

# The Biogas Market in Kenya Status Quo and Potentials

**Combined Biogas Business and Study Trip from Kenya and Tanzania** 

Hannover, November 13, 2009

Michael Franz, Klaus v. Mitzlaff German Technical Cooperation (GTZ)







### Structure

- Biogas in Kenya Status Quo
- Background: situation in the energy sector in East Africa
- Potentials for large-scale biogas
- Framework condititions
- Obstacles
- Recommendations







## Biogas traditionally:

- Used in particular in Kenya and Tanzania
- Small and very small installations
- Used for providing household energy and for supplying social institutions (cooking, heating, lighting)











- Industrial biogas not yet tapped in East Africa
- Two known applications o nly
- A. BG Plant on sisal farm in Tanzania
  - Design not well adapted to sisal operations
  - Substantial operating problems
  - Components of low quality
- B. Plant on sisal cum cattle farm in Kenya
  - Design well adated to farm operations



Fully operational since Sept. 2007





- ▶ The biogas plant in Kilifi
  - Operator: Biogas Power Company (EA) Ltd.; joint venture Kilifi
    Plantations (KE), agriKomp GmbH und Schnell Zündstrahlmotoren AG
    & Co. KG (DE)
  - Location: Kilifi Plantations Ltd.
  - ▶ 750 cbm digester
  - Inst. capacity: 150 kWel; actual production max. 90kW
  - 4t substrate / day, 200 cattle(40%), sisal waste (60%)









- The biogas plant in Kilifi
  - Implemented through tripartite PPP with GTZ
  - Pilot plant, risk reduced through German Dev. Cooperation
  - El. Production cost: 16 EURc / kWh
  - Compare:
    - grid electricty 15-17 EURc / kWh
    - ▶ Diesel generator: 23-42 EURc / kWh
  - Feedstock available for extension
    up to 1 Mwel if excess electricity can
    be sold to KPLC at fair tariff









- The biogas plant in Kilifi; lessons learnt
  - Import of equipment: professional agent and close liaison with authorites for clearance of plant equipment required
  - Tariffs / grid connection: need to liase at a very early stage with KPLC, Minstry of Energy and Energy Regulatory Commission to allow for structured and smooth process
  - Local capacities: need to bring qualified staff and train local staff
  - Local manufacture: local manufacture of pipes, wiring, and civil works should be possible and reduce costs







- Industrial biogas for electricity generation
  - Pilot plant realized, triggered sufficient interest
  - Challenges: regulatory framework / tariffs, lack of local experience and product information, lack of local capacities
  - ► Opportunities: energy crisis, well managed agro-industry (sisal, coffee, tea, horticulture, food, ...), improving regulatory framework
  - In summary: following implementation of incentives e.g. through the FiT, the Kenyan biogas market presents large opportunities that can be developed quickly







# Background: situation in the energy sector in East Africa

- Frequent power cuts due to technical faults, low capacity
- Companies have to install emergency backup power systems, mostly diesel (costs: 0,25-0,35 €/kWh)
- Kenya: High and due to pass-through of fossil fuel costs flucuating power costs (e.g. Kilifi: 0,1575 – 0,185 €/kWh)
- Improvement due to strong government and private sector efforts likely, but medium term; persistent risk of power cuts due to hydro power vulnerability to drought





# Potentials for large-scale Biogas in Kenya

- Study conducted by DBFZ estimates potentials for Kenya
- Estimates based on individual and aggregated data collected by GTZ
- Data not complete: not all sectors, companies, substrates have been covered
- Estimates by DBFZ are conservative,
- Actual potential will be higher
- Estimate is based on agricultural and municipal wastes and

waste waters only, not on renewable biomass





# Potentials for large-scale Biogas in Kenya

Proposed Feed-in Tariffs for Kenya (GTZ/DBFZ)

| Source               | Installed Capacity (MW) | Electricity production (MWh/a) |
|----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Municipal waste NBI  | 37.5                    | 296,589                        |
| Sisal                | 20                      | 156,842                        |
| Coffee               | 10                      | 80,189                         |
| Sugar filter cake    | 4.1                     | 30,723                         |
| Pineapple production | 2.35                    | 18,064                         |
| Chicken              | 1.9                     | 15,271                         |
| Distillery stillage  | 1.1                     | 8,353                          |
| Instant tea          | 0.7                     | 5,241                          |
| Horticulture         | 0.65                    | 5,043                          |
| Milk processing      | 0.55                    | 4,269                          |
|                      | 78.85                   | 620,584                        |







### Framework conditions

- Currently no biogas-specific regulation in East Africa
- Power production of biogas falls under "Standardized PPA (TZ)" or "Feed- in Law" (KE)
- Kenya: biogas covered by "biomass" tariffs, which are too low
- Expressed interest from investors and from government → request to GTZ to provide recommendations based on "hard data" → DBFZ study
- ▶ Recommendations have been provided → implementation ..?







## **Framework conditions**

Proposed Feed-in Tariffs for Kenya (GTZ/DBFZ)

| Suggested tariff steps      | Production costs<br>(USD ct/kWh <sub>el</sub> ) —— | Basic-FiT<br>(USD ct/kWh <sub>el</sub> ) |       |       |
|-----------------------------|--|--|-------|-------|
|                             |  | + 5%                                     | + 10% | + 15% |
| 0 - 50 kW <sub>el</sub>     | 18.05  | 18.96                                    | 19.86 | 20.76 |
| $50-250~\mathrm{kW_{el}}$   | 12.52  | 13.15                                    | 13.77 | 14.40 |
| $250 - 500 \text{ kW}_{el}$ | 10.00 <sup>1</sup>                                 | 10.50                                    | 11.00 | 11.50 |
| > 500 kW <sub>el</sub>      | 9.00 <sup>1</sup>                                  | 9.45                                     | 9.90  | 10.35 |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Production costs for 250-500 and >500 kW<sub>el</sub> are estimates







# **Framework conditions**

# Difference costs for proposed tariffs in Kenya

|   | Scenario 1               | Scenario 2                      | Scenario 3               |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Description   | Emphasis on small plants | Emphasis on medium sized plants | Emphasis on large plants |
| Mean Remuneration (USD/kWh <sub>el</sub> )  | 0,1492                   | 0,1392                          | 0,1352                   |
| Total biogas remuneration [USD]   | 111,924,734              | 104,429,143                     | 101,386,635              |
| Current generation mix (0.08 USD / kWh), difference costs in USD                      | 51,924,734               | 44,429,143                      | 41,386,635               |
| Least Cost Power Development<br>Plan (0.11 USD USD / kWh),<br>difference costs in USD | 29,424,734               | 21,929,143                      | 18,886,635               |
| 100 MW thermal power (0.17 USD USD / kWh), difference costs in USD                    | -15,575,266              | -23,070,857                     | -26,113,365              |





## **Obstacles**

- Little experience with agro-industrial biogas in EA
  - investors: hesitant due to limited knowledge of technology
  - Policy: as above, also no experience with power wheeling
- Local technical capacities limited, few biogas experts, but good pool of skilled technicians that could be trained
- Framework as of yet unattractive; however improvement likely







## **Summary**

- Estimated potential (~80MWel) and provided tariff recommendations (GTZ / DBFZ study)
- Considerable unexplored potentials in agriculture and waste management
- Large share of the potential concentrated in MW-range
- Electricity production for own consumption already viable
- Similar but smaller potentials in neighboring countries
- Obstacles exist, e.g. framework as of yet unattractive







### Recommendations

- Build strong partnerships with viable local partners
- ► Focus on high potentials (low hanging fruits) e.g. own consumption or spatially highly concentrated substrate potentials, e.g. sisal, food production, horticulture, coffee
- Make use of local production of components and local civil construction companies in order to reduce costs
- Build technical capacities for biogas plant engineering, construction and operation
- Policy: establish attractive incentives, constantly monitor framework and successes, adapt where necessary





#### **GTZ-services**

## Promoting B2B-partnerships for Investment

- Target Market Analysis; Business Guides
- Identification of projects and partners
- Framework support with stakeholders
- Support to technical capacity development
- Delegation trips to Germany
- Business trip to East Africa (early 2010)



Local contacts, linkages and facilitation





# Thank you very much for your attention!

#### Further information

#### **Michael Franz**

Regional Energy Advisor

GTZ REAP-EA

michael.franz@gtz.de

+254 20 2731834 / 826 / 828

