

Economically Efficient Operation of CO₂ Capturing Process

Part II: Control Layer

Mehdi Panahi, Sigurd Skogestad*

*Department of Chemical Engineering, Norwegian University of Science and Technology(NTNU), 7491
Trondheim, Norway*

Abstract

In part I of this study, control structures were proposed for different operational regions of a post-combustion CO₂ capturing process using the top-down steady-state economic part of the plantwide procedure. In the current study, the bottom-up part of the complete procedure is considered. For this purpose, dynamic simulation is used to validate the proposed control structures. Different control configurations using decentralized controllers and model predictive control (MPC) are considered. At the end, a simple control configuration is proposed which keeps the process close to the optimum in all operational regions without the need for switching the control loops.

Keywords

Plantwide control, stability, decentralized controllers, MPC, large disturbances

1. Introduction

We study optimal operation of a post-combustion CO₂ capturing process, where the objective is to minimize the sum of the energy cost and the penalty cost for releasing CO₂ to the atmosphere. In part I of this work [1], a top-down analysis of the complete plantwide control procedure (Table 1) was performed to identify different operational regions of active constraints as a function of the throughput (flow rate of flue gas) and to

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +47 73594154; fax.: +47 73594080
E-mail address: skoge@ntnu.no

1
2
3
4 select self-optimizing controlled variables (CVs) in each region. In region I, the flue gas
5 flow rate is given at its nominal value and there are two unconstrained degrees of
6 freedom (DOFs), which may be considered as the CO₂ recovery in the absorber and the
7 CO₂ mole fraction at the bottom of the stripper. The best associated CVs were found to
8 be the CO₂ recovery in the absorber and the temperature on tray no.16 in the stripper [1]
9 (see Figure 1). However, these CVs are not necessarily the best in all operating regions
10 and for larger flowrates of the flue gas (region II), where the reboiler duty reaches its
11 maximum, the temperature of tray 13 in the stripper was found to be the best
12 unconstrained CV [1]. For even larger flue gas flowrates, one reaches the minimum
13 allowable CO₂ recovery of 80% and we have reached the bottleneck where a further
14 throughput increase is infeasible (region III) [1].
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 In this work, we focus on the bottom-up part of the procedure in Table 1, where we want
34 to identify a control structure (as simple as possible) that implements in practice the
35 steady-state control objectives from part I over the entire feasible throughput range. A
36 main issue is to handle transition from region I to region II where an unconstrained
37 degree of freedom is lost due to a constraint becoming active. In general, some logical
38 switching or reconfiguration of control loops would be necessary to manage the
39 transition. Here, using prior knowledge of the constraint that becomes active, we
40 synthesize a simple control structure that does not require any loop reconfiguration and
41 thus provides near-optimal operation over the entire feasible throughput range. The
42 details on how we arrived at the chosen pairings are the main issue for the present paper.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Towards the synthesis of such a simple structure, four different control configurations
5
6 (including the one in Figure 1) using decentralized PI controllers, briefly summarized
7
8 below, are considered.
9

- 10 • Alternative 1: The two unconstrained self-optimizing CVs for region I are
11 controlled using the most obvious pairings (Figure 1).
12
- 13 • Alternative 2: The two self-optimizing CVs for region I are controlled using the
14 reverse pairings compared to Alternative 1.
15
- 16 • Alternative 3: The best self-optimizing CV for region II is controlled.
17
- 18 • Alternative 4: Recommended modification of Alternative 2 which provides near
19 optimal operation over the entire throughput range (regions I and II).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Also, the possibility of using multivariable control is considered.
29
30
31
32

33 To validate the proposed control structures, dynamic process simulation is performed in
34 UniSim [3].
35
36
37

38 There are some other works that study the dynamic behavior of the CO₂ capturing
39 processes ([4]–[7]) but the current study is the first to consider different operational
40 regions and synthesizes a simple control structure that works in the different regions.
41
42
43

44 In another study [8], we designed a control structure for a CO₂ capturing process where
45 the objective function was to minimize energy requirement with fixed CO₂ recovery
46 (90%). In the current study, an economic penalty on the CO₂ released to the air is further
47 imposed, which makes it optimal to remove higher amounts of CO₂ (~95%). However, at
48 higher flue gas rates, when the capacity constraint for the stripper is reached, the CO₂
49 recovery will drop, and at the capacity bottleneck it will reach the minimum allowed
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 recovery which is set to 80%. The details about the objective function, optimization and
5
6 selection of the best self-optimizing controlled variables are given in part I of this study
7
8
9 [1].

10
11 The article is organized as follows. In section 2, design of the control loops for primary
12
13 (CV1) and secondary (CV2) controlled variables in regulatory and supervisory control
14
15 layers is presented. In section 3, alternative control structures to handle larger
16
17 throughputs are introduced and discussed. The dynamic performance of the alternative
18
19 control structures is evaluated for large disturbances in section 4 and the best control
20
21 structure for (near) optimal operation over the entire throughput range is recommended.
22
23
24
25

26 27 **2. Design of the control layers**

28
29 In general, the control system can be divided in two main layers (see Figure 2).
30
31
32
33
34

- 35 • **Regulatory layer:** Control of secondary (stabilizing) controlled variables (CV2).

36
37 This layer usually involves the use of single loop PID controller.
38
39
40
41

- 42 • **Supervisory (economic) control layer:** Control of the primary (economic)
43
44 controlled variables (CV1) using as manipulated variables (MVs) the setpoints to
45
46 the regulatory layer or “unused” valves (from the original MVs). This layer is
47
48 usually about a factor 10 or more slower than the regulatory layer. Since
49
50 interactions are more important at longer time scales, multivariable control may
51
52 be considered in this layer.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Let us start with the control objectives for the supervisory control layer, which generally
5 may change depending on the disturbances and active constraints. As a result of Step 3 in
6 the procedure (Table 1), in region I (low feed rates) the primary (economic) controlled
7 variables were identified as [1]:
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

15
16 $CV1_1 = \text{CO}_2 \text{ recovery in the absorber,}$
17

18
19 $CV1_2 = \text{Temperature at tray 16 in the stripper.}$
20
21
22

23 In region II with higher feedrates, the stripper reboiler duty is at maximum, so there is
24 one less degree of freedom and the best CV was identified as [1]:
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 $CV1 = \text{Temperature at tray 13 in the stripper.}$
32
33
34
35

36 Furthermore, before starting the bottom-up part of the procedure, which starts with the
37 choice of the regulatory layer (Step 5), one generally needs to locate the throughput
38 manipulator (Step 4). However, the CO₂ capture plant is a part of the overall power plant,
39 and the throughput manipulator is located further upstream in the power plant. This
40 means that the feed (flue gas) to the CO₂ capture plant is given and will act as a
41 disturbance, and the control system must be set up to handle this disturbance. However,
42 the CO₂ capture contains a closed amine/water system and one must set the amine flow
43 between the columns. The location of the amine recycle flow manipulator is an important
44 decision.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 The details of the regulatory layer design (Step 5) are given in Table 2. In addition to the
5
6 comments given in Table 2, one would generally like to combine control tasks in order to
7
8 simplify the control system. For example, one may select to control the same stripper tray
9
10 temperature in both regions I and II although there may be a small economic penalty.
11
12 Furthermore, stabilizing the stripper temperature profile is necessary to maintain the CO₂
13
14 inventory circulating around the amine recycle loop. The stripper temperature control
15
16 loop may therefore be moved to the regulatory layer.
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Let us go back to the decisions involved in designing the control layer (Table 2).

24
25 (a) The first issue is to identify the variables that need to be controlled to “stabilize” the
26
27 operation. Here “stabilization” means that the process does not “drift” too far away from
28
29 the designed operational point when there are disturbances. For our process, we identify
30
31 the following seven “stabilizing” CVs which need to be controlled (CV2):
32
33
34
35
36
37

- 38 1. Absorber bottom level,
- 39
- 40 2. Stripper (distillation column) temperature,
- 41
- 42
- 43 3. Stripper bottom level,
- 44
- 45
- 46 4. Stripper top level,
- 47
- 48
- 49 5. Stripper pressure,
- 50
- 51 6,7. Recycle surge tank: inventories of water and amine.
- 52

53 Note that there is no need to control the absorber temperature for the purpose of
54
55 stabilization its profile. However, the temperature inside the absorber needs to be kept at
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 a given value for good operation. We select to do this by controlling the absorber liquid
5
6 feed temperature at 51°C [1] in the regulatory layer.
7
8
9

10
11 The absorber pressure is not controlled (“floating”) because a fixed value would require a
12
13 valve which would give an undesired loss. It is set indirectly by the ambient pressure.
14
15
16
17

18
19 In addition, the inventories of water and amine in the recycle system must be controlled
20
21 to make up for losses. However, these are small so even manual control may be possible.
22
23
24
25

26 (b) The next decision is to select the inputs “pairings” to control these variables (CV2).
27

28 Let us consider operation in region I (Figure 1). We start with the inventory control
29
30 system, that is, control of levels and pressure. The feed flow is given so the inventory
31
32 control system needs to be in the direction of flow ([2] and [9]). However, for this
33
34 particular process this does not really fix any loops, except for the pressure control of
35
36 stripper using the CO₂ outflow (V-3). Next, we consider the closed recycle system of
37
38 amine and water where we, as mentioned, need to decide on where to set the recycle
39
40 flowrate. We choose to set it using the recycle liquid flow to the absorber column (V-8).
41
42
43
44

45 The choice of V-8 as the flow manipulator in the recycle loop is an important decision
46
47 (we will reconsider it later), because the “radiation rule” (Table 2) implies that inventory
48
49 control in the recycle loop “downstream” of this location must be in the direction of flow.
50
51
52

53 Thus, the bottom levels in the absorber and stripper must be controlled by their outflows
54
55 (V-1 and V-6 respectively).
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 The pump V-10 in the recycle controls the pump outlet pressure but this is mainly for
5 simulation purposes and the pump could also be set to run on constant power. However,
6
7 when the pump controls pressure, the pressure measurement must be after the pump (in
8
9 the opposite direction of flow). Finally, the stripper has a partial condenser, and the
10
11 condenser level is controlled by the reflux flow (V-2).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Next, with the inventory control system fixed, we consider the stabilizing temperature
20
21 loop for the stripper. We choose to use the reboiler duty (steam V-5) as the MV which is
22
23 the only remaining option. To combine regulatory and supervisory control, the
24
25 temperature sensor is located at tray 16, which was identified as a self-optimizing
26
27 variable in region I. Finally, the temperature of the absorber liquid feed is kept at 51°C
28
29 using the cooler duty (V-9).
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Let us finally consider the supervisory layer which operates at a slower time scale. The
37
38 stripper condenser temperature, which should be low to reduce the required work for CO₂
39
40 compression in the downstream process, should clearly be controlled using the cooling
41
42 water flow (V-4). The remaining “economic” variable to be controlled is the CO₂
43
44 recovery and as a MV we may use the recycle amine flowrate to the absorber column (V-
45
46 8), which was not used in the regulatory layer. This will be a relatively slow loop. The
47
48 final control structure for region I is shown in Figure 1.
49
50
51
52
53

54 **3. Alternative control structures to handle larger throughputs**

55

56
57 In region II, the stripper reboiler duty (steam) is at its maximum so the stabilizing
58
59 temperature loop used for region I (Figure 1) will no longer work. This is to be expected,
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 because we have not followed the recommendation in Table 2 that says “Avoid selecting
5 as MVs in the regulatory layer, variables that may optimally saturate”. The problem is
6 that there are no obvious alternative for controlling the column temperature. The reflux is
7 often used for distillation columns, but this is a stripper where the reflux of the key
8 component (CO₂) is very small and the reflux has no effect on column temperature. In
9 addition, from the steady state optimization, it is optimal with maximum cooling to
10 minimize the CO₂ compressor work in the down stream process [1]. Therefore, reflux
11 must be used to control condenser level. Alternatively, the column federate could be
12 used, but this is already used for controlling the absorber sump level.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 ***3.1. Alternative 2 (“reverse pairing”)***

30 To find alternative solutions, let us start with region I. We consider the problem of
31 controlling the two self-optimizing CVs
32
33
34

35 y_1 : CO₂ recovery

36 y_2 : temperature on tray no.16 in the stripper

37 using the two available MVs

38 u_1 : recycle amine flowrate (V-8)

39 u_2 : reboiler duty (V-5)

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 The pairing in Figure 1, where y_1 is controlled using u_1 and y_2 is controlled using u_2 is
52 referred to as the “diagonal” pairing (Alternative 1). We will also consider the reverse
53 “off-diagonal” pairing (Alternative 2; see Figure 3).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 **Pairing issues.** Alternative 1 may seem to be an “obvious” pairing choice but a more
5
6 careful analysis shows that this is not so clear. A useful tool for selecting pairings is the
7
8 relative gain array (RGA) and two main pairing rules are [10]:
9

10
11
12
13
14 **RGA-rule 1:** Prefer pairings such that the rearranged system, with the selected pairings
15
16 along the diagonal, has an RGA matrix close to identity at frequencies around the closed-
17
18 loop bandwidth. This may be quantified by selecting pairings with a small RGA number:
19
20

$$21 \text{ RGA number} = \|\text{RGA}(G)-I\|_{\text{sum}} \quad (1)$$

22
23
24 **RGA-rule 2:** Avoid pairing on negative steady-state RGA elements.
25
26
27
28
29

30 The second rule states that pairing on a negative RGA provides a potential unstable
31
32 response when individual loops are malfunctioning, as it is the case of input saturation.
33
34 To compute the RGA we need a dynamic model. Using the dynamic UniSim simulator
35
36 and “Profit Design Studio” (PDS) [11], we identified the following linear model:
37
38

$$39 \text{ G}_{\text{dyn.}}(s) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{6.85s+1.74}{19.7s^2+11.4s+1} & \frac{-0.76s+0.038}{2400s^2+107s+1} \\ \frac{(-9.51s-1.02)e^{-2s}}{218s^2+17.3s+1} & \frac{0.45s+0.0754}{205s^2+18.8s+1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (2)$$

40
41
42
43
44
45
46 The steady-state RGA computed from this model is
47

$$48 \text{ RGA}_{\text{dyn.}}(s=0) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.77 & 0.23 \\ 0.23 & 0.77 \end{bmatrix} \quad (3)$$

49
50
51
52
53 Since all elements are positive one cannot eliminate any of the pairings using RGA-rule
54

55
56 2. The RGA-number as a function of frequencies is plotted for the two alternative
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 pairings in Figure 4. As expected, we find that the diagonal pairing is the best with the
5
6 RGA-number close to 0 at all frequencies.
7
8
9

10
11 To check the model obtained from the dynamic simulator, we compute the steady-state
12 gains using the steady-state UniSim model and this gave a very surprising result. By
13
14 making 5% perturbations in the inputs, the following steady-state model was identified:
15
16
17
18
19
20

$$21 \quad G_{ss} = 10^{-2} \times \begin{bmatrix} -0.5232 & 1.48 \\ -8.47 & 5.17 \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

22
23
24
25 with the corresponding RGA matrix:
26
27

$$28 \quad RGA_{ss} = \begin{bmatrix} -0.27 & +1.27 \\ +1.27 & -0.27 \end{bmatrix} \quad (5)$$

29
30
31
32 Note that steady-state RGA for the diagonal pairing is negative. The reason is that the
33 sign of the 1,1-element of the gain matrix (4) is negative, whereas we found from the
34
35 dynamic model in (2) that the diagonal elements are dominant at higher frequencies
36
37 correspond to having a positive gain at steady state. The sign change can be explained by
38
39 Figure 5, where we see that y_1 (CO₂ recovery) initially increases in response to a step
40
41 increase in u_1 (recycle amine flowrate). This agrees with the dynamic model G_{dyn} . The
42
43 reason for the initial increase in the CO₂ recovery is an initial decrease in the CO₂ vapor
44
45 mole fraction in the top of the absorber, which is expected. However, on a longer time
46
47 scale, with an increased feedrate to the stripper column (u_1) and a constant reboiler duty
48
49 (u_2), the CO₂ concentration in the bottom of the stripper increases and starts “filling up”
50
51 the absorption column with CO₂. This takes a long time because of the large holdup in
52
53 the absorber (see Figure 6). Finally, the CO₂ “breaks through” at the top of the absorber
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 column and after almost 170 minutes the CO₂ recovery (y_1) starts decreasing and keeps
5
6 decreasing until about 250 minutes. There is a second smaller decrease in y_1 about 70
7
8 minutes later. To actually get a negative gain for y_1 , we need the change in recycle amine
9
10 flowrate (u_1) to be sufficiently large, so this is partly a nonlinear effect. The dynamic
11
12 model G_{dyn} is based on simulations on an intermediate time scale and this is why the
13
14 reversal of the sign of the gain was not identified.
15
16
17

18
19 The steady-state RGA suggests “reverse pairing” which is referred to as Alternative 2.
20

21
22 Based on pairing rule 2 and the model G_{SS} , we would conclude that the diagonal pairing
23
24 (Alternative 1) should not be used. However, recall that the reason for RGA rule 2 is to
25
26 avoid instability if one of the loops is no longer working, which in this case will occur
27
28 when the reboiler duty saturates. In summary, the diagonal pairing (“Alternative 1”)
29
30 should be used in region I because the CVs and the MVs are close, but we need to
31
32 reconfigure the loops if the reboiler duty reaches its maximum (region II). Alternative 2,
33
34 on the other hand would work in both regions without any reconfiguration. However
35
36 compared to Alternative 1 the dynamic performance in region I will be poorer as the
37
38 associated MVs are not close-by. This is confirmed by dynamic simulations later.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 ***3.2. Operation in region II (Alternative 3)***

48
49 Let us next consider operation in region II. The “optimal” solution for region II, is to let
50
51 the reboiler duty stay at its maximum, “give up” controlling the CO₂ recovery, and move
52
53 the stripper temperature from tray 16 to tray 13 [1] (Alternative 3, Figure 7). Similar to
54
55 Alternative 2, the stripper temperature is controlled using the recycle flow which is the
56
57 only available “free” MV in region II.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 For strictly optimal operation in both regions I and II, one could use same supervisory
8
9 logic that switches between Alternatives 1 and 3. It would switch from Alternative 1 to
10
11 Alternative 3 when the reboiler duty saturates and it would switch back from Alternative
12
13 3 to Alternative 1 when CO₂ recovery passes 95.26%.

14
15
16
17
18 However, note that Alternative 3 (region II) is actually very close to the “reverse pairing”
19
20 (Alternative 2) for region I. This suggests that Alternative 2 could also be used to handle
21
22 region II, although it would involve a small loss because the stripper temperature is not at
23
24 its optimal location in region II. With Alternative 2, switching between regions I and II
25
26 would simply be to give up control of CO₂ recovery when the reboiler duty saturates.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 ***3.3. Alternative 4 (regions I and II)***

35
36 So far Alternative 2 is the best structure for the combined regions I and II, and we want to
37
38 improve on it. In Alternative 2, the recycle amine flowrate (V-8) is manipulated to
39
40 control the stripper temperature. However, this control loop has a large effective delay so
41
42 performance is relatively poor (see dynamic simulations later). In Alternative 2, the liquid
43
44 inflow to the stripper, which actually has a much more direct effect on the stripper
45
46 temperature, is manipulated to control the level of the absorber. A modification
47
48 (Alternative 4) is to change the pairings for these two loops, which can be viewed as
49
50 moving the location of the given flow in the recycle loop from the inlet to the outlet of
51
52 the absorber (Figure 8) .
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

4. Performance of alternative control structures

In this section we analyse the four alternatives, as well as multivariable control (MPC), using dynamic simulation. We observed some discrepancy in the nominal steady-state in dynamic mode versus the steady-state mode. For example, for the same nominal steady state CV values, the reboiler duty in the dynamic mode is 1074 kW while in the steady state mode the reboiler duty is 1161 kW. This is partly due to the dynamic simulation being pressure driven so that the column pressure profiles are slightly different. In addition, the UniSim dynamics solver may be using approximate thermodynamic models. Fortunately, from a control structure synthesis perspective, the difference in the nominal steady states is not very important as the first constraint to become active (reboiler duty) as throughput increases, remains unchanged in both modes.

As in part I, there are maximum capacities compared to nominal values for the reboiler duty (+20%), cooler (+50%) and pumps (+40%). These constraints are even more important in the present dynamic study.

4.1. *Alternative 1(region I)*

We first consider the diagonal pairing for region I (Figure 1) and look at the performance (dynamic behavior) when there are large disturbances. All the controllers were tuned using SIMC method [12] with tuning parameters in Table 3. The flowrate of flue gas is increased gradually in steps of 5% from 0% to +25% compared to the nominal flowrate (Figure 9a). From Figure 9 we see that the control structure behaves very well in region I

1
2
3
4 (up to +20%) with tight control of the CO₂ recovery and stripper temperature. When the
5
6 flowrate of flue gas increases +20% (at t=269min), the reboiler duty saturates at
7
8 t=273min (Figure 9b), signifying a transition to region II. Initially, it seems that the
9
10 system is stable although the temperature of tray no. 16 (Figure 9c) in the stripper is not
11
12 controlled in its setpoint, but with a further increase in the flue gas flowrate (at
13
14 t=358min), the stripper temperature drops further (t=361min) resulting in insufficient
15
16 CO₂ stripping which builds up in the amine recirculation loop. This necessitates the more
17
18 amine flow in the absorber to meet the desired CO₂ recovery which saturates the pump 1
19
20 (Figure 9d) at t=437min. At t≈600min the recycle valve V-8 (u₁) becomes fully open
21
22 (Figure 9e) and we get an unstable system where the CO₂ recovery can no longer be
23
24 maintained at 95.26% (Figure 9f) resulting in large objective function value (Figure 9g).
25
26 This is as expected from the earlier RGA analysis. In summary, pairing Alternative 1 can
27
28 only handle increased flue gas flowrates of up to +20% (region I), at which point the
29
30 reboiler duty (u₂) saturates.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **4.2. Alternative 3 (region II)**

42
43 We here consider the “optimal” structure for region II. (“Alternative 3”, Figure 7). In the
44
45 simulation, for a closed loop $\tau_c=2.33\text{min}$, SIMC method gives $K_c=0.314$, $\tau_1=14\text{min}$ as
46
47 PI tuning parameters. Figure 10 shows how this structure handles feed flowrate changes
48
49 with operation within region II, starting from 20% above the nominal (where the process
50
51 enters region II) with steps of +5%. In this case, we do not attempt to control CO₂
52
53 recovery and it drops gradually from 95.26% to 80%, which is the minimum allowable
54
55 CO₂ recovery. This happens when the feed flowrate increase is +43% (Figure 10a). As
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 shown in Figure 10c, the stripper temperature is well controlled and hardly affected by
5
6 the feed flow disturbance.
7
8
9

10
11 In general, any active constraint should be considered as a disturbance [2], thus we
12
13 changed the fixed (saturated) reboiler duty by $\pm 10\%$ and the dynamic responses in Figure
14
15 11 shows that also this disturbance is handled well with stripper temperature deviation of
16
17 less than 3°C .
18
19
20
21

22 ***4.3. Alternative 2 (regions I and II)***

23
24 The simulations in Figure 12 show that this alternative can handle increase of the flue gas
25
26 starting from the nominal value (0%) and up to +42% (Figure 12a). The reboiler duty
27
28 (u_2) saturates (Figure 12b) when the flue gas flowrate increase is +20%, at which point
29
30 the CO_2 recovery control is given up, and at +42% the minimum CO_2 recovery of 80%
31
32 (Figure 12f) is met. Note that we in both regions control y_2 (temperature of tray no. 16 in
33
34 the stripper). This is the best choice in region I, and in region II it is close to the best self-
35
36 optimizing variable which is y_3 (temperature of tray no. 13 in the stripper). Thus, it is not
37
38 surprising that if Alternative 2 can handle changes of +42% which is close to the region II
39
40 optimal at +43% (using Alternative 3).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 The advantage of Alternative 2 compared to optimal structure (which is to use
50
51 Alternative 1 in region I and Alternative 3 in region II) is that we do not need switching
52
53 of CVs. The main disadvantage is that we have more interactions than Alternative 1 in
54
55 region I. This is seen by comparing the simulations in Figures 9 (Alt.1) and 12 (Alt.2) in
56
57 region I. The CO_2 recovery is not as tightly controlled (compare the max. deviation of
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 0.4% in Figure 9f with 3% in Figure 12f) and also the stripper temperature shows larger
5 variations (compare max. deviation of 0.3°C in Figure 9c with 1°C in Figure 12c). In
6 region II, using Alternative 2, there is a minor loss compared to Alternative 3 (compare
7 Figure 10g and Figure 12g) and also here the temperature control is comparable (compare
8 Figure 10c and Figure 12c).

19 ***4.4. Alternative 4 (regions I and II)***

21 Alternative 4 (Figure 8) involves repairing the absorber level control. As shown in Figure
22 13, this structure handles increase in flue gas flowrate up to +42% like in Alternative 2
23 but with tighter control of stripper temperature. By comparing Figures 12c and 13c, we
24 see that the stripper temperature deviation decreases from 1°C to 0.2°C while control of
25 CO₂ recovery remains the same. Therefore, Alternative 4 may be the best structure for
26 practical implementation.

39 ***4.5. Multivariable Controller (regions I and II)***

41 Finally, we consider a multivariable controller (MPC) obtained using the RMPCT
42 (Robust Model Predictive Controller) from Honeywell [3]. The aim is to compare its
43 performance with the previous decentralized PI controllers. This MPC includes 2 CVs (y_1
44 and y_2), 2 MVs (recycle lean amine flowrate, u_1 and reboiler duty, u_2) and 2 disturbances
45 (flowrate of flue gas and its CO₂ composition). We used Honeywell's Profit Design
46 Studio to identify the dynamic models and the final responses with MPC are shown in
47 Figure 14. For feed values greater than +20%, when the reboiler duty saturates (region
48 II), instead of controlling the CO₂ recovery at its setpoint value (95.26%), we put less

1
2
3
4 emphasis on controlling the CO₂ recovery by introducing a range with a lower bound of
5
6 80% for this CV. The result is that RMPCT controls the temperature of tray no. 16 at its
7
8 setpoint and gives up controlling the CO₂ recovery. When the flue gas flowrate reaches
9
10 +42% the minimum allowable CO₂ recovery of 80% is met and there are no degrees of
11
12 freedom left and further increase of flue gas flowrate is infeasible.
13
14

15
16
17
18
19 We finally compare the economical performance of all the structures. From the objective
20
21 function in Figures 10g (Alt.3), 12g (Alt.2), 13g (Alt.4) and 14g (MPC) we find that there
22
23 is only a small difference. At the final steady state, the objective function values are 3.38,
24
25 3.39, 3.39 and 3.39 (USD/ton of flue gas) respectively. This implies that we can use both
26
27 Alternative 2, Alternative 4 or MPC to control the system even in the presence of large
28
29 flowrates of flue gas. Note that the design and implementation of reverse pairings with
30
31 decentralized controllers are simpler and cheaper than MPC which needs model
32
33 identification etc. although responses time are comparable.
34
35
36

37
38 Of all the alternatives considered, Alternative 4 is proposed as the best structure for the
39
40 CO₂ capturing process, studied here.
41
42
43

44 **5. Conclusions**

45
46
47 Using the bottom-up part of the plantwide control procedure, we obtained alternative
48
49 control structures that implement the optimal controlled variables (CO₂ recovery in the
50
51 absorber and the temperature of tray 16 in the stripper) from part I. Alternative 1
52
53 (diagonal pairing of the best CVs found in region I with close-by MVs: recycle amine
54
55 flowrate and reboiler duty) can handle flue gas flowrates of up to +20% (region I). The
56
57 reverse pairings (Alternative 2) or MPC handle flow values up to +42%. Due to the large
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 delay between the paired MVs and CVs in Alternative 2, a modified structure
5
6 (Alternative 4) is proposed where the recycle amine flow manipulator is moved from the
7
8 inflow to the outflow of the absorber. This simple structure (Alternative 4) has dynamic
9
10 performance comparable to MPC, and is proposed as the best alternative because of its
11
12 much simpler implementation.
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 References

- 20
21 [1] M. Panahi, S. Skogestad, Economically Efficient Operation of CO₂ Capturing Process Part I:
22 Self-optimizing Procedure for Selecting the Best Controlled Variables, *Chemical Engineering*
23 and Processing: Process Intensification, 50, (3) (2011), 247-253
24
25 [2] S. Skogestad, Control Structure Design for Complete Chemical Plants, *Computers and*
26 *Chemical Engineering*, 28 (2004), 219-234.
27
28 [3] UniSim Design R380, 2008, Honeywell Company.
29
30 [4] Y.-J. Lin, T.-H. Pan, D. S.-H. Wong, S.-S. Jang; Y.-W. Chi and C.-H. Yeh, Plantwide Control
31 of CO₂ Capture by Absorption and Stripping Using Monoethanolamine Solution, *Ind. Eng.*
32 *Chem. Res.*, 50, (3) (2011), 1338-1345.
33
34 [5] S. Ziaii; G. T Rochelle and T. F. Edgar, Dynamic modeling to minimize energy use for CO₂
35 Capture in power plants by aqueous monoethanolamine, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 48, (13) (2009),
36 6105-6111.
37
38 [6] H. M. Kvamsdal; J. P. Jakobsen and K. A. Hoff, Dynamic modeling and simulation of a CO₂
39 absorber column for post-combustion CO₂ capture. *Chemical Engineering and Processing:*
40 *Process Intensification*, 48, (1) (2009), 135-144.
41
42 [7] A. Lawal, M. Wang, P. Stephenson and H. Yeung, Dynamic modelling of CO₂ absorption for
43 post combustion capture in coal-fired power plants, *Fuel*, 88, (12) (2009), 2455-2462
44
45 [8] M. Panahi, M. Karimi, S. Skogestad, M. Hillestad, H. F. Svendsen, Self-Optimizing and
46 Control Structure Design for a CO₂ Capturing Plant, *Proceedings of the 2nd Annual Gas*
47 *Processing Symposium*, 2010, Pages 331-338, [doi:10.1016/S1876-0147\(10\)02035-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1876-0147(10)02035-5).
48
49 [9] E.M.B. Aske and S. Skogestad, Consistent inventory control, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 48, (24)
50 (2009), 10892-10902.
51
52 [10] S. Skogestad, I. Postlethwaite, *Multivariable Feedback Control Analysis and Design*, 2nd
53 edition, 2005.
54
55 [11] Honeywell Profit Design Studio R310, 2007, Honeywell Company.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

[12] S. Skogestad, Simple analytic rules for model reduction and PID controller tuning, *Journal of Process Control*, 13 (2003), 291-309.

Table1. Plantwide control procedure [2]

I. Top-down part (focus on steady-state economics)

Step 1. Define operational objectives (economic cost J to be minimized) and constraints

Step 2. Identify degrees of freedom (MVs) and optimize the operation for important disturbances (offline analysis) to identify regions of active constraints

Step 3. Each region of active constraints: Select primary (economic) controlled variables CV1 (**Decision 1**):

- Active constraints
- “Self-optimizing” CV1s for the remaining unconstrained degrees of freedom

Step 4. Select location of throughput manipulator (TPM) (**Decision 3**)

II. Bottom-up part (focus on dynamics)

Step 5. Choose structure of regulatory control layer (including inventory control)

- a. Select “stabilizing” controlled variables CV2 (**Decision 2**)
- b. Select inputs (valves) and “pairings” for controlling CV2 (**Decision 4**)

Step 6. Select structure of supervisory control layer

Step 7. Select structure of (or need for) optimization layer (RTO)

Table 2. Details on Step 5. Structure of regulatory (stabilizing) layer [2]

- **The purpose of the regulatory layer is to “stabilize”** the plant, preferably using a simple control structure with single-loop PID controllers. “Stabilize” here means that the process does not “drift” away from acceptable operating conditions when there are disturbances. In addition, the regulatory layer should follow the setpoints given by the “supervisory layer”.
- **Reassignments (logic) in the regulatory layer should be avoided:** Preferably, the regulatory layer should be independent of the economic control objectives (regions of steady-state active constraints), which may change depending on disturbances, prices and market conditions.

The main decisions are:

(a) Identify CV2s for the regulatory layer, these include “stabilizing” CVs, which are typically levels, pressures, reactor temperature and temperature profile in distillation column. In addition, active constraints (CV1) that require tight control (small back-off) may be assigned to the regulatory layer.

(b) Identify pairings (MVs to be used to control CV2), taking into account:

- Want “local consistency” for the inventory control [9]. This implies that the inventory control system is radiating around a given flow.
 - Avoid selecting as MVs in the regulatory layer, variables that may optimally saturate (steady-state), because this would require either
 - Reassignment of regulatory loop (complication penalty), or
 - Back-off for the MV variable (economic penalty)
 - Want tight control of important active constraints (to avoid back-off).
 - The general pairing rule is to “pair close” to achieve a small effective delay from input (MV) to outputs (CV2).
-

Table 3- tuning parameters (Alt.1)

Control loop	Closed loop time constant, τ_c (min)	Kc	τ_I (min)
CO ₂ recovery (y_1) with recycle amine flowrate (u_1)	0.38	0.315	3.04
Temp. 16 in the stripper (y_2) with reboiler duty (u_2)	0.30	10.53	2.4

Fig. 1- Alternative 1, proposed decentralized control structure for region I with given flue gas flowrate [1]

Fig. 2- Typical control hierarchy in a chemical plant [2]

Fig. 3- Alternative 2, reverse pairing for region I, and also close to the optimal structure for region II

Fig. 4- RGA number of two different alternatives in pairing

Fig. 5- Response in CO₂ recovery (y_1) to step change in recycle amine flowrate (u_1 by 5%)

Fig. 6- Sluggish dynamic response of the CO₂ mole fraction due to large holdup on absorber trays

Fig. 7- Alternative 3, proposed decentralized control structure for region II [1]

Fig. 8- Alternative 4, proposed structure for combined regions I and II (modified of alternative 2)

Fig. 9- Dynamic simulation of pairing alternative 1 (Fig. 1). The structure handles increase in flue gas flowrates of up to +20% (region I)

Fig. 10- Region II: Alternative 3 (Fig. 7) handles increase in flue gas flowrate to +43%, but it does not cover region I

Fig. 11- Region II: The structure in Fig.7 also handles disturbance in reboiler duty which is the active constraint


Fig. 12- Dynamic simulation of alternative 2 (reverse pairings) in combined regions I and II. The structure handles the increase in flowrates of flue gas to +42%

Fig. 13- Dynamic simulation of pairings alternative 4 (modified reverse pairings) in combined regions I and II.

Fig. 14- Performance of RMPCT tuned in region I, when extended to region II, the structure handles increase in flue gas flowrates of +42%

Figure(1)

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



Figure(2)





Fig. 2- Typical control hierarchy in a chemical plant [2]


Figure(3)

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure(4)


[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



Figure(5)
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure(6)
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure(7)

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



Figure(8)

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



Figure(9)




Fig. 9- Dynamic simulation of pairing alternative 1 (Fig. 1). The structure handles increase in flue gas flowrates of up to +20% (region I)

Figure(10)






Fig. 10- Region II: Alternative 3 (Fig. 7) handles increase in flue gas flowrate to +43%, but it does not cover region I

(a) Reboiler duty, u2



(b) Temperature of tray no.13 in the stripper, y3






Fig. 12- Dynamic simulation of alternative 2 (reverse pairings) in combined regions I and II. The structure handles the increase in flowrates of flue gas to +42%

Figure(13)




Fig. 13- Dynamic simulation of pairings alternative 4 (modified of alternative 2) in combined regions I and II.





Fig. 14- Performance of RMPCT tuned in region I, when extended to region II, the structure handles increase in flue gas flowrates of +42%



Proposed control structure which can handle (close to optimum) disturbances in different operational regions