# MODELING OF BIOMASS GASIFICATION WITH CO<sub>2</sub> ENRICH AIR AS GASIFYING AGENT

#### K K R JAYAKODY

#### 149255T

Thesis/Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Science

Department of Chemical and Process Engineering

University of Moratuwa Sri Lanka

March 2018

#### **Declaration**

Dr. M. Narayana

I certify that this is my job and this thesis does not incorporate without recognition any previously submitted material for a degree or diploma at any other higher education university or institution and as far as I know and believe it does not contain any previously published material or written by another person, except in cases where recognition is made in the text.

Also, I hereby grant to University of Moratuwa the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my thesis/dissertation, in whole or in part in print, electronic or other medium. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books).

Signature:	Date:
The above candidate has carried out research for the under my supervision.	ne Masters/MPhil/PhD thesis/Dissertation
Supervisor	Date

#### **Abstract**

The biomass gasification has been carried out using an updraft gasifier. This work focuses on the production of producer gas from biomass (Rubber Wood). Mathematical model for thermo-chemical process of biomass gasification is developed in this research work. ASPEN PLUS simulator and pilot plant gasifier were used to investigate the effect of reactor temperature, equivalence ratio and CO<sub>2</sub> to air ratio on composition of producer gas. The gasifier was operated over a temperature range of 500-1000 °C, while varying equivalence ratio from 0.2 to 0.36and CO<sub>2</sub> to air percentage from 1% to 10% and it was found that the most of trends were similar for both the case. The results showed Carbon monoxide concentration in the product gas increases with increase in temperature and CO<sub>2</sub> to biomass ratio but decreases with increasing equivalence ratio.

**Keywords**: Updraftgasifier, biomass, equivalence ratio, Carbon dioxide to air ratio, ASPEN PLUS.

#### Acknowledgement

I avail this opportunity to express my indebtedness to my guide Dr. Mahinsasa Narayana, Chemical & Process Engineering Department, University of Mortuwa, Sri lanka, for his valuable guidance, constant encouragement and kind help at various stages for the execution this dissertation work.

In addition to this I express my sincere thanks to Dr. (Mrs.)DuleekaGunarathne, who gave me an excellent support to construct a simulation model with Aspen Plus to complete this research. Further I would like to express my sincere thanks to Mr. Lenagala who works with me to do the test run with gassifier at the University

# **Table of Contents**

Declaration	i
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgement	iv
List of Tables	vii
List of Figures	ix
Acronyams	
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background of Biomass gasification	1
1.2 Biomass	2
1.3 Biomass Conversion Processes	2
1.4 Biomass Gasification	2
1.5 Importance to the Sri Lankan industries	3
1.6 Aspen Plus Simulation	4
1.7 Research Objectives and Scope	5
1.7.1 Objectives	5
1.7.2 Scope	5
1.8 Dissertation Outline	5
2. Modeling theory and technique	6
2.1 Biomass energy and its scenario	6
2.2 Biomass properties	6
2.2.1 Calorific value	7
2.2.2 Proximate analysis	7
2.3 Processes of Gasification	8
2.3.1 Process	8
2.4.2 Gasifying Mediums	11
2.4.3 Drying	11

	2.4.4 Pyrolysis		12
	2.4.5 Char Gasification Theory		14
2.5	Classification of biomass gasifier	16	
	2.5.1 Fixed bed gasifiers		16
	2.5.2 Updraft Gasifiers		16
	2.5.3 Downdraft Gasifiers		17
	2.5.4 Cross-draft gasifier		18
2.6	Model Development	20	
	2.6.1 Model Block Selection		20
	2.6.2 Drying		22
	2.6.3 Separation of moisture and dry Biomass		23
	2.6.4 Biomass Decomposition		23
	2.6.5Char Gasification		23
	2.6.6Gas solid separation		23
	2.6.7Volatile Reactions		23
	2.6.8 Stream Class Selection		24
3 M	ODEL SIMULATIONS		25
3.1	ASPEN UNIT MODELS	25	
	3.1.1 Define nonconventional solid components		25
	3.1.2 Defining Properties		25
	3.1.3 Specify physical properties for nonconventional solid components		26
	3.1.4 Stream classes and sub streams		26
	3.1.5 Calculator Block for Control Drying		27
	3.1.6 Calculator Block for Control decomposition		28
	3.1.7 Aspen Unit Model Description		28
3.2	Results	31	
	3.2.1 Elemental analysis of biomass		31

3.2.2 Aspen Results	32
3.3 Validation	41
4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	42
4.1Result Discussion	42
4.2 Future Work	45
Appendix A	49
Appendix B	51

## **List of Tables**

Table 1: Reaction involve in biomass gasification	13
Table 2:Aspen plus Reactors	21
Table 3: Aspen unit models	28
Table 4: proximate analysis of wood chips	31
Table 5: Ultimate analysis of wood chips	31
Table 6: Comparison in terms of producer gas composition (by Vol.Percentage)	41
Table 7 : CO variation in producer gas with CO <sub>2</sub> variation in inlet air	41

## **List of Figures**

Figure 1:Biomass Gasification Process.	10
Figure 2:Ufdraft Gasifier	17
Figure 3: Downdraft Gasifier	18
Figure 4:: Cross-draft gasifier	19
Figure 5: Aspen model for updraft fixed bed gasification of biomass	22
Figure 6: ER Vs. Temperature	32
Figure 7: ER vs composition	32
Figure 8: CO composition in different zone with ER	33
Figure 9: Air flow rate vs. Temperature with constant CO <sub>2</sub>	33
Figure 10: CO <sub>2</sub> flow rate vs. Composition with Constant air	34
Figure 11: Air flow rate vs. product composition with constant CO <sub>2</sub>	34
Figure 12: Air flow rate vs. CO in different zone with constant CO <sub>2</sub>	35
Figure 13: Air flow rate vs. composition with heat loss	35
Figure 14:Air flow rate vs. product composition with constant CO <sub>2</sub> and heat loss	36
Figure 15:CO <sub>2</sub> flow rate vs. product composition with constant air and heat loss	36
Figure 16: ER vs. Temperature with 5% inlet moisture	37
Figure 17: ER vs. Product composition with 5% inlet moisture	37
Figure 18: ER vs. Temperature with 10% inlet moisture	38
Figure 19: ER vs. Product composition with 10% inlet moisture	38
Figure 20: ER vs. Temperature with 20% inlet moisture	39
Figure 21: ER vs. product composition with 20% inlet moisture	39
Figure 22: Air flow rate vs. unburned carbon - with zero CO <sub>2</sub>	40
Figure 23: Air flow rate vs. unburned carbon-with 2.2L B/HR CO <sub>2</sub>	40

### Acronyams

HHV: Higher heating value

 $HHV_{\mathrm{f}}$ : Higher Heating value of fuel

LHV: Lower heating value

FCR: Fuel Consumption rate

VM: Volatile Matters

FC: Fixed Carbon

ER: Equivalence ratio

SGR: Specific Gasification rate

A/G: Air to gas ratio

G/F: Gas to fuel ratio

GHG: Green House Gases