List of Figures

Figure No.	Title	Page
1.1	Classification of renewable energy resources [3].	4
1.2	Overview of the different gasification technologies, (Source: BIOS, 2010) [6].	7
1.3	Range of biomass gasifiers according to its applicability [5].	7
1.4	Schematic of downdraft gasifier system with temperature profile [5].	8
1.5	Shows the schematic diagram of primary filtration method.	12
1.6	Shows the schematic diagram of secondary filtration method.	12
1.7	Shows the block diagram of catalyst preparation process.	15
1.8	Shows the XRD report of nickel catalyst coating on Al_2O_3.	16
1.9	Shows the single layer catalyst coating in an alumina based circular hole perforated filters.	17
2.1	Downdraft gasifier system, an experimental setup for obtaining producer gas using solid biomass feedstock as a fuel. It is installed at IIT (BHU).	36
2.2	Air nozzle of downdraft gasifier system.	38

2.3	Quality gas test at chimney. The producer gas flame colour is an indication of its quality. At the beginning of the operation, the producer gas flame colour was misty red this is due to the presence of unburned gases, but later on, the flame colour turned uniformly dense red colour at the steady-state condition.	38
2.4	Dual fuel running diesel engine.	41
2.5	Main supply panel of downdraft gasifier system for operating pump and motor which is attached with gasifier system.	42
2.6	Gas chromatograph is used for measuring the different gas compounds present in the producer gas.	43
2.7	(a) Bomb calorimeter unit with display unit. (b) Combustion chamber unit of Bomb calorimeter. Equipment is used for calculating the calorific value of feedstock, Model- *BCM*, Voltage required- 230 V.	43
2.8	Schematic diagram of downdraft gasifier setup.	44
2.9	Coconut shell used as a solid biomass feedstock in downdraft gasifier system for obtained producer gas.	45
2.10	Dalbergia Sisoo used as a solid biomass feedstock in downdraft gasifier system for obtained producer gas.	47
2.11	Shows the variation of Time Vs 20 ml diesel fuel consumption at varying loads; *0 kW, 1 kW, 2 kW,3 kW and 4 kW*.	55
2.12	Shows the variation of time Vs 20 *ml* of diesel fuel consumption when producer gas is simultaneously supplied with diesel to run a dual-fuelled diesel engine at varying load;	55

0 kW, 1 kW, 2 kW,3 kW and *4 kW*. Producer gas obtained from the wood feedstock.

2.13 Shows the variation of time Vs 20 *ml* of diesel fuel consumption when producer gas is simultaneously supplied with diesel to run a dual-fuelled diesel engine at varying load; *0 kW, 1 kW, 2 kW,3 kW* and *4 kW*. Producer gas obtained from the wood + 10 wt.% *CaO* feedstock. 56

2.14 Shows the variation of time Vs 20 *ml* of diesel fuel consumption when producer gas is simultaneously supplied with diesel to run a dual-fuelled diesel engine at varying load; *0 kW, 1 kW, 2 kW,3 kW* and *4 kW*. Producer gas obtained from the coconut shell feedstock. 56

2.15 Shows the variation of time Vs 20 *ml* of diesel fuel consumption when producer gas is simultaneously supplied with diesel to run a dual-fuelled diesel engine at varying load; *0 kW, 1 kW, 2 kW,3 kW* and *4 kW*. Producer gas obtained from the coconut shell + 10 wt.% *CaO* feedstock. 57

2.16 Shows the variation of time Vs external load for a fixed 20 *ml* fuel consumption. 57

2.17 Shows the variation between the % reduction in diesel consumption Vs external varying load; *0 kW, 1 kW, 2 kW, 3 kW* and 4 *kW*. Producer gas is obtained from wood, wood + 10 wt. % *CaO*, Coconut shell and Coconut shell + 10 wt. % *CaO*. 67

2.18 Shows the cost of unit energy production when dual fuelled diesel engine run by diesel, diesel with producer gas at varying 67

	external load; *0 kW, 1 kW, 2 kW, 3 kW* and *4 kW*. The producer gas obtained from wood, wood + 10 wt. % *CaO*, Coconut shell and Coconut shell + 10 wt. % *CaO*.	
2.19	Primary method used for tar reduction [8].	72
2.20	Classification of catalysts [7].	73
2.21	(a) Filter paper containing tar, feedstock- Wood. (b) Filter paper containing tar, feedstock- wood + 10 wt.% *CaO*.	75
2.22	(a) Filter paper containing tar, feedstock- Coconut shell. (b) Filter paper containing tar, feedstock- Coconut shell + 10 wt.% *CaO*.	75
2.23	Shows the tar reduction (gm/min) when calcium oxide (as a catalyst) is mixed with the feedstock – Wood, Wood + 10 wt. % CaO and Coconut shell, Coconut shell + 10 wt. % CaO.	76
2.24	Shows the average time taken for diesel consumption at different load conditions.	79
3.1	Dust production v/s Gas production [1].	84
3.2	Schematic of cyclone separator.	85
3.3	Theoretical and actual grade efficiency curve [7].	87
3.4	Cyclone separator in-built with gasifier system.	88
3.5	Photograph of anemometer to measure the velocity of gas flowing through pipe.	89
3.6	Photograph of digital temperature indicator to measure the temperature of gas flowing through pipe.	89
3.7	Photograph of U-tube manometer to measure the pressure drop across the cyclone separator.	90

3.8	(a) Filter paper containing ash particles at inlet. (b) Filter paper containing ash particles at outlet.	91
3.9	Schematic of cyclone separator [9].	94
3.10	Shows the cyclone collection efficiency for different feedstocks (Experimental).	100
3.11	Shows the variation of cyclone pressure drop Vs different feedstock used for gasification.	100
3.12	Shows the comparison of particle size efficiency between experimental and empirical model when producer gas is obtained from the wood feedstock.	101
3.13	Shows the comparison of particle size efficiency between experimental and empirical model when producer gas is obtained from the wood + 10 wt. % *CaO* feedstock.	101
3.14	Shows the comparison of particle size efficiency between experimental and empirical model when producer gas is obtained from the coconut shell feedstock.	102
3.15	Shows the comparison of particle size efficiency between experimental and empirical model when producer gas is obtained from the coconut shell + 10 wt. % *CaO* feedstock.	102
3.16	Experimental setup of biodiesel production unit by transesterification method installed in IIT (BHU). 1) Caustic mixing tank, 2) Reactor, 3) Condenser, 4) Receiver, 5) Washing tank, 6) Wash water holder, 7) Centrifugal pump, 8) Reciprocating pump, 9) Storage tank.	108

3.17	(a) Experimental setup for capillary flow viscometer installed in IIT (BHU), (b) Schematic representation. 1) Pressure gauge, 2) Receiver, 3) Air compressor unit, 4) Capillary tube, 5) Collecting beaker, 6) Pressure regulator, 7) Inlet pipe.	109
3.18	Block diagram representation of experimental setup of bomb calorimeter.	110
3.19	Experimental setup of variable compression ratio engine installed in IIT (BHU). (a) # 1) Reservoir, 2) Oil level, 3) Load application knob, 4) Rotameter, 5) Speed, 6) Load indicator. (b) # 1) Exhaust pipe, 2) Flywheel housing, 3) Dynamometer, 4) Water pipe.	111
3.20	Block diagram representation of biodiesel transesterification unit.	112
3.21	Soyabean methyl ester preparation, (a) Catalyst *NaOH* in 1% (w/v) of oil i.e. 50 *grams*. (b) Reactant methanol in 1:6 alcohol to oil ratio i.e. 833 *ml*. (c) Mixture of *NaOH* and methanol obtained by continuous stirring. (d) Soyabean oil.	113
3.22	Soyabean methyl ester preparation, (e) Pouring of reactants and catalyst into the reactor. (f) Reaction temperature maintained at 75^{o}C - 80^{o}C with the help of a heating element.	114
3.23	Soyabean methyl ester preparation, (g) & (h) Separation of glycerol from Soyabean methyl ester after 28 hours of undisturbed condition.	114
3.24	Block diagram representation of experimental procedure for measuring viscosity.	115

3.25	Graph between log of shear stress and log of shear rate.	118
3.26	Viscosity measuring process, (a) Reservoir containing the Soyabean biodiesel, (b) Pressure greater than atmospheric pressure (c) Atmospheric pressure, (d) SBME collection in beaker at different pressure in a stipulated time period.	119
3.27	Block diagram representation of experimental procedure for measuring calorific value from bomb calorimeter.	120
3.28	Block diagram representation of experimental procedure to measure the emissions of B10, B20 and B30 biodiesel blends with various loads and compression ratios.	122
3.29	Variation of kinematic viscosity with the storage time.	126
3.30	Variation of calorific value with storage time.	127
3.31	Variation of carbon monoxide emission with various loads at different compression ratios for B10 Soyabean biodiesel blend.	129
3.32	Variation of hydrocarbon emission with various loads at different compression ratios for B10 Soyabean biodiesel blend.	130
3.33	Variation of nitrogen monoxide emission with various loads at different compression ratios for B10 Soyabean biodiesel blend.	130
3.34	Variation of carbon dioxide emission with various loads at different compression ratios for B10 Soyabean biodiesel blend.	131
3.35	Variation of oxygen emission with various loads at different compression ratios for B10 Soyabean biodiesel blend.	131
3.36	Variation of carbon monoxide emission with various loads at different compression ratios for B20 Soyabean biodiesel blend.	133

3.37	Variation of hydrocarbon emission with various loads at different compression ratios for B20 Soyabean biodiesel blend.	133
3.38	Variation of nitrogen monoxide emission with various loads at different compression ratios for B20 Soyabean biodiesel blend.	134
3.39	Variation of carbon dioxide emission with various loads at different compression ratios for B20 Soyabean biodiesel blend.	134
3.40	Variation of oxygen emission with various loads at different compression ratios for B20 Soyabean biodiesel blend.	135
3.41	Variation of carbon monoxide emission with various loads at different compression ratios for B30 Soyabean biodiesel blend.	136
3.42	Variation of hydrocarbon emission with various loads at different compression ratios for B30 Soyabean biodiesel blend.	136
3.43	Variation of nitrogen monoxide emission with various loads at different compression ratios for B30 Soyabean biodiesel blend.	137
3.44	Variation of carbon dioxide emission with various loads at different compression ratios for B30 Soyabean biodiesel blend.	137
3.45	Variation of oxygen emission with various loads at different compression ratios for B30 Soyabean biodiesel blend.	138
4.1	Schematic diagram of a multi-stage (4-stage in this figure) filter design show the parameter details.	146
4.2	Schematic diagram for Euler number variation vs. Reynolds number. In self-similarity region, *Eu* is independent of *Re.*	146
4.3	Figure 4.3: Schematic diagram of the experimental setup showing the various stages of filtration process of the gasification system. After the gasifier unit, contaminated gases	148

	are feed into the filtration unit after which it is feed to the power generation unit. Gas inlet; 1) Toggle valve for gas quality test, 2) Pressure gauge, 3) Ball valve for flow regulation, 4) Temperature indicator, 5) Water cooling jacket. Gas outlet; 1) Water cooling jacket, 2) Temperature indicator, 3) Pressure gauge, 4) Toggle valve for gas quality test, 5) Ball valve for flow regulation.	
4.4	Experimental setup of the filtration unit. Proportional integral controller (PID).	149
4.5	Multi-stage filter design with circular holes.	149
4.6	Computational flow domain showing one stage filter system to 5-stages. All dimensions are in *mm*.	151
4.7	Front view of the honeycomb substrate of hole geometry (a) triangular (b) circular (c) square and (d) hexagonal. Different hole was obtained (shown right) while volume was kept constant.	152
4.8	Geometrical parameters of experimental setup, as in [8]. All dimensions are in millimeters.	156
4.9	Pressure contours at a cross section for different designs of filter holes. Notice that triangular hole shows highly non-uniform pressure distributions.	157
4.10	Velocity contours at a cross section for different hole geometry. The corresponding pressure contours are shown in Figure 4.9.	158
4.11	Variation of static pressure with axial distance for single honeycomb substrate with thickness ratio t/d_h = 1.67.	159

4.12	Variation of static pressure with axial distance for single honeycomb substrate with thickness ratio t/d_h = 3.33.	159
4.13	Variation of local velocity with axial distance for single honeycomb substrate with thickness ratio t/d_h = 1.67.	161
4.14	Variation of local velocity with axial distance for single honeycomb substrate with thickness ratio t/d_h = 3.33.	161
4.15	Effect of multiple filters for a specific type of designs for a constant thickness ratio and porosity (both marked in the figure). Figure shows the static pressure variation with axial distance for equilateral triangular hole.	163
4.16	Effect of multiple filters for a specific type of designs for a constant thickness ratio and porosity (both marked in the figure). Figure shows the static pressure variation with axial distance for circular hole.	163
4.17	Effect of multiple filters for a specific type of designs for a constant thickness ratio and porosity (both marked in the figure). Figure shows the static pressure variation with axial distance for square hole.	164
4.18	Effect of multiple filters for a specific type of designs for a constant thickness ratio and porosity (both marked in the figure). Figure shows the static pressure variation with axial distance for hexagonal hole.	`164
4.19	Effect of multiple filters for a specific type of designs for a constant thickness ratio and porosity (both marked in the	165

figure). Figure shows the variations in local velocity with axial distance for circular hole geometry.

4.20 Effect of multiple filters for a specific type of designs for a constant thickness ratio and porosity (both marked in the figure). Figure shows the variations in local velocity with axial distance for square hole geometry. 165

4.21 Comparison of Euler number for different number of filters having circular, hexagonal, square and equilateral triangle hole for fixed value of relative thickness t/d_h = 1.67 with porosity β = 0.235 and *Re* = 29110. 166

4.22 Comparison of Euler number for different number of filters having circular, hexagonal, square and equilateral triangle hole for fixed value of relative thickness t/d_h = 3.33 with porosity β = 0.235 and *Re* = 29110. 166

4.23 A plot of ln(Eu) versus ln(N) for filtration unit with circular holes. 168

4.24 Comparison of prediction data from the developed correlation with the *CFD* data. It can be seen that the derived correlation predicts the data well. 169

A.1 Flow chart of methodology adopted for the present work. 196