




Fig. 10. Unit CO₂ emitted (kg CO₂/bbl oil) and exergy recovery factor as a function of gross mass CO₂ utilization factor for Scenario 1. The shaded area highlights the range of CO₂ emission and exergy recovery factor based on the utilization factor of the current CO₂-EOR projects. The figure includes CO₂ released from combustion of oil (~422 kgCO₂/bbl).




Fig. 12. Exergy recovery factor as a function of mass CO₂ utilization factor for Case 2 (medium heterogeneity) with the scenarios considered for the produced gas stream.

CO₂ utilization factor of 2 bbl/tCO₂). The difference between Scenarios 1 and 2 depends on the amount of dissolved gas in the oleic phase (or GOR) and lost (or retained) volume of the gas in the reservoir. The difference between the different scenarios decreases as the CO₂ utilization factor increases. This emphasizes the importance of finding ways (e.g., foam) to improve the CO₂ utilization factor.

The majority of the current CO₂-EOR projects uses relatively pure CO₂ extracted from natural sources (i.e. from underground formations) and therefore little exergy is consumed to provide CO₂. The solid black line in Fig. 11 depicts the effect of exergy of capture on the exergy outcome of the CO₂ EOR project for Scenario 2. The exergy recovery increases when this exergetic cost is omitted. CO₂-EOR using the natural sources, even if it leads to significant exergy gains, increases the CO₂ levels in the atmosphere, because it takes the already-stored CO₂ to the surface.

6. Concluding remarks

We perform an analysis to assess whether and under which circumstances it is exergetically efficient to store CO₂ through enhanced oil recovery (EOR). We use pilot examples of CO₂-EOR in combination with the modified Koval method to generate an estimate of the expected oil production history. The system considered includes CO₂ capture, initial compression at the capture site, transport to the oil field, re-compression in the oil field, water injection, separation of the gas stream, oil transport to the refinery, and oil and gas production from the reservoir. The following conclusions are drawn from this study:

- The life cycle of CO₂-EOR with the CCS option can be assessed with the exergy concept. Using the method developed and illustrated, the

Appendix A

A.1. Exergy analysis: General concept

The exergy of a substance is a function of its temperature, pressure and composition, as well as of the average temperature, pressure and composition of its surrounding environment (also known as the dead state) [34,35]. Exergy can also be a function of location (potential exergy) and velocity (kinetic exergy). These functionalities are defined later in this section. The exergy of a system in equilibrium with the environment is zero. For practical reasons, we take the dead state to be at $T_0 = 298.15$ K and $P_0 = 1$ bar. In the following we denote the exergy by Ex [J] and its rate by \dot{Ex} [J/s]. The specific exergy is then defined by $\dot{ex} = \dot{Ex}/\dot{m}$ [J/kg], where \dot{m} [kg/s] is the mass flow rate of the material stream.

Exergy transfer rate associated with the material streams is given by

$$\dot{Ex} = \dot{Ex}^{ke} + \dot{Ex}^p + \dot{Ex}^{ph} + \dot{Ex}^{ch} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $\dot{Ex}^{ke} = \frac{\dot{m}V_0^2}{2}$ is the kinetic exergy rate (V_0 is the speed of the stream, with flow Q [m³/s] relative to the earth surface), $\dot{Ex}^p = \dot{m}gZ_0$ is the

carbon footprint of each stage of the process can also be quantified.

- The exergy recovery factor, the ratio between the produced exergy corrected for material and process exergy requirements for its extraction and the gross exergy of the source, decreases with time.
- For CCS to be an efficient way of reducing CO₂ concentration in the atmosphere (1) the exergetic cost of CO₂ separation should be reduced considerably, and/or (2) the source of energy should be a low carbon source. With the currently large exergetic cost of CO₂ separation, CCS is likely to return significant amounts of CO₂ to the atmosphere, regardless of the cost. Depending on the type of the power-plant fuel (gas, oil or coal), a minimum of 0.43–0.94 kg of CO₂ can be emitted per kg of CO₂ stored.
- The maximum net storage efficiency is 10–56% of the captured CO₂. Practically, with current state of technology, the CCS process using energy from coal-fired power plants will likely generate more CO₂ than stored.
- From thermodynamics point of view, CO₂ EOR with a CCS option is unsustainable, that is during the life cycle of the process more exergy is consumed than the exergy produced from oil.
- The exergy recovery factor of CO₂-EOR depends on the CO₂ utilization factor which, based on field experience, is currently in the range of 2–4 bbl-oil/tCO₂. For this CO₂ utilization range, 35–50% of the exergy produced from oil should be invested to capture, transport, and use CO₂ as an EOR agent.
- The utilization of CO₂ captured from power plants for EOR leads to 30–40% less exergy extraction compared to the case with natural source of CO₂; however, this leads to storage of more than 400 kg of extra carbon dioxide per barrel of oil produced.
- Combination of CCS with EOR reduces the full-cycle unit CO₂ emission to less than 100 kgCO₂/bbl.
- The highest exergy recovery factor (or lowest CO₂ emission) is obtained when produced gas stream is reinjected to reservoir without separation.
- Improvements of the CO₂ utilization factor (by implementing conformance/mobility control techniques) are required to reduce the CO₂ footprint of the CO₂-EOR projects.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

R. Farajzadeh: Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Methodology, Supervision, Writing - original draft. **A.A. Eftekhari:** Software, Writing - review & editing. **G. Dafnomilis:** Formal analysis. **L.W. Lake:** Writing - review & editing. **J. Bruining:** Writing - review & editing, Supervision.

Acknowledgement

Larry W. Lake holds the Shahid and Sharon Chair at the University of Texas. The authors thank Dr. Mollaei for his assistance in generating the oil recovery histories.

potential exergy rate (where g is the acceleration due to gravity and Z_0 [m] is the stream altitude above sea level), $\dot{E}x^{ph}$ [J/s] represents the physical or thermo-mechanical exergy based on the temperature and the pressure difference between the stream and the dead state, and $\dot{E}x^{ch}$ [J/s] is the chemical exergy based on the difference between the chemical potentials of the components in the stream and the dead state.

The thermo-mechanical or the physical exergy is the work that can be obtained by taking the substance through a reversible process from its initial state (T, P) to the state of the environment (T_0, P_0). The specific physical exergy is written as

$$ex^{ph} = h - h_0 - T_0(s - s_0) \quad (A.2)$$

For an ideal gas with a constant heat capacity C_p [J/(mol K)] Eq. (A.2) becomes

$$ex_{gas}^{ph} = C_p T_0 \left(\frac{T}{T_0} - 1 - \ln \frac{T}{T_0} \right) + RT_0 \frac{P}{P_0} \quad (A.3)$$

For solids and liquids assuming a constant heat capacity c [J/(mol K)] the physical exergy can be calculated from

$$ex_{ls}^{ph} = c \left[(T - T_0) - T_0 \ln \frac{T}{T_0} \right] - v_m (P - P_0) \quad (A.4)$$

where v_m [m³/mol] is the molar volume of the substance at temperature T_0 .

The specific chemical exergy at T_0 and P_0 can be calculated by bringing the mixture component into chemical equilibrium with the environment. In practice, it is more convenient to use the chemical exergy of the elements to calculate the chemical exergy of pure components. Using the standard chemical exergies of the elements, the standard chemical exergy of compounds can be calculated from [34,35]

$$\dot{E}x^{ch,0} = \Delta_f G^0 + \sum_{el} n_{el} \dot{E}x_{el}^{ch,0} \quad (A.5)$$

where $\Delta_f G^0$ [J] is the standard Gibbs energy of formation of the compound, n_{el} is the number of moles of the element per unit of the compound, and $\dot{E}x_{el}^{ch,0}$ [J/mol] is the standard chemical exergy of the element. The chemical exergy of a mixture with composition x_i is then calculated by

$$\dot{E}x^{ch} = \Delta_{mix} H + \sum_i x_i \dot{E}x_i^{ch,0} \quad (A.6)$$

where $\Delta_{mix} H$ is the enthalpy of mixing.

References

- Mohr SH, Wang J, Ellem G, Ward J, Giurco D. Projection of world fossil fuels by country. *Fuel* 2015;141:120–35.
- BP Energy outlook 2035, Jan 2014 bp.com/energyoutlook.
- IPCC. Climate change 2013: the physical science basis. Contribution of working group I to the fifth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change. Cambridge (UK), NY (USA): Cambridge University Press; 2013.
- Yantovsky E, Górski J, Shokotov M. Zero emissions power cycles. CRC Press Taylor & Francis Group; 2009.
- Lake L, Johns R, Rossen WR, Pope G. Fundamentals of enhanced oil recovery. Society of Petroleum Engineers; 2014.
- Lake LW, Lotfollahi M, Bryant SL. Fifty years of field observations: Lessons for CO₂ storage from CO₂ enhanced oil recovery. In: 14th International conference on greenhouse gas control technologies, GHGT-14, 21st -25th October 2018, Melbourne, Australia.
- Kovscek AR. Screening criteria for CO₂ storage in oil reservoirs. *Pet Sci Technol* 2002;20.
- Lake L, Walsh M. Enhanced Oil recovery (EOR) field Data literature search. Department of Petroleum and Geosystems Engineering, University of Texas at Austin; 2008.
- Improving Domestic Energy Security and Lowering CO₂ Emissions with “Next Generation” CO₂ Enhanced Oil Recovery (CO₂ EOR), National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL), U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), June 2011.
- Kuuskraa V, Wallace M. CO₂ EOR set for growth as new CO₂ supplies emerge. *Oil Gas J.* (May) 2014;92–105.
- Koottungal L. 2014 worldwide EOR survey. *Oil Gas J.*; April (2014).
- Azzolina N, Hamling JA, Peck WD, Hamling JA, Gorecki CD, Nakles DV, et al. A life cycle analysis of incremental oil produced via CO₂ EOR. *Energy Proc* 2017;114:6588–96.
- Eftekhari AA, Van Der Kooij H, Bruining J. Exergy analysis of underground coal gasification with simultaneous storage of carbon dioxide. *Energy* 2012;45(1):729–45.
- Azzolina N, Peck WD, Hamling JA, Gorecki CD, Ayash SC, Doll TE, et al. How green is my oil? A detailed look at greenhouse gas accounting for CO₂-enhanced oil recovery (CO₂ EOR) sites. *Int J Greenhouse Gas Control* 2016;51:369–79.
- Cooney G, Littlefield J, Marriot J, Skone TJ. Evaluating the climate benefits of CO₂ enhanced oil recovery using life cycle analysis. *Environ Sci Technol* 2015;49:7491–500.
- Hertwich EG, et al. Life-cycle assessment of carbon dioxide capture for enhanced oil recovery. *Chin J Chem Eng* 2008;16(June).
- Jaramillo P, Griffin WM, McCoy ST. Life-cycle inventory of CO₂ in an enhanced oil recovery system. *Environ Sci Technol* 2009;43(21):8027–32.
- Hussain D, Dzombak DA, Jaramillo P, Lowry GV. Comparative lifecycle inventory (LCI) of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of CO₂ enhanced oil recovery (EOR) methods using different CO₂ sources. *Int J Greenhouse Gas Control* 2013;16:129–44.
- Roefs P, Moretti M, Welkenhuysen K, Piessens K, Compennolle T. CO₂-enhanced oil recovery and CO₂ capture and storage: An environmental economic trade-off analysis. *J Environ Manage* 2019;239:167–77.
- Kwak DH, Kim JK. Techno-economic evaluation of CO₂ enhanced oil recovery (EOR) with the optimization of CO₂ supply. *Int J Greenhouse Gas Control* 2017;58:169–84.
- Wang X, Van't Veld K, Marcy P, Huzurbazar S, Alvarado V. Economic co-optimization of oil recovery and CO₂ sequestration. *Appl Energy* 2018;222:132–47.
- Jiang J, Rui Z, Hazlett R, Lu J. An integrated technical-economic model for evaluating CO₂ enhanced oil recovery development. *Appl Energy* 2019;247:190–211.
- Jiang Y, Lei Y, Yang Y, Wang F. Life cycle CO₂ emission estimation of CCS-EOR system using different CO₂ sources. *Pol J Environ Stud* 2018;27(6):2573–83.
- Vosough A, et al. Exergy concept and its characteristics. *Int J Multidiscip Sci Eng* 2011;2(July).
- Cornelissen RL. Thermodynamics and sustainable development: the use of exergy analysis and the reduction of irreversibility. PhD Dissertation. Technical University of Twente; November 1997.
- Wall G, Gong M. On exergy and sustainable development, Part I: conditions and concepts. *Exergy Int J* 2001;1.
- Farajzadeh R. Sustainable production of hydrocarbon fields guided by full-cycle exergy analysis. *J Pet Sci Eng* 2019;181:106204.
- Farajzadeh R, Zaal C, van den Hoek P, Bruining J. Life cycle assessment of water injection into hydrocarbon reservoirs using exergy concept. *J Clean Prod* 2019.
- Farajzadeh R, Kahrobaei SS, de Zwart AH, Boersma D. Life-cycle production optimization of hydrocarbon fields: thermoeconomics perspective. *Sustain Energy Fuels* 2019;3:3050–60.
- Azzolina NA, Nakles DV, Gorecki CD, Peck WD, Ayash SC, Melzer LS, et al. CO₂ storage associated with CO₂ enhanced oil recovery: a statistical analysis of historical operations. *Int J Greenh Gas Control* 2015;37:384–97.
- Mollaie A, Delshad M. General isothermal enhanced oil recovery and waterflood forecasting model. SPE 143925. In: Presented at SPE annual technical conference and exhibition, 30 Oct.-2 Nov. Denver, Colorado, USA.
- Farajzadeh R, Wassing LB, Lake LW. Insights into design of mobility control for chemical enhanced oil recovery. *Energy Rep* 2019;5:570–8.
- Sanchez YAC, de Oliveira Jr S. Exergy analysis of offshore primary petroleum processing plant with CO₂ capture. *Energy* 2015;88:46–56.
- Szargut J, Morris DR. Standard chemical exergy of some elements and compounds on the planet earth. *Energy* 1986;11.
- Szargut J. Chemical exergies of the elements. *Appl Energy* 1989;32.
- Bell Ian H, et al. Pure and pseudo-pure fluid thermophysical property evaluation and the open-source thermophysical property library CoolProp. *Ind Eng Chem Res* 2014;53(6):2498–508.
- Plasynski S, Chen Z. Review of CO₂ capture technologies and some improvement opportunities. In: Papers of the American Chemical Society; 2000.

- [38] Yang H, et al. Progress in carbon dioxide separation and capture: a review. *J Environ Sci* 2008;20.
- [39] Ferrara G, Lanzini A, Leone P, Ho MT, Wiley DE. Exergetic and exergetic analysis of post-combustion CO₂ capture using MEA-solvent chemical absorption. *Energy* 2017;130:113–28.
- [40] Geuzebroek FH, Schneiders LHJM, Kraaijeveld GJC, Feron PHM. Exergy analysis of alkanolamine-based CO₂ removal unit with AspenPlus. *Energy* 2004;29:1241–8.
- [41] Yang Y, Zhai R. MEA-Based CO₂ Capture Technology and Its Application in Power Plants Paths to Sustainable Energy, Dr Artie Ng (Ed.), ISBN: 978-953-307-401-6, InTech, Available from: <http://www.intechopen.com/books/paths-to-sustainable-energy/MEA-based-co2-capture-technology-and-its-application-in-power-plants>.
- [42] Perry RH, Green DW. Perry's Chemical Engineers' handbook. McGraw Hill; 2015.
- [43] Farajzadeh R, Ranganathan P, Zitha P.L.J.; Bruining J. The effect of heterogeneity on the character of density-driven natural convection of CO₂ overlying a brine layer. *Adv Water Resour* 2012;34(3).
- [44] Waggoner JR, Castillo JL, Lake LW. Simulation of EOR processes in stochastically generated permeable media. *SPE formation evaluation*, 7(2), June 1992.