

Indirect vs. Direct Gasification

A. van der Drift
G. Aranda Almansa
B.J. Vreugdenhil
H.J.M. Visser
C.F. Mourao Vilela
C.M. van der Meijden

September 2013 ECN-L--13-063



INDIRECT *vs.* DIRECT GASIFICATION

Bram van der Drift, Guadalupe Aranda, Berend Vreugdenhil, Rian Visser, Carlos Vilela, Christiaan van der Meijden

4 September 2013

www.ecn.nl

GASIFICATION



matching energy consumption and production



SECOND GENERATION *also called: indirect gasification*





gasification:

fuel + air (λ ~0.3) \rightarrow gas + char/soke

GASIFICATION generations

First generation (=direct)

- One reactor, one gas
- N₂-free gas requires ASU
- Incomplete carbon conversion
- High temperature, high steam, small fuel size, large residence time needed for acceptable conversion



Second generation (=indirect)

- Two coupled reactors, two gases
- N₂-free gas without ASU
- Complete carbon conversion
- Additional degree of freedom: temperature, steam, fuel size, residence time





IN OTHER WORDS *Generature (better efficiency, higher conversion*



MILENA TECHNOLOGY indirect gasification technology by ECN



ECN



INDIRECT GASIFICATION

- Energy transport between the two reactors
- Bed material takes carbon from gasifier to combustor
 - Char flows with bed material
 - Tars adsorb on (porous) bed material
 - CO₂ transport through carbonates
- Bed material can take oxygen from combustor to gasifier



OXYGEN TRANSPORT description of the tests

- Bubbling Fluidized Bed
- Olivine bed material (containing Fe)
- Clean wood fuel, 0.25 kg/h
- 880°C, 1 kg bed
- Two tests:
 - Test 1: only gasification
 - Test 2: intermittent gasification/combustion, 100 minutes cycle





OXYGEN TRANSPORT description of the tests





OXYGEN TRANSPORT gas composition





Test 2

OXYGEN TRANSPORT tars (by SPA method)





OXYGEN TRANSPORT oxygen quantity







COMPARED TO MILENA



MILENA operating conditions are equivalent to the initial point of maximum CO₂: olivine is kept at high oxygen transport capacity



OXYGEN TRANSPORT compared to MILENA





CONCLUSIONS

- Indirect gasification offers degree of freedom compared to direct gasification, since unconverted carbon is not a loss: temperature
- Freedom to operate at low temperature means fuel flexibility
- Bed material in indirect gasification can transport oxygen through chemical looping
- This may add up to an ER of 0.2-0.3 during first few minutes of reduction
- This theoretically can supply all the required energy for gasification
- This also reduces tar:
 - By direct combustion of adsorbed tars on surface where iron reduces (O donor)
 - By increased gas phase reforming because of increased CO₂ and H₂O concentration
- MILENA is operated with fast reduction/short residence time: maximum oxygen transport



THANKS FOR THE ATTENTION

Bram van der Drift

ECN

| Westerduinweg 3 | P.O. Box 1 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1755 LE Petten | 1755 ZG Petten |
| The Netherlands | The Netherlands |

| T +31 224 56 45 15 | vanderdrift@ecn.nl |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| M +31 610 909 927 | www.ecn.nl |

publications: www.ecn.nl/publications fuel composition database: www.phyllis.nl tar dew point calculator: www.thersites.nl IEA bioenergy/gasification: www.ieatask33.org Milena indirect gasifier: www.milenatechnology.com OLGA: www.olgatechnology.com / www.renewableenergy.nl SNG: www.bioSNG.com /www.bioCNG.com



ECN

Westerduinweg 3 1755 LE Petten The Netherlands P.O. Box 1 1755 LG Petten The Netherlands

T +31 88 515 4949 F +31 88 515 8338 info@ ecn.nl www.ecn.nl