The role of cost of capital in energy system models

Themenbereich (7), Energiesystem- und Klimamodellierung

Katherine E. LONERGAN[(1)], Florian EGLI [(1)], Sebastian OSORIO[(2)], Giovanni SANSAVINI[(1)], Michael PAHLE[(2)], Tobias S. SCHMIDT[(1)], Bjarne STEFFEN[(1)1]
[(1)]ETH Zürich [(2)]Potsdam Institut für Klimafolgenforschung

Motivation und zentrale Fragestellung

Energy system models guide policymakers in implementing the energy transition in European countries. Despite their importance, several crucial aspects of models remain underexplored, one of which is the cost of capital (CoC), most often captured in the discount rate used [1]. The CoC directly influences the cost-competitiveness of different investment options [2,3] and empirically varies considerably between technologies and regions [4]. Hence, using realistic CoC rates in energy system models is crucial for model results. However, there is no comprehensive review on how modelers are actually considering the CoC within their analysis nor guidelines for how to do it.

Methodische Vorgangsweise

In this study, we aim to address this gap and bring structure to how CoC rates are and ought to be considered in energy system models. To begin, we review 58 recent model-based publications concerning their approaches for addressing CoC. Next, we identify four barriers currently impeding a more thorough consideration of CoC. Finally, we provide recommendations for how CoC could be better accounted for in energy system models, including a heuristic guide to support modelers.

For the literature review part specifically, we first used the Scopus database to retrieve a long-list of 355 publications that explicitly considered CoC in their analysis. We consider English-language publications published between 2010 and 2021. As a second step, we manually filtered our long-list and discarded publications that did not feature a model-based analysis of energy investments, did not apply CoC within the modelling activity, or were otherwise irrelevant. This second step left us with a sample of 58 relevant publications.

Ergebnisse und Schlussfolgerungen

In our review, we find that of the 58 publications that explicitly considered CoC, about two-thirds applied differentiated CoC values in their analysis. Authors most commonly differentiate CoC according to asset location and/or policy scenario. About half of the papers consider more than one type of variation, e.g. considering the CoC to be a function of technology and location.

Concerning the method for determining the CoC, about one third of the publications explain CoC to be based on assumptions alone. Despite an increasing body of literature that provides empirical CoC values and approaches to estimate such, authors' own assumptions have remained the most used approach also in recent years. Meanwhile the use of other sources has changed: expert elicitation is becoming less prominent but the use of past project data and academic reference values are becoming more prominent as the data availability and the literature improve.

To improve the representation of CoC in the future, we then identify four barriers to a more accurate CoC reflection in models and suggest practical steps for overcoming them, including heuristic guidelines to support modelers determine when differentiated CoC rates ought to be applied.

[1] Climate Finance and Policy Group, ETH Zürich, E-Mail: bjarne.steffen@gess.ethz.ch

Literatur

1. Steffen B, Waidelich P. Determinants of cost of capital in the electricity sector. Prog Energy. 2022;4: 033001. doi:10.1088/2516-1083/AC7936
2. Polzin F, Sanders M, Steffen B, Egli F, Schmidt TS, Karkatsoulis P, et al. The effect of differentiating costs of capital by country and technology on the European energy transition. Clim Change. 2021;forthcom.
3. Schmidt TS, Steffen B, Egli F, Pahle M, Tietjen O, Edenhofer O. Adverse effects of rising interest rates on sustainable energy transitions. Nat Sustain. 2019;2. doi:10.1038/s41893-019-0375-2
4. Steffen B. Estimating the cost of capital for renewable energy projects. Energy Econ. 2020;88: 104783. doi:10.1016/j.eneco.2020.104783