



International Institute for
Applied Systems Analysis
www.iiasa.ac.at

Technology Assessment and Decision-Aid Utility Analysis in Fossil Fuel-to-Fuel Conversion

Seo, F. & Sakawa, M.

IIASA Working Paper

WP-79-035

May 1979



Seo F & Sakawa M (1979). Technology Assessment and Decision-Aid Utility Analysis in Fossil Fuel-to-Fuel Conversion. IIASA Working Paper. IIASA, Laxenburg, Austria: WP-79-035 Copyright © 1979 by the author(s). <http://pure.iiasa.ac.at/id/eprint/1148/>

Working Papers on work of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis receive only limited review. Views or opinions expressed herein do not necessarily represent those of the Institute, its National Member Organizations, or other organizations supporting the work. All rights reserved. Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage. All copies must bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. For other purposes, to republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, permission must be sought by contacting repository@iiasa.ac.at

NOT FOR QUOTATION
WITHOUT PERMISSION
OF THE AUTHOR

TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT AND DECISION-AID
UTILITY ANALYSIS IN FOSSIL FUEL-TO-FUEL
CONVERSION

Fumiko Seo
Masatoshi Sakawa

May 1979
WP-79-35

Working Papers are interim reports on work of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis and have received only limited review. Views or opinions expressed herein do not necessarily represent those of the Institute or of its National Member Organizations.

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR APPLIED SYSTEMS ANALYSIS
A-2361 Laxenburg, Austria

PREFACE

In dealing with energy shortage problems around the world, energy utilization is closely related to technological development of fossil fuel-to-fuel conversion processes which provide alternatives to petroleum. Among the fossil fuel-to-fuel processes, several processes of making synthetic gas and oil from coal have been developed by several agencies. These processes are characterized by competitiveness and substitutability of diversified technologies in the same research and development area, and they have many deleterious effects on society, such as, resource exhaustion and environmental pollution. Thus alternative processes of technologies and their effects on human society should be examined and compared not only from the economic but from various social points of view as well. Thus, we propose the sociotechnique (SOTEC) concept for selecting the appropriate technology to the existing society.

To solve the Complex Problematique to which the SOTEC concept corresponds is a multicriteria problem. IIASA's System and Decision Sciences Area has recognized the necessity of coping with the multicriteria problem. This study is going on at IIASA and at Kyoto as one of several cooperative studies. This paper can be seen as a preliminary and modest contribution in this direction. The results were presented at IFAC Symposium on Criteria for Selecting Appropriate Technologies under Different Cultural, Technical, and Social Conditions, May 21-23, 1979, Bari, Italy.

Technology Assessment and Decision Aid Utility Analysis
in Fossil Fuel-to-Fuel Conversion

Fumiko Seo
Kyoto Institute of Economic Research, Kyoto University,
Kyoto, Japan

Masatoshi Sakawa
Department of Systems Engineering, Kobe University,
Kobe, Japan

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent research at MIT has pointed out that because utilization of natural gas in place of petroleum has been increasing, future energy demands will produce a serious shortage of natural gas itself if recent trends in natural gas use (e.g. 6% per year rate of increase in the U.S.) persist. On the other hand, new technologies for nuclear power and solar energy utilization have not yet been developed with acceptable levels of feasibility. In consequence, research and development of synthetic gas and oil produced by gasifying or liquefying coal has recently attracted increasing attention. The purpose of this paper, mainly based on the study by the MIT group (Hottel and Howard [1]), is to propose a methodology for selecting appropriate technologies for substitute-energy development under different resource and social conditions.

Methodology for technology assessment (T.A.) for choosing the most desirable processes among alternatives has not been well developed yet. Technology assessment is multiobjective.

The criteria of evaluation are noncommensurate and they are also often in conflict with each other. And the effects of alternative processes are still under uncertainty. Thus, we are concerned with establishing quantitatively the magnitudes of comprehensive profitability for choosing technological processes under these circumstances.

Technology assessment has two aspects. One is the necessity of examining technologies or processes not only technically but in the context of resource endowment, existing economic and social conditions and external (or environmental) effects. Thus, technology assessment is considered to be combined with location problems involved with technology choice.

In regional science, industrial-complex analysis has been devoted to identifying specific combinations of industrial activities for which one region is more favorable than another. (Isard, Schooler and Vietorisz [2]). Here the criterion of choice is exclusively locational advantages based on cost-revenue differentials as a result of resource endowment and economic development.

In contrast to industrial complex analysis, our method is based on the socio-technique complex (SOTEC) concept for technology assessment. In this concept, the economic advantage of spatial juxtaposition of substitute-energy processes with other industrial activities is not necessarily taken into consideration. Instead the stress is placed on the property of the object, an appropriate-technology development problem, as a complex problematique.

Another aspect of technology assessment is that development of expected technological processes is still under uncertainty. An empirical data base for evaluating alternative processes has not been well established yet, and conditions surrounding the technological development yield to unpredicted changes. Thus assessing preference for technology choice of alternative processes is a decision problem under uncertainty.

Decision analysis developed by Raiffa([3]), Schlaifer ([4]) and Platt([5][6]) presents a method for assessing the preference of the decision-maker for possible consequences of human actions, and for scaling his judgements concerning the chance of possible events. The utility concept is utilized for numerical presentation of his preference in a commensurated term. The expected-utility-maximization principle is used as the criterion for selecting alternative technological processes. The MANECON collection of computer programs for use on a time-sharing system is available to perform these evaluations.(Schlaifer [7])

Considering these characteristics of technology assessment and referring to the above-mentioned methodologies, in this paper a modified decision-analysis device for selecting appropriate technologies under different economic and social conditions is applied to the MIT data.


II. PROBLEM SETTING AND METHODOLOGY

The fossil fuel-to-fuel conversion problem is combined with a complex of resource endowment, transportation facilities, industrial/societal conditions. The structure of the complex

problematique is described sequentially in a decision-making flow-chart. In the terminal situation of the decision diagram, different types of the model can be discerned.(Fig.1) In model 1, the society has rich fossil fuel resources and has been highly industrialized. Thus this society has existing pipeline transportation facilities for liquefied natural gas. In model 2, the society has scarce natural resources and largely depends on overseas transportation from fossil fuel producing countries. On the other hand, this society has highly developed heavy-chemical industries and a great deal of substitute-energy demand; thus it is well-experienced in tanker transportation. In model 3, the society has plentiful coal resources but they have not been highly developed yet. However, if it does not desire to return to a colonial situation, industrialization must be the main object of economic policies. A typical society of model 1(M1) is the U.S.A.. Model 2(M2) is Japan and model 3(M3) is a society like South Africa or Australia which has large unknown possibilities for development.

In these models, decision-making is under uncertainty: even the resources-endowment conditions can be changed by unpredicted discovery of new mines. Marine transportation routes will not only be compelled to change for international political reasons but surface transportation may also suffer from deterioration of international relationships. Economic/societal conditions are greatly changed by political alteration. The uncertainties included in each model are taken into consideration as "risk" in assessing the preference of the model.

Fig. 1. Problem-setting flow chart.



A menu of alternative technological processes for gasification and liquefaction of coal is shown in Table 1. The characteristics of these processes are described in Table 2. The research and development of these alternative technologies in the future is also under uncertainty. Forecasting technological development includes many unpredictable factors. Such uncertain elements are considered in scaling the judgemental probabilities for each process.

The procedure for assessing the desirability of the alternative processes is as follows.

First, basic data for assessing each technological process is formed in quantitative terms. At this time the characteristics of the original data require some modifications of the device. One is that numerical information in comparable forms for the assessment is rarely obtainable from original data, and thus the subjective scale for non-quantified data must be utilized instead of the objective scale for quantified data. Another modification is that, because the data is composed of random variables, this property of the attribute of each process to be assessed is taken into account in calculating the expected utilities at a subsequent stage.

Second, a utility function of coal gasification and liquefaction for each model is assessed. The utility functions with decreasing positive risk aversion are fitted by the MANECON computer program SUMEXFIT in the following form. The MANECON program SUMEXFIT can also calculate parameters of the nonnormalized preference functions.

TABLE 1 Menu of Alternative Processes for
Substitute-energy Technologies from Coal

Gasification label	Process	characteristics (energy supply, etc.)
A1	Hygas-electrothermal (IGT)	electrothermal & hydrogasifier
A2	Molten Carbonate (Kellogg)	molten carbonate gasifier
B1	Bigas (BCR)	oxygen and steam
B2	Synthane (Bureau of mines)	oxygen and steam
C1	Hygas-oxygen (IGT)	oxygen and steam hydrogasifier
C2	Steam-Iron (IGT)	air and steam hydrogasifier use of iron oxide
C3	Hydrogasification (Bureau of mines)	air hydrogasifier
D	CO ₂ Acceptor (CSG)	hot air use of dolomite
Liquefaction		
A	Solvent refining of coal (SRC) (CSC)	hydrogen
B	Consol process (HRI)	hydrogen use of zinc chloride catalyst
C	H-coal (HRI)	hydrogen use of cobalt molybdate catalyst
D	COED	oxygen and steam hydrogen
E	Solvolyis (KKS)	use of asphlt as solvent

TABLE 2 Comparison of Alternative Gasification Processes

	coal size	temperature of gasifier	pressure	methane yield A	B	C
A1	1/8inch	1300~1500F 1700~1800F 1800~1900F	1000~1500psi	0.33	1.69	0.83
A2	12mesh	1830F 1900F	420psia	0.098	0.50	0.29
B1	200mesh	1400~1700F 2700~2800F	750~1500psi	0.21	1.04	0.52
B2	200mesh	750F 1100~1470F 1750~1850F	600~1000psi	0.18	0.79	0.55
C1	1/8inch	1300~1500F	1000~1500psi	no data		
C2	1/8inch	1300~1500F	1000~1500psi	0.25	1.27	0.64
C3	50X100mesh	1650F	1000psi	0.50	2.90	0.95
D	1/4 to 1/8 inch (lignite)	1500F	140psia 300psia	0.16	0.90	0.46

source: Hottel and Howard, New Energy Technology

note: All based on feed of Illinois No. 6 coal, except CSG(Renner Cove Lignite), Molton Carbonate (Pittsburgh seam coal) and Bureau of Mines Hydrogasification (Pittsburg seam coal).

A=(Methane leaving gasifier)/(Carbon in solids feed stream to gasifier);

B=(Methane leaving gasifier)/(Methane-equivalent of hydrogen in coal);

C=(Methane leaving gasifier)/(Methane in final pipeline gas).

$$F(x) = -(e^{-ax} - 1) - c(e^{-bx} - 1) \quad (1)$$

$$a > 0, \quad bc > 0$$

The normalized preference (utility) functions are obtained in the following form:

$$u(x) = \frac{F(x) - F(x_0)}{F(x_1) - F(x_0)} \quad (2)$$

The local risk aversion function is

$$R(x) = \frac{-u''(x)}{u'(x)} = \frac{a^2 e^{-ax} + cb^2 e^{-bx}}{ae^{-ax} + cbe^{-bx}} \quad (3)$$

The conditions $a > 0$ and $bc > 0$ guarantee that the risk aversion function is decreasing over $[-\infty, \infty]$. In addition, if b and c are positive, the risk-aversion function (3) is everywhere positive; if b and c are negative, the risk-aversion function is positive to the left of

$$x^* = \frac{1}{a-b} \log(-a^2/[b^2c]) \quad (4)$$

are negative to the right of x^* where $R(x^*) = 0$. (Schlaifer [7]) Input data for depicting utility curves are derived by assessing certainty equivalents with 50-50 chance lottery techniques.

Third, a probability distribution $P(x)$ of the random variable x in each process is assessed with direct judgement. In fact the value x of the cumulative distribution function $P(x \leq \tilde{x})$ is assessed

for several fractiles of the distribution. Using the MANECON program CDISPRI, continuous piecewise quadratic distributions are graphically printed in the form of the mass functions as well as cumulative functions. Characteristics of the distribution such as mean, standard deviation, and variance are also calculated.

Finally, expected value of utility for each process, $E[u(x)] = \int_0^1 p(x) u(x) dx$, is calculated with the MANECON program PREFEVAL. The numerical results for alternative processes are compared to each other within each model.

The MANECON program was interactively run under IBM CALL/370 with minor modifications. It was known that the computational works could be economically well done using this package.

III. DATA AND RESULTS

Data for items which characterize the coal gasification and liquefaction processes are shown in Table 3 and Table 4. The considerations for each process come from the MIT study above cited. Using these data along with ones in Table 1 and Table 2, the items for each process are examined altogether and are consolidated into one attribute for each process. Measures for the considerations summed up for each process are scaled with subjective judgment in the range of 0 to 10. The weighting for summing up the considerations is different according to the importance of each item for each process in each model.

TABLE 3 Data for Subjective Scale of
Coal Gasification Processes

<u>label</u>	<u>consideration</u>	<u>evaluation</u>
A1	Highest noncatalytic methanation in gasifier of any process developed beyond bench-scale.	+
		+
	Advanced pilot plants developed.	+
	Slurrying of fuel gives the reliable feed to high pressure system.	+
	Coal cost in price components is large(47.4%).	-
		(uncertainty)
	Coal preparation, hydrogasification and hydrogen costs requires large investment.	-
	Necessity of disposing of by-product char.	-
		(uncertainty)
	Electric energy need is economically questionable.	-
A2	Difficulties of pretreater temperature control.	-
		(uncertainty)
	Pretreating operation necessary to handle caking coal produces an extra gas stream and prevents making full use of the relatively high reactivity of fresh coal.	-
	Use of air instead of oxygen.	+
	Coal preparation costs less.	+
	Sodium carbonate has an advantageous catalytic effect on rate of solids gasification.	-
	Molten salt is very corrosive.	-
	Temperature of gasifier is too high for significant methanation.	-
	The lowest yield of methane.	-
	Energy loss for evolution of carbon dioxide in conversion of bicarbonate to carbonate.	-
B1	Difficulties of process control.	-
	Sulfur and power production as by-products.	+
		(uncertainty)
	Enough background of R & D (a result of a state-of-the art survey).	+
	Rapid gasification by entrained flow.	+
	Gasifier methanation is higher than other oxygen-blown processes.	+
	Temperature of reactor (cyclone gasification chamber) for steam-oxygen-char is much higher than in other processes with attendant higher thermal loss in slag.	-
	Lignite is available (low cost).	+
	Many unsolved or questionable technical aspects remain.	-
		(uncertainty)
B2	Direct use of caking coal(pretreatment cost is low).	+
	Concurrent flow at feed point minimizes loss of evolved hydrocarbons.	+
	Production of char stream as one of the final products.	-
		(uncertainty)
	Amount of catalytic methanation necessary is much higher than in hydrogasification processes.	-
	Many unsolved or questionable technical aspects remain.	-
	Coal cost is high (48.2%).	-
		(uncertainty)

<u>label</u>	<u>consideration</u>	<u>evaluation</u>
C1	Input of oxygen into a separate reactor requires considerably less oxygen than in class B processes which add it directly to the gasifier.	+
	Development in pilot plant stage.	+
	Efficiency of noncatalytic methanation (no data).	+
	Direct coupling of the hydrogen-carbon monoxide supply to the methanation process is absent, with attendant thermal loss.	-
	Costs of oxygen and hydrogen is a large component of the price.	-
	Yield of fuel by-products.	+
C2	Use of air, with attendant substantial reduction in equipment cost.	+
	High noncatalytic methanation in all the processes.	+
	Direct coupling of the hydrogen supply to the methanation process is absent, with attendant thermal loss.	-
	In pilot plant stage.	+
	Requirement of sulfur removal from effluent of a reducer of iron oxide.	-
	Continuous, high-pressure, large-scale hydrogen production process by stream-iron technique not well established.	- (uncertainty)
	Control problem for balanced operation of six fluidized beds (3 in gasifier, 3 in steam-iron).	- (uncertainty)
	Hydrogen cost high.	-
	Coal cost high (53.7%).	- (uncertainty)
C3	Use of air instead of oxygen.	+
	Substantial methanation within gasifier and relatively small amount of catalytic methanation (the highest noncatalytic methane yield).	+
	Requirement of sulfur removal from flue gas leaving air-blown fluidized bed combustor.	-
	Absence of direct coupling of the hydrogen-producing process to the methanation process (thermal loss).	-
	Relatively undeveloped state.	-
	Remaining unsolved technical aspects.	-
	Coal cost is less.	+
D	Use of air instead of oxygen.	+
	Efficient supply of reaction energy <u>in situ</u> .	+
	Use of lignite as material, with attendant minimal cost.	+
	Existence of temperature restriction in gasifier, with attendant restriction of usable coal materials.	-
	Regenerator outlet gas contains 3-4% CO and also SO ₂ .	-
	Noncatalytic methane yield is relatively low.	-
	Difficulty of system control.	- (uncertainty)

TABLE 4 Data for Subjective Scale of
Coal Liquefaction Processes

<u>label</u>	<u>consideration</u>	<u>evaluation</u>
A	Use of coal tar as solvent with efficient dissolution capacity.	+
	Hydrogen recycling system requires less hydrogen.	+
	No catalytic treatment.	+
	Requirement of SO ₂ treatment in effluent stock gas and ask disposal from residue furnace.	-
	Pilot plant stage of development.	+
	Sulfur as by-product.	- (uncertainty)
	Energe production from residue treatment process.	+
	Has solvent recovery plant.	+
	Storage of de-ashed desulfurized liquid stream by solidification for delayed coking (economically efficient).	+
B	Extract hydrogenation produces high cost.	-
	Has solvent recovery plant.	+
	Utilization of caking coal (low cost of coal material).	+
	Pilot plant stage of development.	+
C	Catalytic hydrogenation (high cost of hydrogen).	-
	Dependence on discounted cash flow (DCF) on grade of coal (high cost of coal material).	- (uncertainty)
	Possibility of high return on investment (DCF 18% for Illinois coal).	+
	Development in bench scale.	- (uncertainty)

<u>label</u>	<u>consideration</u>	<u>evaluation</u>
D	Staging of temperature by multistage fluidized-bed pyrolysis, which minimizes the loss of hydrocarbons that occur when cracking is too severe.	+
	Catalytic hydrotreating of oil (high cost of hydrogen).	-
	Utilization of char product as boiler fuel for power generation.	+
	Use of oxygen for reactor (high cost of oxygen).	-
	Minimization of gas products.	+
	High price of oil product.	-
	Possible utilization of the produced fuel gas and char as the process fuel for the operation.	+(uncertainty)
	Pilot plant stage of development.	+
E	Use of asphalt as solvent (suitable for mass supply).	+
	Less efficient dissolution capacity of asphalt.	-
	Operation under air pressure (no requirement of hydrogen-use for elevating pressure).	+
	Low equipment cost.	+
	Ease of handling and safety of plant.	+
	High yield of liquid products (depending on the carbon content of coal).	+(uncertainty)
	Advanced experiments performed in Japan.	+
	Requirement of sulfur removal.	-
	Use of nitrogen as inactive gas for reactor.	+ or - (model 3)


Based on the subjectively scaled attributes, utility functions are assessed. Parameters of the utility functions are shown in Table 5. The MANECON program PREFEVAL can evaluate and print out the values of the attributes and the corresponding preferences for them. Using these results, the utility functions for the oil-from-coal as well as gas-from-coal conversion processes in each model are graphically depicted in Fig. 2. The numerical values of the decreasing risk-aversion functions are also shown in the Figure.

The magnitudes of numerical values of the risk-aversion function $R(x)$ are, in descending order, M3, M2 and M1 for the gasification process. In model 3, it is supposed that the decision-maker is most risk-averse in the first half of the whole range of the attributes and becomes rather risk-prone in the end. For the liquefaction process, the situation in model 3 is same. However, unlike in the gasification case, the decision-maker in model 2 is less risk-averse than in model 1. This is due to the relatively advanced stage of research and development for the liquefaction process in Japan.


TABLE 5 Parameters of Utility Functions

	A	B	C
GAS M1	0.72720	0.01016	127.9222
M2	0.40636	-0.02179	-6.29407
M3	0.34382	-0.27372	-0.01485
OIL M1	0.51448	0.09402	13.88968
M2	0.57441	0.03329	23.72738
M3	0.57615	-0.01800	-7.51167

GAS M1



GAS M2



GAS M3





Fig: 2. Utility functions and their values of risk averse functions.

OIL M1




$$R(2.5)=0.14491$$

$$R(5.0)=0.11333$$

$$R(7.5)=0.10098$$

$$R(9.5)=0.09705$$

OIL M2




$$R(2.5)=0.11892$$

$$R(5.0)=0.05837$$

$$R(7.5)=0.04000$$

$$R(9.5)=0.03558$$

OIL M3



$$R(2.5)=0.27375$$

$$R(5.0)=0.08852$$

$$R(7.5)=0.01000$$

$$R(9.5)=-0.00918$$

Fig. 2. Utility functions and their values of risk averse functions.
(continued)

The attribute of each process is a random variable, and its probability distribution function is also assessed with subjective judgement. Characteristics of the distribution functions are also calculated and shown in Table 6. Examples of the probability distributions are graphically shown in Fig. 3.

As seen, among coal gasification processes in model 1, the mean of the probability distribution, or the mathematical expectation for the uncertain quantity of the attribute, is the highest for process C3. Processes C1 and A1 have secondary high values. In these processes, the degree of uncertainty expressed in the term of variance is relatively low. The process which has the highest degree of uncertainty is B2. This is mainly because of the unestablished status of the technology, uncertainty in predicting coal prices and the necessity of marketing char residuals. In model 2, the highest value of means is also in process C3 followed by process A1. The low magnitudes of means compared with those in model 1 reflect the delayed status of development of gasification processes in Japan. The numerical values of variance are generally high in model 2. This is because of the unpredictability of coal prices which obey external conditions. In model 3, the pattern of the mean value is almost the same as in other cases except that process D has a secondary high value. This is because of the efficiency of the energy supply system and utilizing air instead of oxygen, which are more suitable for less developed societies without well-established heavy-chemical industry complexes. In addition, use of lignite

TABLE 6

GASMLA1

MEAN = 7.239
 STD DEV = 1.705
 VARIANCE = 0.291E+01
 FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
2282	2891	4790	6100	7500	8600	9309	9816	9941

 UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

GASMLA2

MEAN = 4.518
 STD DEV = 1.880
 VARIANCE = 0.353E+01
 FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
204	646	2040	3202	4500	5800	6903	9013	9688

 UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

GASMLB1

MEAN = 6.170
 STD DEV = 2.058
 VARIANCE = 0.424E+01
 FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
340	1074	3364	4800	6300	7800	8808	9649	9890

 UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

GASMLB2

MEAN = 5.591
 STD DEV = 2.183
 VARIANCE = 0.477E+01
 FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
242	765	2442	4000	5800	7300	8369	9491	9839

 UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

GASMLC1

MEAN = 7.282
 STD DEV = 1.574
 VARIANCE = 0.248E+01
 FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
2315	2995	5117	6300	7500	8500	9176	9755	9922

 UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

GASMLC2

MEAN = 6.568
 STD DEV = 1.797
 VARIANCE = 0.323E+01
 FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
1781	2389	4288	5300	6500	8000	9062	9773	9927

 UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

GASMLC3

MEAN = 7.712
 STD DEV = 0.411
 VARIANCE = 0.169E+00
 FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
2780	3384	5268	6500	7800	8900	9560	9956	9996

 UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

-20-
TABLE 6 (continued)

GASM1D

MEAN = 6.507
STD DEV = 1.879
VARIANCE = 0.353E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
1312	1987	4097	5200	6500	8000	9062	9773	9927

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

GASM2A1

MEAN = 6.332
STD DEV = 1.781
VARIANCE = 0.317E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
2170	2537	3745	5000	6500	7750	8586	9553	9859

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

GASM2A2

MEAN = 3.996
STD DEV = 2.013
VARIANCE = 0.405E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
161	510	1607	2500	3700	5200	7000	9067	9705

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

GASM2B1

MEAN = 4.967
STD DEV = 2.317
VARIANCE = 0.537E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
165	522	1756	3202	5000	6800	8079	9401	9811

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

GASM2B2

MEAN = 5.472
STD DEV = 2.488
VARIANCE = 0.619E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
153	484	1768	3500	5800	7500	8643	9600	9874

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

GASM2C1

MEAN = 6.080
STD DEV = 1.657
VARIANCE = 0.275E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
1265	1837	3631	5000	6500	7250	7805	9279	9772

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

GASM2C2

MEAN = 5.996
STD DEV = 1.772
VARIANCE = 0.314E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
1218	1688	3182	4503	6000	7500	8546	9553	9859

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

TABLE 6 (continued)

GASM2C3

MEAN = 7.041
STD DEV = 1.781
VARIANCE = 0.317E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
2253	2801	4516	5800	7200	8500	9314	9845	9950

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

GASM2D

MEAN = 6.086
STD DEV = 2.090
VARIANCE = 0.437E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
1178	1563	2905	4500	6500	7750	8586	9553	9859

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

GASM3A1

MEAN = 5.713
STD DEV = 2.189
VARIANCE = 0.479E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
1146	1460	2592	4000	5800	7500	8643	9600	9874

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

GASM3A2

MEAN = 3.387
STD DEV = 1.719
VARIANCE = 0.296E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
132	418	1337	2201	3200	4200	5691	8326	9471

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

GASM3B1

MEAN = 3.796
STD DEV = 2.048
VARIANCE = 0.419E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
92	290	1089	2200	3700	5200	6469	8674	9644

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

GASM3B2

MEAN = 4.539
STD DEV = 2.054
VARIANCE = 0.422E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
202	639	2004	3000	4300	6000	7497	9210	9750

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

GASM3C1

MEAN = 5.896
STD DEV = 1.797
VARIANCE = 0.323E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
361	1141	3582	4803	6000	7200	8123	9401	9811

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

TABLE 6 (continued)

GASM3C2

MEAN = 5.867
 STD DEV = 1.595
 VARIANCE = 0.255E+01
 FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
392	1240	3916	5000	6000	6900	7680	9261	9766

 UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

GASM3C3

MEAN = 6.553
 STD DEV = 2.051
 VARIANCE = 0.421E+01
 FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
1678	2063	3405	5000	7000	8200	9011	9704	9907

 UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

GASM3D

MEAN = 6.174
 STD DEV = 1.760
 VARIANCE = 0.310E+01
 FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
1310	1980	4088	5000	6000	7500	8674	9617	9879

 UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

OILM1A

MEAN = 7.285
 STD DEV = 1.409
 VARIANCE = 0.199E+01
 FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
2347	3096	5451	6500	7500	8300	8899	9650	9889

 UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

OILM1B

MEAN = 6.546
 STD DEV = 1.682
 VARIANCE = 0.285E+01
 FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
1333	2053	4303	5500	6700	7800	8609	9560	9861

 UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

OILM1C

MEAN = 5.959
 STD DEV = 2.103
 VARIANCE = 0.442E+01
 FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
297	939	2952	4500	6200	7600	8584	9562	9862

 UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

OILM1D

MEAN = 5.820
 STD DEV = 1.841
 VARIANCE = 0.339E+01
 FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
1254	1802	3514	4500	5700	7200	8425	9524	9849

 UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

TABLE 6 (continued)

OILM1E

MEAN = 6.877
STD DEV = 1.715
VARIANCE = 0.294E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
2268	2848	4654	5800	7000	8200	9011	9706	9907

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

OILM2A

MEAN = 6.550
STD DEV = 1.679
VARIANCE = 0.282E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
1355	2122	4546	5500	6500	7800	8823	9657	9892

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

OILM2B

MEAN = 5.818
STD DEV = 1.968
VARIANCE = 0.387E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
312	986	3087	4500	6000	7300	8266	9450	9826

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

OILM2C

MEAN = 5.667
STD DEV = 2.269
VARIANCE = 0.515E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
242	765	2442	4000	5800	7500	8643	9600	9874

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

OILM2D

MEAN = 5.428
STD DEV = 2.226
VARIANCE = 0.495E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
231	729	2326	3802	5500	7200	8381	9504	9843

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

OILM2E

MEAN = 7.100
STD DEV = 1.485
VARIANCE = 0.220E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
2312	2987	5097	6200	7300	8200	8862	9640	9887

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

OILM3A

MEAN = 6.017
STD DEV = 2.128
VARIANCE = 0.453E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
355	1124	3522	5200	7000	8300	9145	9766	9925

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

TABLE 6 (continued)

OILM3B

MEAN = 5.433
STD DEV = 2.048
VARIANCE = 0.419E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
265	837	2631	4000	5500	7000	8103	9400	9810

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

OILM3C

MEAN = 5.666
STD DEV = 2.533
VARIANCE = 0.642E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
189	599	2021	3700	5800	7800	9035	9812	9940

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

OILM3D

MEAN = 4.972
STD DEV = 2.481
VARIANCE = 0.615E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
129	408	1503	3000	5000	7000	8352	9510	9845

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

OILM3E

MEAN = 6.513
STD DEV = 1.905
VARIANCE = 0.363E+01

FRACTILES

.001	.01	.1	.25	.5	.75	.9	.99	.999
1276	1873	3746	5200	6800	8000	8837	9642	9887

UQ VALUES JUST ABOVE ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-3

OPTION?

?

4

-25-

VALUES ON UQ AXIS ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY $10E-1$

10*

20*

30*

40*

50*

60*

70*

80*

90*

100*

OPTION?

?

5

VALUES ON UQ AXIS ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY $10E-1$

.0

.2

.4

.6

.8

1.0

10*

20*

30*

40*

50*

60*

70*

80*

90*

100*

Fig. 3. Probability distributions of the attributes for selected oil-from-coal processes.

OPTION?
?
4

VALUES ON UQ AXIS ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-1





Fig. 3. Probability distributions of the attributes for selected oil-from coal processes. (continued)

OPTION?
?
5

VALUES ON UQ AXIS ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY 10E-1



OPTION?
?
4

-27-

VALUES ON UQ AXIS ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY $10E-1$





Fig. 3. Probability distributions of the attributes for selected oil-from-coal processes. (continued)

OPTION?
?
5

VALUES ON UQ AXIS ARE TO BE MULTIPLIED BY $10E-1$



gives more leeway for locational choice. The degrees of uncertainty in model 3 are sometimes lower than in model 2: in these cases, locational advantages in coal-producing countries contribute to this situation.

For coal liquefaction processes, the mean value is the highest for process A in model 1, and for process E in model 2. The high values of variance in model 2 are caused by the same factors as in the gasification processes in that model. In model 3, process A has the highest mean value and process E is secondary. The variance for each process is often higher than in other models, and also higher than for gas-from-coal processes in that model. This means that, although there is a relatively good possibility for a liquid refinery with high profitability in coal-producing sites, the decision-making will come from consuming countries exclusively. Thus, uncertain quantities of the attribute of each process have a large variance.

The numerical values of the expected utility of the alternative processes are shown in Table 7, where we see that in model 1, process C3 has the highest value of the expected utility and processes C1 and A1 are secondary among the gasification processes. Process A has the highest value and process E is secondary among the liquefaction processes.

In model 2, the preferred processes of gasification are the same as in model 1. The high magnitude of the expected utility, except for more advanced processes in model 1, results from the fact that, research and development being generally less advanced in model 2, possible range for high profitability disperses

TABLE 7 Expected Utility of Alternative Processes

M1	Preference	M2	Preference	M3	Preference
GAS A1	0.7517	GAS A1	0.7303	GAS A1	0.7476
A2	0.4933	A2	0.5239	A2	0.5621
B1	0.6518	B1	0.5994	B1	0.5872
B2	0.5971	B2	0.6468	B2	0.6616
C1	0.7559	C1	0.7107	C1	0.7656
C2	0.6902	C2	0.6963	C2	0.7686
C3	0.7822	C3	0.7847	C3	0.8042
D	0.6842	D	0.7063	D	0.7880
OIL A	0.8237	A	0.7233	A	0.7678
B	0.7648	B	0.6566	B	0.6820
C	0.7095	C	0.6396	C	0.6911
D	0.7037	D	0.6161	D	0.6346
E	0.7913	E	0.7707	E	0.7642

with relatively high probabilities. This stems from the benefit of technology transfer to late-comers, or the "risk of developers." For liquefaction processes, the situation is in the opposite, and process E is most preferable.

In model 3, the situation is about the same as in model 2: however, process C3 is most preferable, process D is secondary, and processes C1 and C2 are third for gasification. For liquefaction, the order of preference is about the same as in model 1. The relatively low magnitude of numerical values of expected utility, compared with model 1, reflects the risk of expectation for high profitability due to plants being invited, and thus final decisions about them being made by consuming countries.

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

As assessment of alternative processes of technologies for substitute-energy from coal has been presented in terms of numerical expressions of preference. Our main device has been concerned with quantifying unquantified data in comparative terms. The variables are also uncertain quantities whose probability distributions can not be obtained from empirical/experimental mass observations. Thus subjective judgement has been used for assessing preferences and scaling probabilities of uncertain quantities of the attributes. As a result, the expected utility concept is used for final assessment.

The SOTEC concept has been used for structuring the problems and model classification has been performed according to this concept.

However, the results are still quite preliminary. As the MIT study points out, hasty conclusive assertions should be withheld because the money and time lost in going back to a complex process abandoned of an early stage are too great. Also, a data base for evaluation has not been well-established yet. Any process may have more advantage in large-scale operations than in laboratory research and pilot plant operations.

Also, the methodology for technology assessment has not been well developed yet. Although a modified version of decision analysis has been presented here, a device combining this method with multi-attribute utility analysis in a hierarchical system of decision making will be investigated, and development of a revised interactive computer program for this purpose is expected, In addition, impact

assessment on residential and natural environments as well as on related industrial combinations in the region for locating fossil fuel-to-fuel conversion processes has not yet been performed in well-established quantified terms. Although we have to wait for such work until the arrangement of a suitable data-base is performed, methodological elaborations for technology assessment in terms of environmental control are expected in the near future.

The main directions of further research for technology assessment include greater utilization of the behavioral scientific approach to preference theory. Computer-aided systems design will also be useful for efficiently calculating preference orders among alternative technologies in numerical terms. Interactive man-machine systems especially will contribute to evaluation procedures.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT


The authors are indebted to Dr. Hitoo Kakiyama, Chief of the Chemistry Division of the National Industrial Research Institute, Kyushu, for providing valuable information on the Solvolysis liquefaction process. Mr. Kimio Ishimaru of the Research Center of Osaka Gas Company also provided a general state-of-art survey of fossil fuel-to-fuel conversion processes in Japan. Contributions made by Mr. Sumio Hasegawa were critical in assisting computer utilization and assessment work.

REFERENCES


- [1] Hottel, H.C. and J.B.Howard (1971). New Energy Technology -- Some Facts and Assessment. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- [2] Isard, W., E.W.Schooler, and T.Vietorisz (1959). Industrial Complex Analysis and Regional Development. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- [3] Raiffa, H. (1970). Decision Analysis. Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass.
- [4] Schlaifer, R. (1969). Analysis of Decision under Uncertainty. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- [5] Pratt, J.W. (1964). Risk aversion in the small and in the large. Econometrica, 32, 122-137.
- [6] Pratt, J.W., H.Raiffa, and R.Schlaifer (1964). The foundations of decision under uncertainty: An elementary exposition, J. Am. Stat. Assoc., 59, 353-375.
- [7] Schlaifer, R. (1971). Computer Programs for Elementary Decision Analysis. Division of Research, Harvard Business School, Boston.

APPENDIX


source: Hottel and Howard, New Energy Technology
(A1 to E)




A1. Hygas-Electrothermal
(Institute of Gas Technology)




A2 Molten Carbonate (M.W. Kellogg Co.)




BL Bigas (Bituminous Coal Research, Inc.)







C1 Hygas-Oxygen (IGT)




C2 Steam-Iron (IGF Fuel Gas Associates)




C3. Hydrogasification (Bureau of Mines)




D1. CSG Process or CO₂-Acceptor
(Consolidation Coal CO.)




A. Solvent-Refining of Coal
(Pittsburgh and Midway Coal Mining Company)




B. Consol Process (Consolidation Coal Company)



C. H-Coal (Hydrocarbon Research, Inc. HRI)



D. COED (Char Oil Energy Development)
(F.M.C. Corporation)



E. Solvolysis Liquefaction of Coal (National Industrial Research Institute, Japan)