

A Critical Look at Geothermal, Solar, and Wind Power Generations

Kewen Li

China University of Geosciences, Beijing/Stanford University
Stanford Geothermal Program, Stanford CA, USA
kewenli@stanford.edu

ABSTRACT

Geothermal, solar and wind are all clean, renewable energies with a huge amount of resources and a great potential of electricity generation. The unfortunate fact is that the total capacity installed of geothermal electricity is left behind solar and wind. In this paper, attempt has been made to find the essential reasons to cause the above problem and to look for the solutions. Cost, payback time, size of power generation, construction time, resource capacity, characteristics of resource, and other factors were used to compare geothermal, solar, and wind power generation systems. Furthermore, historical data from geothermal, solar, and wind industries were collected and analyzed. Suggestions have been proposed for geothermal industry to catch up solar and wind industries.

Introduction

Renewable energy sources have grown to supply an estimated 16.7% of the total global energy consumption in 2010. Of this total, modern renewable energy (wind, solar, geothermal, etc.) accounted for an estimated 8.2%, a share that has increased in recent years (Renewables 2012: Global Status Report).

It is known that geothermal energy has many advantages compared with solar and wind systems. These advantages include weather proof, base load, great stability, and high thermal efficiency. The total installed capacity of geothermal electricity, however, is much less than solar and wind. The power of the total solar PVs manufactured by China in the last five years were equal to the total geothermal power installed in the entire world in the last one hundred years.

As summarized in Renewables 2012: Global Status Report, renewables accounted for almost half of the estimated 208 gigawatts (GW) of electric capacity added globally during 2011. Wind and solar photovoltaics (PV) accounted for almost 40% and 30% of new renewable capacity, respectively, followed by hydro-power (nearly 25%). By the end of 2011, total renewable power capacity

worldwide exceeded 1,360 GW, up 8% over 2010; renewables comprised more than 25% of total global power-generating capacity (estimated at 5,360 GW in 2011) and supplied an estimated 20.3% of global electricity. Non-hydropower renewables exceeded 390 GW, a 24% capacity increase over 2010. Unfortunately, the contribution of geothermal power is very small.

Not only do future energy technologies need to be clean and renewable, but they also need to be robust, especially in some developing countries such as China. Recently the heavy fog enveloped a large swathe of East and Central China was an example. There was neither sunshine (no solar energy) nor wind (no wind turbine rotating). Beijing was hit 4 times by heavy haze and fog within one month in January 2013. Hundreds of flights were cancelled and highways were closed. Beijing meteorological observatory issued a yellow alert (the highest level alert) for heavy fog on January 22, 2013.

In this study, cost, payback time, capacity factor, size of power generation, construction time, resource capacity, characteristics of resource, social impact, and other factors were compared for geothermal, solar, and wind power generation systems. Historical data from geothermal, solar, and wind industries were collected and analyzed. Possible directions have been proposed to speed up geothermal power growth. Note that only geothermal electricity generation was considered and direct use of geothermal energy was not included in this paper.

Comparison of Resources, Installed Power, and Capacity Increase

The resources, installed capacity, and its increase in the last three years for PV, wind, hydro and geothermal energies are listed in Table 1. Note that the resources of the four energy types from different references are very different. According to GEA, the total geothermal power installed in world was about 11.2 GW until May 2012 (also see Clean Energy, v.6, p. 72, 2013). According to WEA (2000), geothermal has the largest resources among the four types of renewable energies.




Figure 4. Resources, installed capacity and the increase in the last three years.

power plants. The geothermal resource worldwide was about 67 TW (Stefansson, 2005).

The comparison of resources, installed capacity and the increase of power in the last three year is plotted in Figure 4.

The change of the installed global power capacity with time for geothermal, PV, and wind is shown in Figure 5. One can see that PV's power change rate was the maximum, followed by wind power. The above trend can also be seen in Figure 6, which demonstrates the average annual growth rates of renewable energy capacity during the period of 2006–2011.




Figure 5. Comparison of installed global capacity for individual energy types.




Figure 6. Average annual growth rates of renewable energy capacity, 2006–2011 (REN 21, 2012).

Note that the average annual growth rate of geothermal power was about 2% while that of PV was about 58% during the same period and up to 74% in 2011 only.



Comparison of Cost, Efficiency, and Environmental Impacts

The cost, payback time, and construction time for different energy types are listed in Table 2. The data are also plotted in Figure 7.

The cost of geothermal energy is very close to wind energy but much less than PV. Compared with wind and PV, the main disadvantages of geothermal energy may be the long payback time and the construction period (Tc).

Table 2. Comparison of cost, payback time, and construction period (Kenny, et al, 2010).

	Cost (US/kWh)	Payback (year)	Construction (year)
PV	\$0.24	1-2.7	0.3-0.5
Wind	\$0.07	0.4-1.4	<1
Hydro	\$0.05	11.8(small) 0.5 (large)	1 10-20
Geoth	\$0.07	5.7	3-5
Coal	\$0.04	3.18	1-3
Gas	\$0.05	7	2-3







Figure 7. Comparison of cost, initial investment, payback time, and construction period.

In addition to cost, parameters like capacity factor (CF), efficiency, and environmental impacts for individual energy generation technology are also important factors that affect the growth. These parameters are listed in Table 3 and plotted in Figure 8.




Figure 8. Capacity factor, efficiency, and environmental impacts.

Table 3. Capacity factor, efficiency, and environmental impacts (Evan, 2009).

	CF(%)	Efficiency(%)	CO ₂ ^①	Water ^②	Land ^③
PV	8-20	4-22	90	10	28-64
Wind	20-30	24-54	25	1	72
Hydro	20-70	>90	41	36	750
Geoth	90+	10-20	170	12-300	18-74
Coal		32-45	1004	78	
Gas		45-53	543	78	

①Average greenhouse gas emissions expressed as CO₂ equivalent for individual energy generation technologies: CO₂ equivalent g/kWh
 ②Water consumption in kg/kWh of electricity generation
 ③Units: km²/TWh




Figure 9. Comparison of generated energy for individual energy type.

Geothermal power has the highest capacity factor, over 90% in many cases, as listed in Table 3. The average value of the capacity factor of PV is about 14% and that of wind is around 25%. Considering this, the energy generated per year may be



Figure 10. Solar footprints.
(cncmrn.com/channels/energy/20100929/365527.html)



Figure 11. Wind footprints (afdاتا.cn/html/hygz/nyky/20090730/8420.html; ewindpower.cn/news/show-htm-itemid-2482.html).



Figure 12. Geothermal footprints.
(hb114.cc/news/hydt/20090807103400.htm).

more important than the power installed. The amount of energy generated per year was calculated using the power installed listed in Table 1 and the capacity factor from Table 3 and the results are plotted in Figure 9. The energy generated by geothermal was more or close to PV after considering the capacity factor.

One can see from Table 3 that the renewable energies all have the problem of significant footprint (Figures 10-12), occupying a large amount of land.

Geothermal power has the largest consumption of water because of the need of cooling. However the water consumption by geothermal power could be reduced remarkably by using new cooling technologies.

Comparison of Social Impacts and Government Barriers

Social impact of renewable energies is also an important factor to affect the growth rate, even the existence in some areas or communities. Table 4 lists the social impacts (Evans, et al, 2009) and the government barriers (mostly the infrastructure system). Relatively, PV and wind have minor social impacts. The main social impact of geothermal may be seismic events, which could be very serious in some cases (Majer, et al, 2008). Except hydro-power, the other renewable energies may all face the problem of integrating and improving the grid and other infrastructure systems.

Table 4. Qualitative social impact assessment.

Energy	Impact	Gov. Barriers
PV	Toxins: Minor-major Visual: Minor	Infrastructure (grid) need to be improved
Wind	Bird strike: Minor Noise: Minor Visual: Minor	Infrastructure (grid) need to be improved
Hydro	Displacement: Minor-major Agricultural: Minor-major River Damage: Minor-major	No barriers and grid problem
Geothermal	Seismic: Minor-major Odour: Minor Pollution: Minor-major Noise: Minor	Infrastructure (grid) depends on location

Unit Power Size and Modularization

Do the size of a power unit and the ability of modularization affect the growth of a renewable energy? It is difficult to answer for the power unit size but the answer to the effect of modularization is yes. The possible, commercially available minimum unit power size, the ability of modularization, and the scalability of the individual renewable energy are listed in Table 5. Also demonstrated in Table 5 is the difficulty to assess the resources of renewable energies. It is known that PV power is highly modularized, followed by wind power. PV also has the smallest commercially available minimum power units. Note that PV power had an annual growth rate of 74% in 2011 only (REN21, 2012). On the other hand, geothermal has the largest commercially available minimum power units. Geothermal power had a less than 1% growth rate in 2011, only 2% in a five-year period from end-2006 to 2011 (REN21,

2012). It is difficult for geothermal power to be modularized. The fact is that almost each geothermal power plant is different.

Having reliable resources definitions and assessment are equally important for the geothermal energy sector as it is for the oil and gas industry (Bertani, 2005). However, it is extremely difficult to assess the resource accurately and reliably if comparing with solar and wind energies.

Table 5. Unit size and the ability of modularization of renewable energies.

	Unit size	Modularization	Scalability	Assessment
PV	1 W	High	High	Easy
Wind	1 KW	High	High	Easy
Hydro	1 KW	Middle	High	Easy-difficult
Geothermal	>70 KW	Low	High	difficult

According to the above data and analysis, the advantages and disadvantages of individual renewable energy are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6. Advantages and disadvantages of individual energies.

Tech.	Advantages	Disadvantages
PV	Easy to assess resource Easy to modularize Easy to install Low social impact Easy to scale up Short construction period	Low efficiency High cost Low capacity factor Not weather proof High land use
Wind	Low cost Easy to assess resource Easy to modularize Easy to install Low-medium social impact Easy to scale up Short construction period	Low capacity factor Not weather proof High land use
Hydro	High efficiency Low cost High capacity factor	High initial investment Long construction time Long payback time
Geothermal	Medium-high efficiency High capacity factor Low to medium cost Weather proof	High initial investment Long payback time Long construction time Tough to assess resource Tough to modularize

One can see that geothermal energy has many serious disadvantages in terms of current commercially available technologies although it has a lot of advantages.

The main disadvantage of PV and wind may be the capacity factor affected by weather, which causes serious stability problem and high risk to the electricity grid. As reported by Beckwith (2012): sometimes the wind will go from several thousand megawatts to zero in less than a minute. And gas plants cannot come on within a minute. Solar power plants may have similar problems. Geothermal power, on the other hand, is very stable.

Evans, et al. (2009) ranked the renewable energies in terms of sustainability (see Table 7) using data collected from extensive range of literature. The ranking revealed that wind power is the most sustainable, followed by hydropower, PV and then geothermal.

Table 7. Sustainability rankings (Evans, et al, 2009).

	PV	Wind	Hydro	Geothermal
Price	4	3	1	2
CO ₂ -equivalent	3	1	2	4
Availability	4	2	1	3
Efficiency	4	2	1	3
Land use	1	3	4	2
Water consumption	2	1	3	4
Social impacts	2	1	4	3
Total	20	13	16	21

Jacobson (2009) also ranked the renewable energies in terms of cleanness (see Table 8). Wind was also ranked No. 1 and geothermal was ranked No.3 in all of the 7 different types of renewable energies.

Table 8. Rankings of renewable energies (Jacobson, 2009; Evans, et al, 2009).

Ranking	By cleanness	By Sustainability
1	Wind	Wind
2	CSP	Hydro
3	Geothermal	PV
4	Tidal	Geothermal
5	PV	
6	Wave	
7	Hydro	

Jacobson (2009) pointed out: the use of wind, CSP, geothermal, tidal, PV, wave, and hydro to provide electricity will result in the greatest reductions in global warming and air pollution and provide the least damage among the energy options considered.

Solutions to Speed Up Geothermal Power Growth

It is obvious that geothermal power has been lagged behind wind and solar in terms of both growth rate and installed capacity. As stated previously, geothermal power growth has only a few percent per year. The increase is more or less linear while wind and solar PV power exhibit fast-tracking growth with a clearly exponential tendency.

How do we speed up the growth of geothermal power? Many researchers have tried to answer this question. However there are no easy answers and solutions. Considering the present status and the literature review, some of the solutions and directions are suggested:

- New technology
- Co-produced geothermal power from oil and gas fields
- EGS

Discussion on the above possible ways and approaches to speed up geothermal power growth is addressed as follows.

New Technology

There have been many great technologies in the area of geothermal power generation. New technologies, however, are

definitely required to speed up the growth of geothermal power. Why? It is because it has been tested and shown that current commercially available geothermal technologies can only yield a linear, instead of an exponential, and a very slow growth rate in the last four decades or so.

One of the new technologies that may make breakthrough is the technology to directly transfer heat to electricity, without going through mechanical function. Such a technology exists and has been utilized for a while in making use of waste heat. The core part of this technology is the thermoelectric generator or TEG (Thacher, 2007). TEG has almost all of the advantages of PVs. Plus, the lower limit temperature for generating electricity using TEG may be 30°C. With this advantage, much more geothermal resources might be used and much more power might be generated using TEG technology. Li, et al. (2013) has conducted some preliminary study on TEG.

Co-Produced Geothermal Power from Oil and Gas Fields

There is a huge amount of geothermal resource associated with oil and gas reservoirs for power generation and other purpose (Li, et al, 2007; Erdlac et al, 2007; Johnson and Walker, 2010; Li, et al, 2012; Xin, et al, 2012). There are 164,076 oil and gas wells (2005 data) in China. 76,881 wells have been abandoned, about 32% of the total. These abandoned wells may be served as geothermal wells. The potential geothermal resource in the reservoirs holding these oil and gas wells is huge.

Erdlac, et al. (2007) reported that Texas has thousands of oil and gas wells that are sufficiently deep to reach temperatures of over 121°C and sometimes 204°C. In total there are 823,000 oil and gas wells in the United States. The possible electricity generation from the hot water, estimated by Erdlac, was about 47-75 billion MWh (equivalent to about 29-46 billion bbls of oil).

The main advantage of the co-produced geothermal power is the lower cost than that of EGS because the infrastructure, including wells, pipes, roads, and even grid, is already there.

EGS

One of the hot spots in geothermal industry in recent years was EGS since the publication of MIT report (Tester, et al, 2006). Many papers have been published in the area of EGS. It is known that EGS has a huge amount of resource. The EGS geothermal resource at a depth from 3.0 to 10.0 km in USA is equivalent to 2800 times of USA's 2005 annual total energy consumption if only 2% of the EGS resource can be recovered (Tester, et al, 2006). In China, 2% of the EGS resource at a depth of 3.0-10.0 km is about 5300 times of China's 2010 annual total energy consumption (Wang, et al, 2013). According to the above data, EGS has a great theoretical potential to speed up geothermal power growth. Unfortunately, it is obvious that EGS is presently still at the "proof of concept" stage, as pointed out by Rybach (2010).

Conclusions

According to the above review and analysis, the following preliminary remarks may be drawn:

1. Geothermal power has been left behind wind and solar in terms of both growth rate and installed capacity. The main reasons may be high initial investment, long payback time and construction time, difficulty to assess resource and difficulty to modularize.
2. Some of the solutions and directions to speed up geothermal growth may be: development and utilization of new technologies such as TEG, co-produced geothermal power from oil/gas fields, and EGS. Currently EGS is still at the stage of "proof of concept".
3. Geothermal power has the potential to grow exponentially in the future.

References

- Bertani, R. World geothermal power generation in the period 2001–2005. *Geothermics*, Volume 34, 2005; 651-690.
- Beckwith, R. Switch. *The New Documentary on Energy's Future*. JPT; 2012, 52 .
- Chamorro, C. R, Mondéjar, M. E, Ramos, R, Segovia, J. J, Martín, M. C. and Villamañán, M. A. World geothermal power production status: Energy, environmental and economic study of high enthalpy technologies. *Energy*, V. 42; 2012, 10-18.
- Erdlac, Jr, R.J, Armour, L, Lee, R, Snyder, S, Sorensen, M, Matteucci, M, and Horton, J. *Ongoing Resource Assessment of Geothermal Energy from Sedimentary Basins in Texas*. Proceedings of 32nd Workshop on Geothermal Reservoir Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, California; 2007 , 22-24.
- Evans, A, Strezov, V. and Evans, T.J. Assessment of sustainability indicators for renewable energy technologies. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, V. 13; 2009, 1082–1088.
- Hong, W. *The Rapid Increase of the World Solar Power*. *Guangzhou Environmental Sciences*, Volume 1; 1999, 16.
- Jacobson, M. *A Plan for a Sustainable Future. Using Economics to Confront Climate Change*, SIEPR Policy Forum Stanford University, 2009.
- Johnson, L. A. and Walker, E. D. Oil Production Waste Stream, A Source of Electrical Power. Proceedings of 35th Workshop on Geothermal Reservoir Engineering Stanford University, Stanford, California; 2010 , 1-3. [9] Kenny, R, Law, C. and Pearce, J. M. Towards real energy economics: Energy policy driven by life-cycle carbon emission. *Energy Policy*, Volume 38; 2010, 1969-1978.
- Li, K, Zhang, L, Ma, Q, Liu, M, Ma, J, and Dong, F. Low Temperature Geothermal Resources at Huabei Oilfield, China. *GRC Trans*. V; 2007, 31 .
- Li, K, Wang, L, Mao, X, Liu, C. and Lu, J. Evaluation and Efficient Development of Geothermal Resource Associated with Oilfield. *Science & Technology Review*, Volume 32; 2012, 32-41.
- Li, K, Liu, C, and Chen, P. Direct Power Generation from Heat without Mechanical Function. Proceedings, 38th Workshop on Geothermal Reservoir Engineering Stanford University, Stanford, California; 2013, 11-13.
- Li, M. and Wang, L. The Development and Utilization Trend of the Solar Energy Technology. *Energy Base Construction*, Volume 6; 2000, 12-14.
- Lucky, M. *Global Hydropower Installed Capacity and Use Increase*. *Vital Signs Online*; 2012.
- Majer, E, Baria, R. and Stark, M. Protocol for induced seismicity associated with enhanced geothermal systems. Report produced in Task D Annex I , International Energy Agency-Geothermal Implementing Agreement; 2008.
- Renewables 2012. *Global Status Report, REN21 (Renewable Energy Policy Network for the 21st Century)*. Available at: www.ren21.net.

- Rybach, L. Status and prospects of geothermal energy. Proceedings of World Geothermal Congress, 2010.
- Stefansson, V. World Geothermal Assessment. presented at the Proceedings World Geothermal Congress 2005, 24-29.
- Tester, J.W. et al. The Future of Geothermal Energy – Impact of Enhanced Geothermal Systems (EGS) on the United States in the 21st Century, MIT-Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, 2006.
- Thacher, E, Helenbrook, B, Karri, M. and Richter, C. J. Testing of an automobile exhaust thermoelectric generator in a light truck. Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part D: Journal of Automobile Engineering, Vol. 221 ; 2007, 95-107.
- Wang, G, Li, K, Wen, D, Lin, W, Lin, L, Liu, Z, Zhang, W, Ma, F. and Wang, W. Assessment of Geothermal Resources in China. Proceedings, 38th Workshop on Geothermal Reservoir Engineering Stanford University, Stanford, California, 2013;11-13.
- WEA : World Energy Assessment Report: Energy and the Challenge of Sustainability. 2000; 500 .
- Xin, S, Liang, H, Hu, B, and Li, K. A 400 kW Geothermal Power Generator Using Co-Produced Fluids from Huabei Oilfield. GRC Trans. V.2012; 36.
- IEA. International energy annual 2004. Energy Information Administration; 2006.
- IEA. World energy outlook 2004. International Energy Agency; 2004.
- Bilek M, Lenzen M, Hardy C, Dey C. Life-cycle energy and greenhouse gas-emissions of nuclear power in Australia. The University of Sydney; 2006.
- Hondo H. Life cycle GHG emission analysis of power generation systems: Japanese case. Energy 2005;30:2042–56.
- Kato K, Murata A, Sakuta K. Energy pay-back time and life-cycle CO2 emission of residential PV power system with silicon PV module. Progr Photovoltaics 1998;6:105–15.
- Kammen DM, Pacca S. Assessing the costs of electricity. Annu Rev Environ Resour 2004;29:301–44.
- Phylipsen GJM, Alsema EA. Environmental life-cycle assessment of multi-crystalline silicon solar cell modules. Department of Science, Technology and Society Utrecht University; 1995.
- Vestas Wind Systems, A.S. Life cycle assessment of offshore and onshore sited wind power plants based on Vestas V90-3.0MW turbines; 2006.
- Schleisner L. Life cycle assessment of a wind farm and related externalities. Renew Energy 2000;20:279–88.
- Stewart GB, Pullin AS, Coles CF. Poor evidence-base for assessment of windfarm impacts on birds. Environ Conserv 2007;34:1–11.
- Clapp RW. Nuclear power and public health. Environ Health Perspect 2005;113:A720–1.
- Brown VJ. Childhood leukemia in Germany: cluster identified near nuclear power plant (science selections). Environ Health Perspect 2007;115:A313.
- Brown MT, Ulgiati S. Energy evaluations and environmental loading of electricity production systems. J Clean Product 2002;10:321–34.
- Bergerson J, Lave L. A life cycle analysis of electricity generation technologies. Carnegie Mellon Electricity Industry Center; 2002.
- Gagnon L, Belanger C, Uchiyama Y. Life-cycle assessment of electricity generation options: the status of research in year 2001. Energy Policy 2002;30:1267–78.
- Chapman C, Ward S. Valuing the exibility of alternative sources of power generation. Energy Policy 1996;24:129–36.
- Denholm P, Kulcinski GL. Life cycle energy requirements and greenhouse gas emissions from large scale energy storage systems. Energy Convers Manage 2004;45:2153–72.
- Uchiyama Y. Life cycle assessment of renewable energy generation technologies. IEEEJ Trans Electr Electron Eng 2007;2:44–8.
- Weisser D. A guide to life-cycle greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from electric supply technologies. Energy 2007;32:1543–59.
- Awerbuch S. Investing in photovoltaics: risk, accounting and the value of new technology. Energy Policy 2000;28:1023–35.
- Cavallo A. Controllable and affordable utility-scale electricity from intermittent wind resources and compressed air energy storage (CAES). Energy 2007;32:120–7.
- Charters WWS. Solar energy: current status and future prospects. Energy Policy 1991;19:738–41.
- Cottrell A, Nunn J, Palfreyman D, Urfer A, Scaife P, Wibberley L. Systems assessment of future electricity generation options for Australia. CCSD technology assessment report 32, Cooperative Research Centre for Coal in Sustainable Development, Brisbane, Australia; 2003.
- DeCarolis J, Keith D. Is the answer to climate change blowing in the wind? In: Proceedings of the 1st international doctoral consortium on technology, policy, and management; 2002.
- DENA. German Energy Agency Dena study demonstrates that large scale integration of wind energy in the electricity system is technically and economically feasible; 2005.
- biomass-based energy storage. Renew Energy 2006;31:1355–70.
- Deutch JM, Deutch JM, Moniz EJ, Moniz EJ. The nuclear option. Sci Am 2006;295:76–83.
- Dincer I. Environmental impacts of energy. Energy Policy 1999;27:845–54.
- Drennen TE, Erickson JD, Chapman D. Solar power and climate change policy in developing countries. Energy Policy 1996;24:9–16.
- Dudhani S, Sinha AK, Inamdar SS. Renewable energy sources for peak load demand management in India. Int J Electr Power Energy Syst 2006;28:396–400.
- Edmonds J, Wise M, Dooley J, Kim S, Smith S, Runci P, et al. Global energy technology strategy—addressing climate change. Battelle Memorial Institute; 2007.
- energy. Renew Energy 2003;28:1257–76.
- El-Kordy MN, Badr MA, Abed KA, Ibrahim SMA. Economical evaluation of electricity generation considering externalities. Renew Energy 2002;25:317–28.
- Evrendilek F, Ertekin C. Assessing the potential of renewable energy sources in Turkey. Renew Energy 2003;28:2303–15.
- Fridleifsson IB, Freeston DH. Geothermal-energy research-and-development. Geothermics 1994;23:175–214.
- Gross R. Technologies and innovation for system change in the UK: status, prospects and system requirements of some leading renewable energy options. Energy Policy 2004;32:1905–19.
- Hammons TJ. Geothermal power generation worldwide: Global perspective, technology, eld experience, and research and development. Electr Power Compon Syst 2004;32:529–53.
- Herbert GMJ, Iniyani S, Sreevalsan E, Rajapandian S. A review of wind energy technologies. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2007;11:1117–45.
- Houri A. Prospects and challenges of using hydropower for electricity generation in Lebanon. Renew Energy 2006;31:1686–97.
- Idaho National Laboratory. Hydropower plant costs and production expenses. INL; 2005.
- IEA. Key world energy statistics. International Energy Agency; 2006.
- Ito M, Kato K, Sugihara H, Kichimi T, Song J, Kurokawa K. A preliminary study on potential for very large-scale photovoltaic power generation (VLS-PV) system in the Gobi desert from economic and environmental viewpoints. Solar Energy Mater Solar Cells 2003;75:507–17.
- Jager-Waldau A, Ossenbrink H. Progress of electricity from biomass, wind and photovoltaics in the European Union. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2004;8:157– 82.

- Kannan R, Leong KC, Osman R, Ho HK. Life cycle energy, emissions and cost inventory of power generation technologies in Singapore. *Renew Sustain Energy Rev* 2007;11:702–15.
- Koch FH. Hydropower—the politics of water and energy: introduction and overview. *Energy Policy* 2002;30:1207–13.
- Lackner KS, Sachs JD. A robust strategy for sustainable energy. *Brookings Pap Econ Activ* 2005;215–84.
- Lovseth J. the renewable energy potential of Norway and strategies for its development. *Renew Energy* 1995;6:207–14.
- MacLeod M, Moran D, Spencer I. Counting the cost of water use in hydro-electric generation in Scotland. *Energy Policy* 2006;34:2048–59.
- McGowan JG, Connors SR. Windpower: a turn of the century review. *Annu Rev Energy Environ* 2000;25:147–97.
- Mock JE, Tester JW, Wright PM. Geothermal energy from the earth: its potential impact as an environmentally sustainable resource. *Annu Rev Energy Environ* 1997;22:305–56.
- Moran D, Sherrington C. An economic assessment of windfarm power generation in Scotland including externalities. *Energy Policy* 2007;35:2811–25.
- Muneer T, Asif M, Munawwar S. Sustainable production of solar electricity with particular reference to the Indian economy. *Renew Sustain Energy Rev* 2005;9:444–73.
- Pacca S, Horvath A. Greenhouse gas emissions from building and operating electric power plants in the upper Colorado River Basin. *Environ Sci Technol* 2002;36:3194–200.
- Sanner B, Bussmann W. Current status, prospects and economic framework of geothermal power production in Germany. *Geothermics* 2003;32:429–38.
- Schumacher K, Sands RD. Innovative energy technologies and climate policy in Germany. *Energy Policy* 2006;34:3929–41.
- Sims REH. Electricity-generation from woody biomass fuels compared with other renewable energy options. *Renew Energy* 1994;5:852–6.
- Sims REH, Rogner HH, Gregory K. Carbon emission and mitigation cost comparisons between fossil fuel, nuclear and renewable energy resources for electricity generation. *Energy Policy* 2003;31:1315–26.
- Soderholm P, Ek K, Pettersson M. Wind power development in Sweden: global policies and local obstacles. *Renew Sustain Energy Rev* 2007;11:365–400.
- UNDP. World energy assessment energy and the challenge of sustainability. United Nations Development Program 2000.
- UNDP. World energy assessment 2004 update. United Nations Development Program 2004.
- van der Zwaan B, Rabl A. Prospects for PV: a learning curve analysis. *Solar Energy* 2003;74:19–31.
- WEC. 2007 survey of energy resources. World Energy Council; 2007.
- Wibberley L, Cottrell A, Palfreyman D, Scaife P, Brown P. Techno-economic assessment of power generation options for Australia. *Technology assessment report* 52; 2006.
- Alsema EA. Energy pay-back time and CO2 emissions of PV systems. *Progr Photovoltaics* 2000;8:17–25.
- Balat M. Hydropower systems and hydropower potential in the European Union countries. *Energy sources Part A—recovery utilization and environmental effects*. 28;2006:965–78.
- IEA. Renewables in global energy supply. International Energy Agency; 2007.
- Barbier E. Geothermal energy technology and current status: an overview. *Renew Sustain Energy Rev* 2002;6:3–65.
- Alsema EA, Nieuwlaar E. Energy viability of photovoltaic systems. *Energy Policy* 2000;28:999–1010.
- Armannsson H, Fridriksson T, Kristjansson BR. CO2 emissions from geothermal power plants and natural geothermal activity in Iceland. *Geothermics* 2005;34:286–96.
- Bertani R, Thain I. Geothermal power generating plant CO2 emission survey. *IGA News* 2002;49:1–3.
- Fthenakis VM, Kim HC, Alsema E. Emissions from photovoltaic life cycles. *Environ Sci Technol* 2008;42:2168–74.
- Chatzimouratidis AI, Pilavachi PA. Objective and subjective evaluation of power plants and their non-radioactive emissions using the analytic hierarchy process. *Energy Policy* 2007;35:4027–38.
- Denholm P, Kulcinski GL, Holloway T. Emissions and energy efficiency assessment of baseload wind energy systems. *Environ Sci Technol* 2005;39:1903–11.
- Dones R, Frischknecht R. Life-cycle assessment of photovoltaic systems: results of Swiss studies on energy chains. *Progr Photovoltaics* 1998;6:117–25.
- Dones R, Heck T, Emmenegger MF, Jungbluth N. Life cycle inventories for the nuclear and natural gas energy systems, and examples of uncertainty analysis. *Int J Life Cycle Assess* 2005;10:10–23.
- Elsam Engineering AS. Life cycle assessment of onshore and offshore sites wind power plants; 2004.
- Frankl P, Masini A, Gamberale M, Toccaceli D. Simplified life-cycle analysis of pv systems in buildings: present situation and future trends. *Progr Photovoltaics Res Appl* 1998;6:137–46.
- Fthenakis V, Alsema E. Photovoltaics energy payback times, greenhouse gas emissions and external costs: 2004—early 2005 status. *Progr Photovoltaics* 2006;14:275–80.
- Fthenakis VM, Kim HC. Greenhouse-gas emissions from solar electric- And nuclear power: a life-cycle study. *Energy Policy* 2007;35:2549–57.
- Gagnon L, van de Vate JF. Greenhouse gas emissions from hydropower: the state of research in 1996. *Energy Policy* 1997;25:7–13.
- Greijer H, Karlson L, Lindquist SE, Hagfeldt A. Environmental aspects of electricity generation from a nanocrystalline dye sensitized solar cell system. *Renew Energy* 2001;23:27–39.
- Hunt TM. Five lectures on environmental effects of geothermal utilization. Geothermal training programme 2000, report 1. United Nations University; 2000.
- Komiyama H, Yamada K, Inaba A, Kato K. Life cycle analysis of solar cell systems as a means to reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide emissions. *Energy Convers Manage* 1996;37:1247–52.
- Kreith F, Norton P, Brown D. A comparison of CO2 emissions from fossil and solar power plants in the United States. *Energy* 1990;15:1181–98.
- Lenzen M, Munksgaard J. Energy and CO2 life-cycle analyses of wind turbines—review and applications. *Renew Energy* 2002;26:339–62.
- Markandya A, Wilkinson P. Energy and health 2—electricity generation and health. *Lancet* 2007;370:979–90.
- Meier P. Life-cycle assessment of electricity generation systems and applications for climate change policy analysis. University of Wisconsin, Madison: College of Engineering; 2002.
- Meijer A, Huijbregts MAJ, Schermer JJ, Reijnders L. Life-cycle assessment of photovoltaic modules: comparison of mc-Si, InGaP and InGaP/mc-Si solar modules. *Progr Photovoltaics Res Appl* 2003;11:275–87.
- Nieuwlaar E, Alsema E, van Engelenburg B. Using life-cycle assessments for the environmental evaluation of greenhouse gas mitigation options. *Energy Convers Manage* 1996;37:831–6.
- Nomura N, Inaba A, Tonooka Y, Akai M. Life-cycle emission of oxidic gases from power-generation systems. *Appl Energy* 2001;68:215–27.
- Norton B. Renewable electricity—what is the true cost? *Power Eng J* 1999;13:6–12.

- Oliver M, Jackson T. The evolution of economic and environmental cost for crystalline silicon photovoltaics. *Energy Policy* 2000;28:1011–21
- Pacca S, Sivaraman D, Keoleian GA. Parameters affecting the life cycle performance of PV technologies and systems. *Energy Policy* 2007;35:3316–26.
- Pehnt M. Dynamic life cycle assessment (LCA) of renewable energy technologies. *Renew Energy* 2006;31:55–71.
- Proops JLR, Gay PW, Speck S, Schroder T. The lifetime pollution implications of various types of electricity generation—an input–output analysis. *Energy Policy* 1996;24:229–37.
- Spadaro J, Langlois L, Hamilton B. Assessing the difference: greenhouse gas emissions of different electricity generating chains. *IAEA Bull* 2000;42:19–24.
- Voorspools KR, Brouwers EA, D’Haeseleer WD. Energy content and indirect greenhouse gas emissions embedded in ‘emission-free’ power plants: results for the low countries. *Appl Energy* 2000;67:307–30.
- ABARE. Australian energy projections 2007; 2007.
- dos Santos MA, Rosa LP, Sikar B, Sikar E, dos Santos EO. Gross greenhouse gas emissions from hydro-power reservoir compared to thermo-power plants. *Energy Policy* 2006;34:481–8.
- Abril G, Guerin F, Richard S, Delmas R, Galy-Lacaux C, Gosse P, et al. Carbon dioxide and methane emissions and the carbon budget of a 10-year old tropical reservoir. *Global biogeochemical cycles*, vol. 19. French Guiana: Petit Saut; 2005.
- Forster PV, Ramaswamy P, Artaxo T, Bernsten R, Betts DW, Fahey J, et al. Changes in atmospheric constituents and in radiative forcing. In: *Climate change 2007: the physical science basis*. Contribution of working group I to the fourth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change. Intergovernmental panel on climate change; 2007.
- Huttrer GW. The status of world geothermal power generation 1995–2000. *Geothermics* 2001;30:1–27.
- IEA. The potential of wind energy to reduce CO₂ emissions. International energy agency greenhouse gas R&D programme. International Energy Agency 2000;Paris.
- Egre D, Milewski JC. The diversity of hydropower projects. *Energy Policy* 2002;30:1225–30.
- Balat M. Current geothermal energy potential in Turkey and use of geothermal energy. *Energy sources Part B—economics planning and policy*. 1:2006;55–65.
- Bertani R. World geothermal power generation in the period 2001–2005. *Geothermics* 2005;34:651–90.
- Rybach L. Geothermal energy: sustainability and the environment. *Geothermics* 2003;32:463–70.
- Bartle A. Hydropower potential and development activities. *Energy Policy* 2002;30:1231–9.
- Andersson BA, Jacobsson S. Monitoring and assessing technology choice: the case of solar cells. *Energy Policy* 2000;28:1037–49.
- Chopra KL, Paulson PD, Dutta V. Thin-film solar cells: an overview. *Progr Photovoltaics Res Appl* 2004;12:69–92.
- de Wild-Scholten MJ, Alsema EA. In: *Environmental life cycle inventory of crystalline silicon photovoltaic module production—proceedings of the materials research society fall 2005 meeting symposium G*; 2006.
- DiPippo R. Ideal thermal efficiency for geothermal binary plants. *Geothermics* 2007;36:276–85.
- Fthenakis VM, Moskowitz PD. Photovoltaics: environmental, health and safety issues and perspectives. *Progr Photovoltaics Res Appl* 2000;8:27–38.
- Granovskii M, Dincer I, Rosen MA. Greenhouse gas emissions reduction by use of wind and solar energies for hydrogen and electricity production: economic factors. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 2007;32:927–31.
- Green MA. Photovoltaics: technology overview. *Energy Policy* 2000;28:989–98.
- Green MA. Price/efficiency correlations for 2004 photovoltaic modules. *Progr Photovoltaics* 2005;13:85–7.
- Green MA, Emery K, King DL, Hishikawa Y, Warta W. Solar cell efficiency tables (version 29). *Progr Photovoltaics* 2007;15:35–40.
- Gurzenich D, Wagner HJ. Cumulative energy demand and cumulative emissions of photovoltaics production in Europe. *Energy* 2004;29:2297–303.
- Hegedus S. Thin film solar modules: the low cost, high throughput and versatile alternate to Si wafers. *Progr Photovoltaics Res Appl* 2006;14: 393–411.
- Hepbasli A. Current status of geothermal energy applications in Turkey. *Energy Sources* 2003;25:667–77.
- Jungbluth N, Bauer C, Dones R, Frischknecht R. Life cycle assessment for emerging technologies: case studies for photovoltaic and wind power. *Int J Life Cycle Assess* 2005;10:24–34.
- Kanoglu M. Exergy analysis of a dual-level binary geothermal power plant. *Geothermics* 2002;31:709–24.
- Mason JE, Fthenakis VM, Hansen T, Kim HC. Energy payback and life-cycle CO₂ emissions of the BOS in an optimized 35 MW PV installation. *Progr Photovoltaics Res Appl* 2006;14:179–90.
- Mohr NJ, Schermer JJJHMA, Meijer A, Reijnders L. Life cycle assessment of thin-film GaAs and GaInP/GaAs solar modules. *Progr Photovoltaics Res Appl* 2007;15:163–79.
- Treble F. Milestones in the development of crystalline silicon solar cells. *Renew Energy* 1998;15:473–8.
- Tripanagnostopoulos YMS, Battisti R, Corrado A. Energy, cost and LCA results of PV and hybrid PV/T solar systems. *Progr Photovoltaics Res Appl* 2005;13:235–50.
- Watt ME, Johnson AJ, Ellis M, Outhred HR. Life-cycle air emissions from PV power systems. *Progr Photovoltaics* 1998;6:127–36.
- Yang H, Wang H, Yu H, Xi J, Cui R, Chen G. Status of photovoltaic industry in China. *Energy Policy* 2003;31:703–7.
- Inhaber H. Water use in renewable and conventional electricity production. *Energy Sources* 2004;26:309–22.
- Abbasi SA, Abbasi N. Likely adverse environmental impacts of renewable energy sources. *Appl Energy* 2000;65:121–44.
- Axtmann RC. Environmental impact of a geothermal power plant. *Science* 1975;187:795–803.
- Krohn S, Damborg S. On public attitudes towards wind power. *Renew Energy* 1999;16:954–60.