Investigation of the Oxidation Zone in a Biomass two-stage downdraft Gasifier
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ABSTRACT

The partial combustion in a two-stage downdraft gasifier is critical for the process optimisation. Flame temperature and residence time of gas in the hot zone are indeed determining for tar cracking, the major issue in gasification. This paper presents a CFD model of the oxidation zone. Chemical reactions, including tar cracking, are treated by the “EDC” model (homogeneous reactions). Fluid flows are turbulent and simulated by the k-ε RNG turbulence model.

The validation of the model is done with the DTU 100 kW two-stage gasifier. Results fit satisfactory the data, regarding the temperature profile.
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NOMENCLATURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Concentration [kmol. m⁻³]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c_p</td>
<td>Specific heat [J. kg⁻¹. K⁻¹]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Diameter [m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D₀,ᵣ</td>
<td>Molar diffusion coefficient [kmol. m⁻³]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eₐ</td>
<td>Activation energy [J. kmol⁻¹]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Heat transfer coefficient [W. m⁻². K⁻¹]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h₀</td>
<td>Standard state enthalpy [J.kg⁻¹]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Radiative intensity [W. m⁻³]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Thermal conductivity [W. m⁻². K⁻¹]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kₙ</td>
<td>Frequency factor [s⁻¹]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k_c</td>
<td>Arrhenius kinetic rate [s⁻¹]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k_m</td>
<td>Mass diffusion coefficient [kg.m².s⁻¹]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Mass [kg]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Molar weight [kg. kmol⁻¹]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Index of refraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Pressure [Pa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Ideal gas constant [8 314 J. kmol⁻¹]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R₀,ᵣ</td>
<td>Homogeneous reaction rate [kg. m⁻³.s⁻¹]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Temperature [K]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>Axial velocity [m.s⁻¹]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>Radial velocity [m.s⁻¹]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Axial coordinate [m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Mass fraction, ( \frac{m_i}{m_{total}} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greek Letters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>Absorption coefficient [m⁻¹]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αᵣₚ</td>
<td>Inverse of the turbulent Prandtl number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εₘ</td>
<td>Emissivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ</td>
<td>Hydraulic diameter [m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ν</td>
<td>Kinematic viscosity [m². s⁻¹]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>Density [kg. m⁻³]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σₛ</td>
<td>Scattering coefficient [m⁻¹]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ</td>
<td>Boltzman constant [5.67×10⁻⁸ W.m⁻².K⁻⁴]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTRODUCTION

The energy crisis of the 1970s sparked a renewed interest in biomass gasification systems. Nowadays environmental concerns are questioning the continued use of fossil fuels and the need for sustainable energy production has prompted new research into the possibility of gasification as a key source of energy production.

Gasification is a thermal process converting biomass feedstock into a mixture of gases that can be burnt in boilers, internal combustion engines and gas turbines.

If well designed, gasification allows an environmentally friendly energy production. Furthermore, it can help reducing the "waste disposal" constraints by using it as a feedstock to convert it into useful and valued product.

Biomass is indeed a particular kind of fuel. Its price is fixed by the collecting expenses. That is why small-scale installations are well adapted to this market. They allow valorising wastes directly on their production location.

In these perspectives downdraft gasifiers present indisputable advantages [1]. A traditional example is presented in Figure 1 [2]. In current pilots called two-stage, drying/pyrolysis and combustion/reduction zones are physically separated. This low tar level technology only requires a small gas-cleaning unit to prevent engine fouling problems [3]. Furthermore it is well adapted to turnover and biomass diversity. Finally its utilisation is relatively easy and can be highly automated.

However available kinetics data and the theoretical comprehension of the physical phenomena remain still insufficient to build a general accurate model.

This paper presents a tool for validating two-stage downdraft gasifier design. In this type of installation, temperature field in the partial oxidation zone is crucial. Indeed gas produced during pyrolysis must pass through a hot uniform zone to crack satisfactorily tar, the main issue of gasifier. As a result, reactor diameter, throat shape and nozzle geometry have to be well designed in order to ensure an optimum process.

A CFD model is used to simulate the complex phenomena occurring in the partial oxidation zone. It includes detailed chemical mechanism with tar cracking, heat transfer with radiation and turbulent fluid flow.

Vijeu’s pyrolysis model [4] is used to determine input pyrolysis gas composition, given in Table 1 at a temperature of 650°C. Results are then validated with the experimental data get from the DTU 100 kWth two-stage gasifier [5,6]. They are finally discussed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO</th>
<th>CO₂</th>
<th>H₂</th>
<th>H₂O</th>
<th>CH₄</th>
<th>C₆H₆</th>
<th>C₁₀H₈</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35a</td>
<td>20.8a</td>
<td>2.4a</td>
<td>7.2a</td>
<td>9.6a</td>
<td>8.7a</td>
<td>16.3b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Pyrolysis gas composition (mass %)

a: calculated by Vijeu’s pyrolysis model [4]  
b: estimated [3,7]

MODEL

The model is divided into three parts: fluid flow, chemical mechanism and heat transfer. Model equations are listed in Table 2. Figure 2 shows model geometry and boundary conditions.

Fluid flow

Air is injected into the reactor through three injectors with five nozzles each. Reynolds number is around 2,000 at the air injector nozzles. The flow may thus be turbulent in this zone. Moreover velocity pattern is complex as recirculation may occur.

A detailed turbulence model is thus required to simulate these phenomena. After a preliminary sensitivity study, the RNG k-ε model was chosen.
Pyrolysis gas + steam inlet

\[ u = 0.52 \text{ m/s}, \text{ turbulence intensity: } 3\%, \ T=650^\circ \text{C}, \text{ hydraulic diameter: } \phi = 0.26 \text{ m}. \]

Air inlet

\[ v = 0.56 \text{ m/s} \]

\[ \text{Turbulence intensity: } 1\% \]

\[ T=450^\circ \text{C} \]

\[ \phi = 0.1 \text{ m} \]

Wall heat transfer

Convective heat transfer coefficient: \( h=8 \text{ W.m}^{-2}.\text{K}^{-1} \)

Insulation: 100 mm

External emissivity: 0.1

Figure 2: Model geometry

as the best compromise between accuracy and efficiency. It is also adequate for laminar flow that may develop inside the gasifier.

Wall boundary conditions are simulated by a low Reynolds number approach [8]. Solid phase is modelled by a Lagrangian particles tracking.

Chemical mechanism

The chemical mechanism consists in five oxidation reactions (1-5) and the water-gas shift reaction (6).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{CO} + 0.5 \text{ O}_2 & \rightarrow \text{ CO}_2 & (1) \\
\text{CH}_4 + 1.5 \text{ O}_2 & \rightarrow \text{ CO} + 2 \text{ H}_2\text{O} & (2) \\
\text{H}_2 + 0.5 \text{ O}_2 & \rightarrow \text{ H}_2\text{O} & (3) \\
\text{C}_6\text{H}_6 + 4.5 \text{ O}_2 & \rightarrow 6 \text{ CO} + 3 \text{ H}_2\text{O} & (4) \\
\text{C}_{10}\text{H}_8 + 7 \text{ O}_2 & \rightarrow 10 \text{ CO} + 4 \text{ H}_2\text{O} & (5) \\
\text{CO} + \text{ H}_2\text{O} & \rightarrow \text{ CO}_2 + \text{ H}_2 & (6)
\end{align*}
\]

Arrhenius rate is calculated from equation (7).

\[
k_c = k_v e^{-\frac{E_a}{RT}} [A]^a [B]^b
\]

Constants are taken from literature. They are listed in Table 3. The reverse term of (6) is obtained by a free Gibbs energy variation method.

Tars are modelled as a simplification of Jess works [9]. Pyrolysis, as it is slow and long, is considered to produce only secondary tar compounds, represented by benzene, and tertiary tar compounds, represented by naphthalene.

Naphthalene is indeed one of the main component of tar and 6C ring hydrocarbons are considered as the key component of thermal decomposition of aromatic hydrocarbon [9].

Further model development should include oxygenated hydrocarbons as phenol, whose concentration is not negligible particularly in steam gasification [10].

Initial tar concentration is extrapolated from literature data [3,7]. Methane includes C2 compounds as ethane and ethylene. Tars are considered to be thermally cracked and to form soot. Figure 2 shows the tar evolution mechanism. The kinetics constants of the five reactions are taken from Jess [9,11].

As flow is turbulent, it must be taken in consideration in the chemical reaction model. The chosen model, called “Eddy Dissipation Concept” model [12], calculates also Arrhenius rate at the turbulence time scale (18). It seems to suit well to this kind of reactive flow [13].

Besides it is observed that particles residence time is relatively short (<1s) in a two-stage downdraft gasifier. As a consequence heterogeneous reactions are negligible in the oxidation zone, as oxygen reacts far quicker with gas phase.

Heat transfer

As temperature exceeds 1000°C in the reactor core, heat transfer by radiation is predominant. They are simulated by the Discrete Ordinates model [14], a four-flux method. It integrates the Radiative Transfer Equation (13). As a result a source term \( S_{f} \) due to radiative transfer is included in the energy equation (12). \( S_{f} \) also includes the heat of the chemical reactions from equation (8).

\[
S_{f,r} = - \sum_{i} \( \frac{h_{f,i}^{0}}{M_{i}} + \int_{T_{i}}^{T} c_{p,i,j}dT \) R_{j,r}
\]

The absorption coefficient of the fluid phase is computed by the cell-based Weighted-Sum-of-Gray-Gases model [15]. It only takes into account the concentration of CO2 and H2O.
Heat transfer from fluid to solid phase is calculated by equation (9).

\[ m_p C_p \frac{dT_p}{dt} = h A_p (T_\infty - T_p) - \frac{dm_p}{dt} H_r + A_p \varepsilon_p \sigma (T^4 - T_p^4) \]  

**Numerical solution**

A segregated solver solves sequentially the continuity, momentum (Navier-Stokes equations), energy, radiation and species equations (N-1 equations for N species).

Governing equations are converted to algebraic equations that can be solved numerically by a control-volume-based technique through a power-law scheme [16]. SIMPLE algorithm couples velocity and pressure [17].

Simulation is 2D axisymmetric. In this purpose, the air injector, which is composed of five cylinders with three nozzles each, is considered as annular. Flowrate and injection surface area are conserved. Thus momentum is also conserved. Previous studies showed that this analogy was correct in this kind of problem [18]. However swirl neglecting may be a source of error.

The unstructured grid is composed of 20,000 cells. Meshing tests have been performed from 5,000 to 30,000 cells to insure independence of results. Simulation is considered as converged when residuals remain constant at a value below $10^{-5}$ ($10^{-4}$ for momentum). The calculation time is approximately fifty hours on a 3.2 GHz computer.

\[ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla (\rho \mathbf{v}) = S_m \]  

**Mass**

\[ \frac{\partial (\rho \mathbf{v})}{\partial t} + \nabla (\rho \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{v}) = -\nabla p + \rho \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{F} \]  

**Momentum**

\[ \frac{\partial (\rho E)}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v} (\rho E + p)) = \nabla \cdot \left[ \kappa_{\text{eff}} \nabla T - \left( \sum_j h_u J_j \right) + (\mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{v}) \right] + S_f \]  

**Energy**

\[ \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v} (\rho E + p)) = \nabla \cdot \left[ \kappa_{\text{eff}} \nabla T - \left( \sum_j h_u J_j \right) + (\mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{v}) \right] + S_f \]  

with \( \kappa_{\text{eff}} = \alpha_p \mu_{\text{eff}} C_p \) [8]

Radiative transfer

\[ \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v} (\rho E + p)) = \nabla \cdot \left[ \kappa_{\text{eff}} \nabla T - \left( \sum_j h_u J_j \right) + (\mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{v}) \right] + S_f \]  

Homogeneous reaction rate

\[ R_{i,r} = \frac{(\xi^*)^2 \chi}{\tau^*} (Y_i^* - Y_i) \]  

With \( \xi^* = C_\xi \left( \frac{\nu e}{k^*} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \); \( \tau^* = C_\tau \left( \frac{\nu}{e} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \); \( \chi = \frac{\rho}{[1 - (\xi^*)^3]} \); \( C_\xi = 2,1377 \); \( C_\tau = 0,4082 \).

**Table 2: Governing equations**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>( k_s ) ((s^{-1}))</th>
<th>( E_a ) ((J.kmol^{-1}))</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1.3 \times 10^{11} \times [H_2O]^{0.5})</td>
<td>(1.256 \times 10^8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Shin [19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4.4 \times 10^{11})</td>
<td>(1.2552 \times 10^8)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Jones [20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4.462 \times 10^{12})</td>
<td>(4.2 \times 10^7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Di Blasi [21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(2.4 \times 10^{11})</td>
<td>(1.2552 \times 10^8)</td>
<td>1(^a)</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>Westbrook [22]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(9.2 \times 10^6 \times T)</td>
<td>(8 \times 10^7)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Di Blasi [21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(124.03)</td>
<td>(1.26 \times 10^7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Di Blasi [21]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\): modified (see Results & Discussion)

Table 3: Reference value for kinetic constants

![Diagram of tar cracking mechanism](image)

**EXPERIMENTAL**

**Facilities**

The plant is a two-stage gasifier built at DTU with a thermal input of 100 kW. It consists of following components: propane heated pyrolysis unit, partial oxidation zone, air preheater, steam feeder and char bed lying on a movable grate [6]. It is showed in Figure 3.

![Diagram of 100 kWth two-stage gasifier](image)

**Operating conditions**

Experiments are performed with wood chips. Wood moisture is 26.5% of the total mass and the wood elementary formula is \(\text{CH}_{1.4515}\text{O}_{0.66}\). Operating conditions are reported in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Temperature field inside the reactor was investigated through two different techniques. A rod equipped with nine thermocouples measures the temperature along the vertical axis. It is movable and thus can inspect the radial temperature profile. Secondly an infra red detector and a suction pyrometer are used to measure axial temperature in the symmetry axis. Gas was analysed at the end of the process, i.e. after the reduction zone. Tar level is below 25 mg/Nm\(^3\). The final dry gas composition is in volume-%: 17 CO, 17 CO\(_2\), 2 CH\(_4\), 32 H\(_2\) and 32 N\(_2\). The soot particles concentration is around 450 mg/Nm\(^3\) at the exit.

**RESULTS & DISCUSSION**

**Temperature field**

The Figure 4 shows the comparison of the temperature profile along the vertical axis between the infrared measurement and the simulation.
results. It fits satisfactorily the experimental data, although temperature is slightly overestimated. It may be partially due to an overestimation of the gas pyrolysis heating value.

Figure 4: Comparison modele/experiences results

Temperature field is shown in Figure 5. The reaction heat is released mainly close to the injector. It induces a very hot zone in this area.

Figure 5: Temperature field inside the reactor

The uncertainties of measure and the operating conditions make the comparisons between experience and simulation difficult. Indeed gasification is not a totally steady-state process. Inlet gas composition may for example vary strongly with time, as pyrolysis is also not fully stable. The effects of pyrolysis unsteadiness are studied later.

Flow pattern

The air velocity at the nozzle outlet is around 48 m/s, as the constriction accelerates the air. It implies fully developed turbulence in the flow and recirculations. These latter are shown in Figure 6.

Figure 6: Axial velocity inside the reactor

Effect of the injection surface area

The injection surface area influences strongly the flow. Smaller nozzles induce higher air radial velocity but also higher axial gas velocity. As a result air penetrates deeper in the reactor, temperature is thus more uniform than with bigger nozzles. In the latter case the very hot zone located close to the wall is bigger. Temperature along the axis is shown in Figure 7.

Figure 7: Axial temperature with different nozzles

The injector should also be carefully designed. A low opening area will induce better mixing and higher turbulence rate, necessary for a good combustion, but high gas velocity and thus smaller residence time too. This tool is also useful to find the best compromise to optimise the process.
Unsteady-state effects

The pyrolysis unsteady effects on temperature profile have been studied with the model. Figure 8 shows a comparison of the axial temperature in the standard case, with 10% lower pyrolysis gas flowrate and with two different pyrolysis gas compositions – poorer and richer, respectively +/- 20% [CO], [H₂], [CH₄], +/- the difference [CO₂]. It is observed that instabilities influence significantly the process. They should also be taken into account during a gasifier conception.

Chemical model discussion

The simulated final gas composition, summarised in Table 5, is in good agreement with experimental observations. Reduction reactions indeed convert water and char to hydrogen and carbon monoxide, diluting the mixture. Moreover the water-gas shift reaction, catalysed by the char bed, modifies the mixture composition.

It will be used in a future study as input for a reduction model to obtain a complete gasification model and then to compare numerical and experimental gas composition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>CO₂</th>
<th>H₂</th>
<th>CH₄</th>
<th>N₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor gas</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich gas</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low flowrate</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Final gas dry composition (volume %)

The modelling of competitive combustion reactions in an oxygen-limiting environment presents two main difficulties.
Firstly kinetic data are often determined for complete oxidation. Uniform sources have thus to be find or adaptations to be made.
That is why the –0.1 coefficient for benzene in its oxidation reaction (5) has been switched to 1. It implied furthermore heavy problems of solution convergence. Moreover the mechanism is very stiff and it is difficult to make it converged. It requires much time and precautions.

Besides the attempt of tar modelling is not a complete success. Naphthalene is reduced by a 5 factor during the process. It is far from the experimental results in similar case, which shows a decrease by a 100 factor. This difference can be partially explained by the neglecting of swirl effects. Residence time in simulation is thus lower than in reality.

The kinetic constants appear also to be uncertain. As already observed by Morf [10], naphthalene conversion to soot is negligible with rate of [5] used in this study. It means that either different pathways to produce soot exist or that the kinetic constants, calculated for coke-oven gas, are not adapted to biomass gasification.

To verify the later hypothesis, a try with a first order rate from Diesel combustion [23] has been performed. Naphthalene conversion to soot is then complete, whereas it was negligible with previous rate. Further kinetic study is thus required.

CONCLUSION

The oxidation zone of a two-stage downdraft gasifier has been simulated by a 2D CFD model. It takes into account turbulence, detailed chemical mechanism including tars and heat transfer.
Results fit satisfactorily to the experimental data regarding temperature pattern. However tar model requires further investigation.
Simulations enlightened several crucial point of the process:

- injector design is fundamental in gasification;
- pyrolysis unsteadiness influences significantly the process;
- kinetic data adapted to the process should be determined to ensure the tar model precision.
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