

Impact of carbon dioxide removal technologies on deep decarbonization: EMF37 MARKAL–NETL modeling results

Nadejda Victor^{a,*}, Christopher Nichols^b

^a National Energy Technology Laboratory support contractor, 626 Cochran Mill Road, Pittsburgh, PA 15236-0940, USA

^b National Energy Technology Laboratory, 3610 Collins Ferry Road, Morgantown, WV 26507-0880, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

EMF 37
MARKAL–NETL multi-regional energy model
Deep decarbonization scenarios
Carbon dioxide removal
Bioenergy with carbon capture and storage
Direct air capture

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the MARKAL–NETL modeling results for the Energy Modeling Forum study on Deep Decarbonization and High Electrification Scenarios for North America (EMF 37) with a specific focus on carbon dioxide removal (CDR) technologies and opportunities under different scenario guidelines, policies, and technological advancements.

The results demonstrate that CDR, such as bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS), direct air capture (DAC), and afforestation, are key technologies in deep decarbonization scenarios and account for 40–60 % of avoided carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions annually. From 2025 to 2050, cumulative CO₂ abatement by CDR technologies will range from 37 to 47 billion tons (GtCO₂), or more than 2 GtCO₂ annually by 2050. The potential scale of CDR and its impact depends on the advancement and costs of energy supply and demand technologies, end-use sector electrification, and availability and costs of CDR. Results show that the price of carbon is substantially lower when advanced technologies are available, particularly in the EMF 37 carbon management scenarios [1].

While BECCS deployment is likely to be constrained for environmental and/or political reasons, the results display relatively large-scale BECCS deployment. The study found that BECCS could make a substantial contribution to emissions reductions after 2035, and, in the medium term, CO₂ sequestration by BECCS will depend on CO₂ price; BECCS deployment starts at a carbon price of around \$70/tCO₂. Long-term CO₂ sequestration by BECCS increases in all scenarios, reaching the same annual level of ~890 MtCO₂ by 2050 in net-zero CO₂ scenarios. According to the modeling results, DAC acts as a true backstop technology at carbon prices of around \$600/tCO₂.

1. Introduction

The EMF 37 study on deep decarbonization and high electrification analyzed a set of illustrative policies to reach economy-wide net-zero carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions in North America by mid-century; it achieved this through a modeling results analysis comprising 16 energy-economy models running a common set of scenarios [1]. Energy system models are diverse in their geographical landscape, modeling types and capabilities, sectoral coverage, available decarbonization technology options, and costs. An essential goal of modeling results via intercomparison with EMF 37 is to identify which insights are robust across all models and scenarios and which are sensitive to model-specific characteristics and assumptions.

The objectives of this paper are as follows: provide details on the

MARKAL–NETL energy system model for the EMF 37 study; present MARKAL–NETL modeling results and decarbonization pathways for net-zero CO₂ emissions scenarios by 2050; and evaluate the magnitude of carbon dioxide removal (CDR) technologies for deep decarbonization.

The current debate over developing CDR technologies has been prompted by the comprehensive review of climate science by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) [2]. According to current studies, CDR technologies, such as bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS) and direct air capture (DAC), are key technologies for deep decarbonization of the U.S. energy sector since some hard-to-abate CO₂ emissions from, for example, aviation and industrial processes remain a challenge and would need to be offset by CDR [3,4].

The CDR options have been investigated primarily using integrated

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: nadejda.victor@contr.netl.doe.gov (N. Victor).

assessment models and mainly at the global level [5–8]. In previous studies on CDR, DAC performs as a long-term mitigation measure, and it is mainly deployed in the distant future, and BECCS and land use, land use change, and forestry (LULUCF) are more cost-competitive [9–12]. The current literature on CDR technologies mainly addresses detailed technical and economic characteristics, factors limiting CDR deployments, and the risks associated with CDR deployed at scale. Our study addresses detailed CDR impact on long-term energy system in the U.S. and how the availability and cost of other mitigation technologies can impact CDR deployment.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides an overview of the MARKAL–NETL model; Section 3 looks at the results from six scenarios and provides insights into the similarities and differences across the scenarios; and Section 4 discusses the challenges regarding the questions raised and provides a summary and recommendations for future work.

2. Method: the MARKAL–NETL model and EMF 37 scenarios

MARKet Allocation (MARKAL) is an integrated energy systems modeling platform that analyzes energy, economic, and environmental matters to quantify the impacts of policy options on energy technology deployment and associated environmental feedback in the long term [13]. MARKAL does not contain a built-in database, so the modeler must enter input parameters, energy system technological characteristics, energy carrier types, energy service demands, etc. MARKAL–NETL is a modified version of the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) nine-region database of the U.S. energy system based on the nine U.S. census divisions (EPAUS9r) [14–16].

MARKAL–NETL is an optimized, bottom-up, linear programming energy system model that identifies the optimal fuel and technology mixes to achieve the lowest energy system cost while meeting energy service demands and constraints, which allows the U.S. energy system to be modeled for 2010–2075 in five-year increments. MARKAL–NETL computes an inter-temporal, partial equilibrium on energy markets, which means that the quantities and prices of the fuels and commodities are in equilibrium, and investments made in any given period are optimal over the time horizon as a whole. Each of the U.S. census regions in MARKAL–NETL is modeled as a distinct energy system with different regional costs, resource availability, existing capacity, and end-use demands, and regions are connected through a trade network.

MARKAL–NETL includes energy production, conversion, and final energy consumption modules. It is a demand-driven energy system model; therefore, end-use energy service demand is the same in all scenarios and consistent with the Annual Energy Outlook 2022 reference scenario [17]. In the reference scenario, the model must satisfy these energy service demands in each period by using the existing capacity or by deploying new capacity for end-use technologies. The model can also be run with some or all, demands assumed inelastic. In alternate scenarios, the prices of energy services could vary from the reference case prices; for example, a scenario causing the price of oil to rise would increase the cost of vehicle travel relative to the reference case and would also affect investment decisions. By design, the EMF 37 study focuses on the United States and includes only North America’s energy trade flow. MARKAL–NETL does not incorporate important global dimensions of the natural gas trade beyond North America and does not include the export of liquefied natural gas.

The model includes the following existing policies as environmental constraints: the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule [18]; Mercury and Air Toxics Standards regulations [19]; state-level renewable portfolio standards, aggregated and represented in MARKAL–NETL at the regional level [20]; and the Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards for light-duty vehicles included in the transportation sector [21]. The U.S. government’s Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 (IRA), designed to stimulate clean energy and carbon management, was not included in this study. The MARKAL–NETL modeling results on the impact of IRA

energy systems have been provided separately in a multi-model analysis study [22].

CDR technologies in the model are presented via BECCS, DAC, and LULUCF. The MARKAL–NETL model does not include a LULUCF submodule; LULUCF is an exogenous sink with assumptions of 728 MtCO₂ in 2010 and 772 MtCO₂ in 2050. BECCS technology is presented in the model through biomass integrated gasification combined cycle (IGCC) plants with pre-combustion CO₂ capture. There are two modes of capturing CO₂ emissions within the model: (1) post-combustion capture, applicable to both coal steam and natural gas combustion turbines, and (2) pre-combustion capture. The CO₂ capture rate is assumed to be 90 % for coal and biomass plants and 85 % for natural gas combined cycle.

Though IGCC biomass with carbon capture and storage (CCS) employs a system design similar to advanced coal IGCC technology, BECCS deployment depends highly on biomass resource availability, which varies across regions, has lower energy density than coal, and has a higher feedstock cost per unit of energy produced. Biomass resources in MARKAL–NETL are organized into three categories: woody, herbaceous, and landfill gas from municipal solid waste. They are characterized by supply chains covering biomass for use in electricity and hydrogen production, in the industrial sector, ethanol from both cellulosic feedstocks and corn feedstocks, the blending of denatured ethanol and gasoline, and biodiesel. In each census region, different biomass feedstock supplies are made available to the model, including transportation for biomass and conversion technologies. Data for biomass supply were taken from [23], which includes feedstock supply estimates organized by forest biomass and wood waste resources, agricultural biomass and waste resources, and biomass energy crops. Each of the supply curves includes several steps that present the cost and upper bound for the given feedstock. It is important to mention that efforts to expand biomass supply can increase the demand for water, land, and fertilizer or have other ecosystem impacts [24,25]. Thus, the assumptions in the model regarding the technical aspects of biomass with CCS are considered realistic, but they could be unrealistic regarding the extent of bioenergy deployment as the results of the institutional and infrastructural barriers to the use of biomass energy feedstocks [26].

The CO₂ capture approaches in DAC technologies are more expensive than capture from fossil fuel or biomass power plants because CO₂ in the air is about 300 times more diluted than that from a power plant. Two groups of DAC technologies have been identified as the most promising from technical and economic perspectives—liquid solvent DAC and solid solvent DAC—and the solid solvent DAC technologies are still at the earlier research stage. Liquid solvent DAC technology clusters that are currently available include high-temperature DAC (natural gas), high-temperature DAC (fully electric), and low-temperature DAC (electric heat pump). Only high-temperature DAC (natural gas) was included in the current version of the model as the more economically attractive option [27]. All technical parameters and costs were taken from [27], with capital cost assumptions at the high end of the range. Table 1 provides additional information for CDR technology assumptions.

BECCS and DAC technology deployments depend on the geological storage potential to safely trap CO₂. The cumulative CO₂ storage capacities in the MARKAL–NETL model are indicated by region, increase over time, and are based on U.S. Department of Energy estimations [28]. In addition, there is no carbon storage availability in New England [28]. We ran twenty EMF 37 scenarios using the MARKAL model but focused on reference scenarios and advanced scenarios to catch the impact of advanced technologies in different sectors on CDR deployment. Thus, this paper examines six of the EMF 37 scenarios, presented in Table 2.

The cap-and-trade approach¹ has been implemented for CO₂ constraints in deep decarbonization scenarios with CO₂ trade among census regions. Investment costs, operation and maintenance (O&M) costs, and

¹ The CO₂ cap-and-trade approach in MARKAL–NETL indicates national CO₂ upper limit and allows regions to sell or buy CO₂ allowances.

Table 1
Assumptions for CDR technologies.

Technology	Investment costs*		Variable O&M*		Fixed O&M*		Fuel use		Availability factor
	First year	2050	First year	2050	First year	2050	First year	2050	
BECCS	4921 2018 \$10e6/GW (\$445/tCO ₂ / year)	4921 \$10e6/ GW (\$445/tCO ₂ / year)	1.99 \$10e6/ PJ	1.99 \$10e6/ PJ	132.68 \$10e6/PJ	132.68 \$10e6/PJ	2.42 PJ/ MtCO ₂	2.42 PJ/ MtCO ₂	0.85
BECCS advanced	4921 \$10e6/GW (\$445/tCO ₂ / year)	2193 \$10e6/ GW (\$199/tCO ₂ / year)	1.99 \$10e6/ PJ	1.62 \$10e6/ PJ	132.68 \$10e6/PJ	114.51 \$10e6/PJ	2.42 PJ/ MtCO ₂	2.42 PJ/ MtCO ₂	0.85
DAC	1255 \$10e6/PJ (\$1314/tCO ₂ / year)	1255 \$10e6/PJ (\$1314/tCO ₂ / year)	1.70 \$10e6/ PJ	1.70 \$10e6/ PJ	29.70 \$10e6/ PJ	29.70 \$10e6/ PJ	5.25 PJ/ MtCO ₂	5.25 PJ/ MtCO ₂	0.95
DAC advanced	1255 \$10e6/PJ (\$1314/tCO ₂ / year)	1026 \$10e6/PJ (\$1075/tCO ₂ / year)	1.70 \$10e6/ PJ	1.70 \$10e6/ PJ	29.70 \$10e6/ PJ	29.70 \$10e6/ PJ	5.25 PJ/ MtCO ₂	5.25 PJ/ MtCO ₂	0.95

All cost data are in 2018\$USD.

Table 2
Scenarios and scenario definitions.

EMF 37 scenarios	Scenario abbreviations	Scenario definitions
Reference	Reference	No new climate policy after early 2022
Net-zero reference	Net Zero	U.S. energy system-wide net-zero CO ₂ emissions defined as a linear CO ₂ emissions reduction from 2020 to net-zero emissions by 2050; default assumptions for technology costs, complementary policies, and consumer preferences; CO ₂ trade among census regions is allowed
Net-zero scenario with advanced technologies in the building sector	Net Zero BSG+	Includes optimistic assumptions regarding the potential for electrification and decarbonization in the building sector
Net-zero scenario with advanced technologies in the industrial sector	Net Zero ISG+	Includes optimistic assumptions regarding electrification, efficiency improvement, and decarbonization in the industrial sector
Net-zero scenario with advanced technologies in the transportation sector	Net Zero TSG+	Includes optimistic assumptions regarding technology cost and availability in the transportation sector
Net-zero scenario with advanced carbon management technologies	Net Zero CMSG+	Includes optimistic assumptions regarding the technology costs of all carbon management options (CCS, hydrogen, and DAC)
Net-zero scenario with advanced technologies in all sectors and carbon management technologies	Net Zero+	Includes optimistic assumptions regarding the potential for electrification and decarbonization in the building, industrial, and transportation sectors, and a decline in the technology costs of all carbon management options

heat rate technology assumptions in reference cases are the same as those for the start year and improved only in scenarios involving advanced technologies. The next section presents results for one

reference and five net-zero scenarios.

The following assumptions should be noted: (1) EMF 37 Net-Zero scenario run under the assumption that CCS technologies are unavailable shows infeasibility; (2) EMF 37 Net-Zero scenario that uses the assumption that DAC technologies are unavailable resulted in dummy technologies² in 2055–2075 and a high CO₂ price of approximately \$9000/tCO₂ in 2050; and (3) only three models of the EMF 37 Carbon Management Study Group—FARM, GCAM, and US-REGEN—were able to run scenarios under the assumption that CCS technologies are unavailable [29]. On the one hand, this is an indication of how strict CO₂ mitigation constraints are and how little time is available to make the transition, on the other hand, this is an indication of how important CO₂ sequestration technologies are in achieving the net-zero 2050 goal.

3. Results and discussion

The U.S. energy system’s CO₂ emissions (including industrial processes) in the reference scenario are projected to moderately decrease by 8 % in 2050 from 2020 emissions (Fig. 1). MARKAL-NETL projects gross CO₂ emissions greater than 3148 MtCO₂ by 2050 in the reference scenario. In the net-zero scenarios, emissions from energy and industrial processes experience a maximum decline to around 1800 MtCO₂ by 2050 in the Net Zero+ scenario and a minimum decline to around 2600 MtCO₂ in the Net Zero CMSG+ scenario. Except for the Net Zero TSG+ and Net Zero+ scenarios, CO₂ emissions are projected to be greater than 2000 MtCO₂. Positive CO₂ emissions reductions from 2020 to 2050 range from 40 % to about 60 % in the net-zero scenarios. Residual positive emissions are offset by large-scale deployment of negative emission technologies, especially DAC and BECCS.

Fig. 2 shows residual CO₂ emissions and sectoral CO₂ emissions modeling results. There is no consistent definition of residual CO₂ emissions, but in the literature on energy systems modeling, “residual CO₂ emissions” is defined as emissions whose abatement remains uneconomical or technically infeasible under the assumptions of specific model and scenario constraints [30,31]. The transportation and building sectors show the largest variation in residual CO₂ emissions between scenarios. Residual emissions in the net-zero scenarios for the transportation sector are larger than in other sectors for all scenarios, followed by those for the industry and building sectors. Residual CO₂ emissions positively correlate with DAC in all net-zero scenarios—lower DAC is associated with lower residual CO₂ emissions.

Results of the Net Zero+ scenario show reductions in gross emissions

² Dummy technologies in MARKAL are technologies with high variable O&M costs that are used only when the model cannot meet its demand with available technologies.




Fig. 1. CO₂ emissions in 2050 for reference and net-zero scenarios; the stacked bars show 2050 reported CO₂ emissions, and the line shows gross 2020 energy and industrial process emissions from the reference scenario; industrial process emissions include only cement and limestone production emissions.




Fig. 2. Sectoral CO₂ emissions for net-zero scenarios in 2050; the left stacked-bar graph shows residual sectoral emissions in the net-zero scenarios and DAC (dots) in 2050; the right stacked-bar graph shows the difference in sectoral emissions between the reference scenario and the net-zero scenarios.

across the building, industry, and power sectors, as well as hydrogen production (with the largest reduction in the power sector) as compared to the reference scenario (the right stacked bar in Fig. 2). Other net-zero scenario results demonstrate that in net-zero scenarios without advanced end-use sector technological assumptions, the transportation and/or building sectors' CO₂ emissions are 100–400 MtCO₂ higher than in the reference scenario. Industrial sector CO₂ emissions reductions are about the same in all scenarios due to a trade-off between sectoral CO₂ reductions and the cost of clean technologies for those reductions, primarily electrification.

In the MARKAL–NETL model, clean technologies in the building sector primarily include electrification and efficiency improvements (hydrogen was not included as a technological option in the building sector). Clean technologies in transportation include electrification, efficiency improvements, biofuels, and hydrogen. The modeling results show that decarbonization of the building and transportation sectors is more flexible than in the industry sector and depends on the costs of advanced clean technology and electricity.

In the industry sector, fossil fuels are currently the main source of energy and feedstock in the United States. Fossil fuels are particularly suitable for providing the high-temperature heat required by heavy industry production processes at a relatively low cost. In the MARKAL–NETL model, advanced clean technologies in the industrial sector include CCS, electrification, and efficiency improvements; however, hydrogen technologies are not presented in the industrial sub-module. Hydrogen and biomass-based technologies can reduce industrial CO₂

emissions; however, these technologies may not be compatible with various industrial production processes or may require different infrastructure. According to the modeling results, the industrial sector decarbonization level is inflexible and roughly the same in all scenarios, and it does not rely heavily on the availability of advanced technologies. The question remains whether it is difficult to decarbonize the industrial sector or difficult to model it. On the one hand, despite the urgent need to reduce CO₂ emissions, many studies show that the decarbonization of most high-emitting industries is not aligned with the net-zero CO₂ emissions goal [32], and one of the hard-to-decarbonize industries is the steel industry (including primary iron production). On the other hand, it is challenging to model material substitution, recycling, and dematerialization in the industrial sector into the future or to model related technologies that are unknown at present.

It is important to explore the relative contribution of reductions in CO₂ emissions by different technology clusters in more detail since future energy policies should leverage the projected technologies' successes. Figs. 3–5 show technology contributions to reductions in CO₂ emissions in the net-zero scenarios compared to the reference scenario for 2025–2050. These figures do not include LULUCF, as it is an exogenous sink assumption that is identical in all scenarios.

In the short term, 36 % of avoided CO₂ emissions will be via LULUCF and 11–25 % will be via BECCS; therefore, CDR will be responsible for 50–60 % of decarbonization by 2030 in all net-zero scenarios at a CO₂ price of \$60–70/tCO₂ (Figs. 3–5). The next important decarbonization sources in the short term are fuel switching (e.g., shifts from coal to gas




Fig. 3. Contributions of CCS, BECCS, DAC, nuclear, renewables, and end-use fuels switching and efficiency improvements to CO₂ emissions reductions in the Net Zero scenario (top) and the Net Zero BSG+ scenario (bottom) in comparison to the reference scenario; lines show CO₂ emission prices in 2025–2050 (right axis values for each graph).

or from petroleum products to biofuels and electricity), efficiency gains, and CCS, and all are associated with 20–40 % CO₂ reduction. By 2030, CO₂ emissions reductions due to renewables and nuclear deployments in the power generation sector will be roughly the same in all scenarios (approximately 250 MtCO₂ and 60 MtCO₂, respectively) and correspond to a 10–18 % CO₂ reduction when combined.

In the EMF 37 study, the total use of CDR, including LULUCF, ranged from 1.2 GtCO₂ (gTech) to 3.1 GtCO₂ (FECM-15 NEMS) by 2050 [29]. According to the MARKAL-NETL model, CO₂ decarbonization through CDR will range from 1.7 GtCO₂ (Net Zero+) to 2.5 GtCO₂ (Net Zero CMSG+) by 2050. CO₂ decarbonization through CDR will range from 40 to 60 % of CO₂ emissions reductions, with unchanged shares of BECCS and LULUCF (21 % and 18 %, respectively). Decarbonization through DAC technology fluctuates from 2 to 21 % of total avoided CO₂ emissions and depends on net-zero scenario assumptions. The highest level of DAC deployment is in the Net Zero CMSG+ scenario (at a CO₂ price of \$875/tCO₂) and the lowest level is in the Net Zero+ scenario (at \$1232/tCO₂). In the scenarios with end-use sector advanced technologies, the lowest level of CO₂ decarbonization by DAC is seen in Net Zero TSG+ (5 % at a CO₂ price of \$1490/tCO₂), and the highest is seen in the Net Zero ISG+ scenario (18 % at \$1478/tCO₂).

CO₂ emissions reductions through CCS technologies have a 5–23 % range, with the lowest share in the Net Zero scenario and the highest share in the Net Zero ISG+ scenario. The contributions of fuel switching and efficiency gains in long-term decarbonization vary between 12 and 35 % of CO₂ emissions reductions, while energy from nuclear and renewable sources is about 20 % in all scenarios (excluding Net Zero ISG+, which has the highest level of CCS deployment). The average capture rate across the EMF 37 scenarios for fossil, bioenergy, and DAC is approximately 1.5 GtCO₂ in 2050—high values were roughly 2.6 GtCO₂ in 2050, and low rates were as little as about 0.4 GtCO₂ in 2050. The range of capture rate for CCS, BECS, and DAC across MARKAL-NETL scenarios is 1.3–2.6 GtCO₂ in 2050. FECM-NEMS and MARKAL-NETL had the highest cumulative capture of CO₂ among the three models. [29].

CO₂ prices in the Net-Zero scenarios are reported in the EMF 37 overview paper [1], with a range across models of approximately \$100 to \$1500/tCO₂ in 2050, and exhibited considerable variation across models, and most models were within a range of \$400 to \$800/tCO₂. Nonetheless, the marginal cost of achieving net zero in 2050 was between two and 10 times higher without CCS and/or DACCS available (when CCS was not available, CO₂ prices ranged from \$1300 to




Fig. 4. Contributions of CCS, BECCS, DAC, nuclear, renewables, and end-use fuels switching and efficiency improvements to CO₂ emissions reductions in the Net Zero TSG+ scenario (bottom) and the Net Zero ISG+ scenario (top) in comparison to the reference scenario; lines show the CO₂ emissions price in 2025–2050 (right axis values for each graph).

\$2100/tCO₂) [29]. Figs. 3–5 show high CO₂ prices after 2035 (up to \$1500/tCO₂). MARKAL-NETL has significantly higher carbon prices across all scenarios than the other models [29]; however, according to IPCC, CO₂ worldwide marginal abatement costs ranging from \$245/tCO₂ to \$13,000/tCO₂ would be needed to stabilize emissions below the 1.5 °C limit by 2050, which is between three to four times higher than for a 2 °C limit [33].

In the short term, by 2035, the total cumulative CO₂ abatement range is 29–32 GtCO₂ with a CDR share of 55–57 % (Table 3). Beyond CDR, fuels switching and efficiency improvements (12–30 %) and CCS (12–16 %) play a significant role in total cumulative CO₂ abatement by 2035. The highest total cumulative CO₂ abatement (33 GtCO₂) is in Net Zero+ in comparison to 29 GtCO₂ in all other scenarios, which is mainly due to the higher level of CO₂ emissions through fuel switching and efficiency improvements (9.7 GtCO₂ in 2035).

By 2050, the cumulative CO₂ abatement range is 80–90 GtCO₂ with a CDR share of 41–59 %. Fuels switching and efficiency improvements (12–30 % of total cumulative CO₂ abatement) and CCS (10–20 % of total cumulative CO₂ abatement) are more important than abatement from nuclear and renewables combined. The highest total cumulative CO₂

abatement (90 GtCO₂) is in Net Zero+ in comparison to 80 GtCO₂ in all other scenarios.

Cumulative captured CO₂ emissions through 2050 across models and scenarios ranged up to 42 GtCO₂ [29]. According to our results, cumulative captured CO₂ emissions of 27–41 GtCO₂ do not challenge existing storage resources, though matching capture sites and storage sites could be challenging, and more work to explore the implications of better representations of CO₂ storage capacity and reservoir fill rates at the sub-regional levels is needed.

4. Conclusion

U.S. mitigation of energy system pathways to reach net-zero CO₂ emissions by 2050 will include demand-side measures and improvements in efficiency and a transition to fossil fuels with CCS, BECCS, renewables and nuclear, and, in the long term, to DAC. The results show that in the MARKAL-NETL model, CDR technologies could substantially contribute to emission reductions in 2030–2050 under climate stabilization goals.

The combination of bioenergy and carbon dioxide sequestration




Fig. 5. Contributions of CCS, BECCS, DAC, nuclear, renewables, and end-use fuels switching and efficiency improvements to CO₂ emissions reductions in the Net Zero MSG+ scenario (top) and Net Zero+ scenario (bottom) in comparison to the reference scenario; lines show the CO₂ emissions price in 2025–2050 (right axis values for each graph).

Table 3
Cumulative CO₂ abatement in 2025–2050 by technology group in 2035 and 2050 in GtCO₂.

Technology group	Net zero		Net zero BSG+		Net zero ISG+		Net zero TSG+		Net zero MSG+		Net zero+	
	2035	2050	2035	2050	2035	2050	2035	2050	2035	2050	2035	2050
LULUCF	9.76	19.70	9.76	19.70	9.76	19.70	9.76	19.70	9.76	19.70	9.76	19.70
BECCS	6.71	18.21	5.96	17.46	6.93	18.43	6.23	17.73	7.00	18.50	5.45	16.95
DAC	0.00	7.03	0.00	3.96	0.00	7.50	0.00	1.81	0.00	8.85	0.00	0.53
CDR total	16.47	44.95	15.71	41.12	16.68	45.63	15.98	39.24	16.76	47.06	15.21	37.19
CCS	4.2	8.0	4.7	13.1	4.1	15.3	3.8	11.6	4.0	10.5	4.0	9.3
Nuclear	0.7	2.9	0.7	2.6	0.8	1.9	0.9	2.9	0.8	3.1	0.8	3.2
Renewables	2.7	9.5	3.2	8.7	3.3	6.9	3.3	9.1	3.7	10.1	3.1	10.0
Fuels switching and efficiency improvements	4.6	14.66	4.43	14.57	3.75	10.20	4.75	17.1	3.4	9.3	9.7	30.1
Total	28.65	79.96	28.72	80.03	28.66	79.97	28.71	80.02	28.69	80.00	32.82	89.87

creates an opportunity for net negative CO₂ emissions, and the most common pathway in the Net Zero scenario is BECCS [29]. Sequestration using BECCS varies widely across EMF 37 models (up to 1 GtCO₂ in 2050), and in MARKAL-NETL modeling results it is 0.9 GtCO₂ in all Net Zero scenarios by 2050. After 2035, DAC acts as a true backstop technology for the majority of deep decarbonization scenarios since (1) decarbonization rates through other CDR technologies have limits in the

long term (i.e., BECCS has resource constraints and LULUCF is limited and exogenous); (2) energy service demand is exogenous in the MARKAL-NETL model (i.e., unchanged in all scenarios), and DAC does not produce energy but consumes it; and (3) the capital cost of DAC technology is assumed at a relatively high level at \$1,255 10e6/PJ (\$1314/tCO₂). In comparison, BECCS has a capital cost of \$4921/kW (\$445/tCO₂), and while available by 2030 in the model, DAC

deployments start at the earliest by 2040.

In the EMF 37 study, some models rely on DAC for sequestration (up to 2.2 GtCO₂), and others use a combination of BECCS and DAC, and the marginal cost associated with net-zero CO₂ emissions exhibited considerable variation across models [29]. However, the literature shows low agreement in DAC cost estimates, and, according to the results of this study, a lower DAC capital cost increases its deployment and, for the most part, decreases investments in fuel-switching and efficiency improvements. A scenario with DAC as the only available CDR option was not run, but a net-zero scenario run without DAC resulted in dummy technologies in 2055–2075 and a CO₂ price of approximately \$9000/tCO₂ in 2050. Still, it is crucial that policies consider DAC as a complement to drastic CO₂ emission reductions while establishing supporting policies for clean technology deployment in energy end-use sectors.

Several caveats regarding this model and the results should be mentioned. The scenario projections are not predictions but only possible future pathways based on specific modeling assumptions. An assumption on terrestrial carbon sink of up to 800 MtCO₂ is highly uncertain [34]. Furthermore, behavioral changes are not captured in the model, and exploring the impact of those changes on the results could be an avenue for future work. An analysis of the cost of various DAC technologies and multiple sources of energy usage by DAC would be a fruitful area for future analysis. Also, water constraints were not included in this analysis, but the dependence of the U.S. energy sector on water and its scarcity or abundance will affect modeling results on the construction of new power plants and DAC in different regions. For example, efforts to expand biomass supply can increase the demand for water, land, and fertilizer, or have other ecosystem impacts. Thus, the assumptions regarding the technical aspects of biomass with CCS are considered to be realistic but could be unrealistic regarding the extent of bioenergy deployment. The spatial distribution of CDR technologies deployment that depends on considerable regional variation, such as biomass availability and suitable geologic CO₂ storage sites, was not presented in this study and is an area of forthcoming analysis.

5. Disclaimer

This project was funded by the United States Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory, in part, through a site support contract. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, nor the support contractor, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Nadejda Victor: Writing – original draft, Visualization, Methodology, Investigation, Funding acquisition, Formal analysis, Data curation, Conceptualization. **Christopher Nichols:** Writing – review & editing, Supervision, Resources, Project administration, Funding acquisition.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

References

- [1] M. Browning, J. McFarland, J. Bistline, G. Boyd, M. Muratori, M. Binsted, C. Harris, T. Mai, G. Blanford, J. Edmonds, A. Fawcett, O. Kaplan, J. Weyant, Net-zero CO₂ by 2050 scenarios for the United States in the Energy Modeling Forum 37 study, *Energy Clim. Change* 4 (100104) (2023), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egycc.2023.100104>. ArtDec.
- [2] International Panel on Climate Change, Sixth Assessment Report (AR6), IPCC (2023) [Online]. Available, <https://www.ipcc.ch/assessment-report/ar6>.
- [3] S. Griffiths, B.K. Sovacool, J. Kim, M. Bazilian, J.M. Uratani, Industrial decarbonization via hydrogen: a critical and systematic review of developments, socio-technical systems and policy options, *Energy Res. Social Sci.* 80 (102208) (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2021.102208>. ArtOct.
- [4] R.W. Wimbadi, R. Djalante, From decarbonization to low carbon development and transition: a systematic literature review of the conceptualization of moving toward net-zero carbon dioxide emission (1995–2019), *J. Clean. Prod.* 256 (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.120307>. Art. no. 12030720 May.
- [5] G. Realmonte, et al., An inter-model assessment of the role of direct air capture in deep mitigation pathways, *Nat. Commun.* 10 (2019) 3277, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-10842-5>.
- [6] International Panel on Climate Change, “Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C”, IPCC (2018).
- [7] D. van Vuuren, et al., Alternative pathways to the 1.5 °C target reduce the need for negative emission technologies, *Nat. Clim. Change* 8 (2018) 391–397, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0119-8>.
- [8] D. Van Vuuren, et al., The role of negative CO₂ emissions for reaching 2°C—Insights from integrated assessment modelling, *Clim. Change* 118 (2013) 15–27, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-012-0680-5>.
- [9] C. Chen, & M. Tavoni, Direct air capture of CO₂ and climate stabilization: a model based assessment, *Clim. Change* 118 (2013) 59–72, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-013-0714-7>.
- [10] A. Marcucci, S. Kypreos, E. Panos, The road to achieving the long-term Paris targets: energy transition and the role of direct air capture, *Clim. Change* 144 (2017) 181–193, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-017-2051-8>.
- [11] J. Strefler, et al., Between scylla and charybdis: delayed mitigation narrows the passage between large-scale CDR and high costs, *Environ. Res. Lett.* 13 (2018) 4, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aab2ba>.
- [12] S. Fuss, W. Reuter, J. Szolgayová, M. Obersteiner, Optimal mitigation strategies with negative emission technologies and carbon sinks under uncertainty, *Clim. Change* 118 (2013) 73–87, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-012-0676-1>.
- [13] R. Loulou, G. Goldstein, K. Nobel, Documentation for the MARKAL family of models. Energy Technology Systems Analysis Programme, IEA, Paris, 2004. Oct. [Online]. Available, https://unfccc.int/resource/ed_roms/na1/mitigation/Module_5/Module_5_1/b_tools/MARKAL/MARKAL_Manual.pdf.
- [14] C. Lenox, R. Dodder, C. Gage, O. Kaplan, D. Loughlin, W. Yelverton, EPA U.S. Nine-Region MARKAL Database, Database Documentation, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Cincinnati, OH, U.S.A., 2013. EPA/600/B-13/203[Online]. Available, https://cfpub.epa.gov/si/si_public_record_report.cfm?dirEntryId=278925.
- [15] D.H. Loughlin, W.G. Benjey, C.G. Nolte, ESP v1.0: methodology for exploring emission impacts of future scenarios in the United States, *Geosci. Model Dev.* 4 (2011) 287–297, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-4-287-2011>.
- [16] S. Babae, D.H. Loughlin, Exploring the role of natural gas power plants with carbon capture and storage as a bridge to a low-carbon future, *Clean Techn. Environ. Policy* 20 (2018) 379–391, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10098-017-1479-x>.
- [17] Annual Energy Outlook 2023, U.S. Energy Information Administration, AEO2023, Nov. 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/aeo/data/browser/>.
- [18] Environmental Protection Agency, *Federal Implementation Plans: Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone and Correction of SIP Approvals*; Final rule, 76, 2011, 8 Aug. [Online]. Available, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2011-08-08/pdf/2011-17600.pdf>.
- [19] Environmental Protection Agency, National Emission Standards for hazardous air pollutants from coal- and oil-fired electric utility steam generating units and standards of performance for fossil-fuel-fired electric utility, industrial-commercial-institutional, and small industrial-commercial-institutional steam generating units, Final Rule 77 (32) (2012), 16 Feb. [Online]. Available, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2012-02-16/pdf/2012-806.pdf>.
- [20] NC Clean Energy. “Database of state incentives for renewables and efficiency.” dsireusa.org. [Online]. Available: <http://www.dsireusa.org>.
- [21] Environmental Protection Agency, *2017 and Later Model Year Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards*; Final rule, 77, 2012, 15 Oct. [Online]. Available, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2012-10-15/pdf/2012-21972.pdf>.
- [22] J. Bistline, et al., Emissions and energy impacts of the Inflation Reduction Act, *Science* 380 (6652) (2023) 1324–1327, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adg3781>, 29 Jun.
- [23] U.S. Department of Energy, 2011. U.S. Billion-Ton Update: Biomass Supply For a Bioenergy and Bioproducts Industry. R.D. Perlack and B.J. Stokes (Leads), ORNL/TM-2011/224. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN. [Online] Available: <https://www.energy.gov/eere/bioenergy/articles/us-billion-ton-update-biomass-supply-bioenergy-and-bioproducts-industry>.
- [24] B. Solomon, Biofuels and sustainability, *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* 1185 (1) (2010) 119–134, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.05279.x>, 29 Jan.

- [25] T. Abbasi, S.A. Abbasi, Biomass energy and the environmental impacts associated with its production and utilization, *Renew. Sust. Energy Rev.* 14 (3) (2010) 919–937, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2009.11.006>. Apr.
- [26] J. Cook, J. Beyea, Bioenergy in the United States: progress and possibilities, *Biomass Bioenergy* 18 (6) (2000) 441–455, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0961-9534\(00\)00011-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0961-9534(00)00011-8).
- [27] The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, *Negative Emissions Technologies and Reliable Sequestration: A Research Agenda*, The National Academies Press, Washington, DC, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.17226/25259>.
- [28] K. Gray, *Carbon Sequestration Atlas of the United States and Canada (Third Edition)*, U.S. DOE Office of Fossil Energy, 2010, <https://doi.org/10.2172/1814019>. Rep. DOE-SSEB-42590-120.
- [29] M. Binsted, Carbon management technology pathways for reaching a U.S. economy-wide net-zero emissions goal, *Energy Clim. Change* (2024) (in press).
- [30] G. Luderer, et al., Residual fossil CO₂ emissions in 1.5–2°C pathways, *Nat. Clim. Change* 8 (2018) 626–633, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0198-6>.
- [31] H.J. Buck, W. Carton, J.F. Lund, N. Markusson, Why residual emissions matter right now, *Nat. Clim. Change* 13 (2023) 351–358, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-022-01592-2>.
- [32] S. Dietz et al., “TPI State of Transition Report 2020,” The Transition Pathway Initiative, London, U.K., March 2020. [Online]. Available: https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5e26ce0b8524a16d5bee0a53/t/5e82fc07e2b00968fafa1590/1585642514271/TPI+State+of+Transition+Report+_2020.pdf.
- [33] International Panel on Climate Change, “Global Warming of 1.5°C,” IPCC, SR15, Ch 4 (2018) [Online]. Available, <https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/>.
- [34] D. Huntzinger, et al., Uncertainty in the response of terrestrial carbon sink to environmental drivers undermines carbon-climate feedback predictions, *Sci. Rep.* 7 (2017) 4765, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-03818-2>.