



European Aviation Safety Agency

*Research Project EASA.2008/6*

# SloBiA - Safety Implication of Biofuels in Aviation

## **Disclaimer**

This study has been carried out for the European Aviation Safety Agency by an external organization and expresses the opinion of the organization undertaking the study. It is provided for information purposes only and the views expressed in the study have not been adopted, endorsed or in any way approved by the European Aviation Safety Agency. Consequently it should not be relied upon as a statement, as any form of warranty, representation, undertaking, contractual, or other commitment binding in law upon the European Aviation Safety Agency.

Ownership of all copyright and other intellectual property rights in this material including any documentation, data and technical information, remains vested to the European Aviation Safety Agency. All logo, copyrights, trademarks, and registered trademarks that may be contained within are the property of their respective owners.

Reproduction of this study, in whole or in part, is permitted under the condition that the full body of this Disclaimer remains clearly and visibly affixed at all times with such reproduced part.

# SAFETY IMPLICATION OF BIOFUELS IN AVIATION

**Thomas Esch**  
**Harald Funke**  
**Peter Roosen**

**Aachen University of Applied Sciences**

**EASA Report No. EASA.2008.C51**

**compilation date July 7, 2010**

## **Keywords**

General Aviation, safety, gasoline, petrol, ethanol, blending, biofuels, MOGAS, AVGAS, E-0, E-5, E-10, E-15, aircraft airworthiness, water, solved water detection, gasoline mixing, volatility, vapour pressure, vapour locking, long-term storage, material compatibility, carburettor icing, gasoline turbidity, phase separation, life-cycle analysis



# Contents

<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>1 Introduction and Outline of Work</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>2 Summary and Recommendations</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>3 Operating Existing Engines with Ethanol-Admixed Fuels</b>	<b>17</b>
3.1 Definition of an “Old” Engine . . . . .	17
3.2 Survey of Aircraft Frames and Engines Authorized for MOGAS Operation . . . . .	17
3.3 Legislative and Practical Boundary Conditions for Biogenic Components Admixing	21
3.3.1 Usage Statistics of Various Fuel Types . . . . .	23
3.4 Aircraft Fitness for Ethanol Admixtures . . . . .	25
<b>4 Determination of the Status Quo in General Aviation</b>	<b>26</b>
4.1 Gasoline Types . . . . .	26
4.1.1 Historic Development of Gasolines and their Alcohol Admixtures . . . . .	26
4.1.2 Prevailing Legal Boundary Conditions and Norms for Vehicle Gasolines . . . . .	28
4.1.3 Assessment of Knocking Properties for Gasolines by Octane Numbers . . . . .	32
4.2 Synoptical Statistical Data on General Aviation (T 1) . . . . .	35
<b>5 Scientific and Technical Boundary Conditions for Ethanol-Admixed Gasoline Usage in Aviation (T 1)</b>	<b>38</b>
5.1 Water-Induced Phase Separation in Gasoline-Ethanol Mixtures . . . . .	38
5.2 Vapour Locking Potential of Mixtures of Ethanol-Admixed Gasolines . . . . .	43
5.3 Evaporation Enthalpy Effects . . . . .	47
5.4 Compatibility of Fuel System and Engine Materials with Ethanol Content in Fuel . . . . .	48
5.4.1 Metallic components . . . . .	49
5.4.2 Plastics, Elastomers and Glues . . . . .	50
<b>6 Assessment of Danger Potentials Attributed to Gasoline Ethanol Admixtures</b>	<b>51</b>
6.1 Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (T 7) . . . . .	51
6.1.1 Methodology and Approach . . . . .	51
6.1.2 Overall Results of the Failure Mode and Effects Analysis . . . . .	53
6.1.3 FMEA Conclusions . . . . .	61
6.2 Task Spanning Activities for Experimentation . . . . .	63

6.3	Analysis of Phase Separation Hazard (T 2a, 2c)	64
6.3.1	Methodology and Approach	64
6.3.2	High-Altitude Flight Experiments for Cool-Down Experiments Boundary Conditions Determination (T 2a)	64
6.3.3	Tank Air Throughput During a Flight (T 2a)	66
6.3.4	Determination of Compositional Changes in Gasolines Stored in Aircraft Tanks for Prolonged Periods (T 2c)	67
6.3.5	Onset of Hazing in Custom Mixed Ethanol-Containing Gasolines (T 2a)	72
6.3.6	Phase Separation: Conclusion (T 2a)	74
6.4	Analysis of Carburettor Icing Hazard (T 2b)	76
6.4.1	Methodology and Approach	76
6.4.2	Temperature Drop Determination in a ROTAX Engine	76
6.4.3	Temperature Drop Determination in a Lycoming O 360 A1A Engine	77
6.4.4	Icing: Conclusions	79
6.5	Analysis of Intensified Vapour Locking Hazard Caused by Gasoline Mixing	80
6.5.1	Fuel Heat-Up Experiments with a MORANE MS 893 E-D Aircraft (T 3)	81
6.5.2	Investigation of Pressure Drops in the MORANE Fuel System Under Operating Conditions (T 3)	84
6.5.3	Vibration Measurements in the MORANE Fuel System (T 3)	85
6.5.4	Vapour Locking Experiments on a Custom Test Rig (T 3)	86
6.5.5	Assessment of a Common Gasoline Volatility Test Device (T 3)	92
6.5.6	Vapour Lock: Conclusions	93
6.6	Material Compatibility of Common Constructive Materials for Aircraft Parts (T 4)	93
6.6.1	Approach / Methodology	93
6.6.2	Report on Plastic Materials Compatibility with Ethanol-Admixed Gasolines	94
6.6.3	Survey on Deployed Materials for Fuel Systems	120
6.6.4	Conclusions	125
<b>7</b>	<b>Metrological Aids for Gasoline Composition Assessment (T 6)</b>	<b>126</b>
7.1	Determination of an Ethanol Share in Gasoline	126
7.1.1	Colour Indicator Method	126
7.1.2	Ethanol Extraction by Water	127
7.2	Detection of Solved Water	128
7.2.1	Chemical Water Detection	129
7.2.2	Optical Water Detection	131

7.2.3	Electrical Water Detection . . . . .	132
7.2.4	Water detection by molecule-specific adsorption . . . . .	133
7.3	Detection of Solved Water: Conclusion . . . . .	135
<b>8</b>	<b>Life-Cycle Analysis of Ethanol-Admixed Gasolines (T 5)</b>	<b>137</b>
8.1	Approach / Methodology . . . . .	137
8.2	Experimental Investigation of Exhaust Gas Emissions for a ROTAX 912 ULS Engine	138
8.3	Life Cycle Analysis of Measured Exhaust Gas Emissions of the ROTAX 912 Engine	140
8.4	Conclusions . . . . .	143
	<b>References</b>	<b>144</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Engines and Cells Certified by the United States FAA</b>	<b>146</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Statistical Data on General Aviation and Ultralight Aircraft (T 1)</b>	<b>154</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Tabulated FMEA Results</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>Task Spanning Activities for Experimentation</b>	<b>196</b>
D.1	Acquisition and Handling of Test Fuels . . . . .	196
D.2	Instrumentation of ACUAS's flying lab, a MORANE MS 893 E-D . . . . .	200
D.3	Setup, Instrumentation and Test Matrix of a Test-Rigged ROTAX 912 ULS Engine in Propeller Operation . . . . .	203
D.4	Custom Designed Test Rig for Vapour Locking and Water Detection Experimentation	205
D.4.1	Rig Control . . . . .	208
D.4.2	Procedures of Test Rig Operation for Nucleation Assessment . . . . .	208
D.4.3	Functions . . . . .	209
D.4.4	Measurement Options . . . . .	210
D.4.5	Environment Protection and Safety Arrangements . . . . .	210
D.4.6	Bubble Sensor Design . . . . .	210
D.4.7	Calibration of the Test Rig . . . . .	211
<b>E</b>	<b>Life-Cycle Analysis of Ethanol-Admixed Gasolines — Report by LUDWIG BÖLKOW SYS- TEMTECHNIK</b>	<b>213</b>
<b>F</b>	<b>Keywords and Abbreviations Index</b>	<b>277</b>

# List of Figures

1	Development of biogenic fuel shares from 2007 to 2009 in Germany . . . . .	23
2	Ethanol content in random German Super Plus gasoline probes taken in June 2009	24
3	Shares of different fuel types (Diesel fuel excluded) for 2008 in Germany. The share titled “Automotive Petrol Fuel” also contains the amount of gasoline taken for aviation purposes, which is smaller than the AVGAS share (see Sect. B). Source: Mineralölwirtschaftsverband Deutschland . . . . .	24
4	Ratio of Super Plus RON 100 to Super RON 98 gasolines . . . . .	25
5	Qualitative evaporation curves for various gasoline types and two jet fuels. . . . .	30
6	DVPE values of random test samples, June 2009 . . . . .	32
7	Octane numbers of 21 gasoline test samples and SIOBIA standard gasoline . . . . .	34
8	German and United Kingdom numbers for the aircraft categories of interest. No distinction is made with respect to used fuel type. . . . .	36
9	Estimated European total numbers for the aircraft categories of interest . . . . .	36
10	Graphical display of the distribution of small aircraft in Europe . . . . .	37
11	Ternary diagram for the substances gasoline, water and ethanol . . . . .	39
12	Maximum water concentrations in different gasoline/ethanol mixtures . . . . .	40
13	Measured water concentrations in different commercially offered gasolines . . . . .	41
14	Binodal and spinodal limit curves in a ternary GEW diagram . . . . .	42
15	Dependence of static vapour pressure on the amount of admixed ethanol . . . . .	44
16	Dependence of dynamic vapour pressure on the amount of admixed ethanol . . . . .	45
17	Mixing gasoline types with differing ethanol admixtures . . . . .	46
18	DVPE values of 21 test samples taken at different gasoline stations . . . . .	46
19	Enthalpy of vaporization for ethanol admixed gasoline blends . . . . .	48
20	Temperature/humidity domains for increased danger of carburettor icing . . . . .	49
21	Hard plastics typology pyramid . . . . .	51
22	FMEA objectives overview . . . . .	52
23	FMEA risk attribution classes overview . . . . .	53
24	FMEA issues categories overview . . . . .	54
25	Principal experimentation objects . . . . .	63
26	Flight test card for tank heat drain experiments . . . . .	65
27	Temperature developments at different positions on a MORANefuel tank surface . . . . .	65
28	Temperature developments inside a MORANefuel tank . . . . .	66
29	Temperature crossover point inside a MORANefuel tank . . . . .	67

30	Air ingestion by tank ventilation . . . . .	68
31	Storage tank design . . . . .	69
32	Normalized residual gasoline masses observed for the different storage tanks. . . . .	70
33	Development of water contents for gasoline tanks stored under differing ambient conditions . . . . .	71
34	Ambient humidity and temperature conditions for the gasoline storage experiment . . . . .	72
35	Onset of phase separation hazing in water admixture and cool-down experiments . . . . .	73
36	Three-dimensional approximation plane of turbidity onset . . . . .	74
37	ROTAX 912 ULS temperature drop in the intake manifold, full load . . . . .	76
38	ROTAX 912 ULS temperature drop in the intake manifold, zero load . . . . .	77
39	Morane icing test setup for operation with ethanol admixed fuels. . . . .	78
40	Temperature drop in a Lycoming O 360 A1A engine . . . . .	79
41	Flight Test Card for a heavy load circuit heat-up experiment . . . . .	82
42	Development of fuel hose temperatures near to the engine for consecutive starts and fast touch-downs . . . . .	82
43	Fuel hose temperatures near to engine for low service ceiling starts and touch-downs . . . . .	83
44	Dynamic pressure drops in the MORANE fuel system . . . . .	84
45	Vibration frequencies and strengths in the MORANE fuel system . . . . .	86
46	Viewport bubble images in test rig experiments . . . . .	87
47	Bubble nascence of pure substances compared to calibration curves . . . . .	87
48	Bubble sensor readout field for AVGAS . . . . .	88
49	Bubble sensor readout field for E-0 and E-5 . . . . .	89
50	Bubble sensor readout field for E-10 and E-15 . . . . .	90
51	Pressure / Temperature limits for low bubble incidence limits . . . . .	91
52	Pressure / Temperature limits for high bubble incidence limits . . . . .	91
53	Hodges tester for gasoline volatility assessment. . . . .	92
54	Temperature resistance of elastomers . . . . .	101
55	Oil resistance of elastomers . . . . .	101
56	Gasoline and ethanol resistance of elastomers . . . . .	102
57	Classification of thermoplastics . . . . .	103
58	Temperature resistance of thermoplastics . . . . .	113
59	Resistance of thermoplastics against gasoline and alcohol / ethanol . . . . .	114
60	Resistance of thermosettings against gasoline and alcohol / ethanol . . . . .	116
61	Results of compability tests of a fluorocarbon elastomer . . . . .	118

62	Realisation of a test for environmental stress cracking . . . . .	119
63	Materials questionnaire tree (partial) . . . . .	121
64	Decrease of materials general questionnaire participation . . . . .	122
65	Production areas of questionnaire participants . . . . .	123
66	Distribution of materials for aviation parts . . . . .	123
67	Estimate of ethanol admixture effect on aviation affairs . . . . .	124
68	Valuation of potential consequences of ethanol admixture on aviation parts . . . . .	124
69	Sensitivity determination schema for an ethanol detection kit working on colour change reaction. . . . .	126
70	Water/ethanol mix excess volume . . . . .	127
71	Maul's Fuel-Alk Tester . . . . .	128
72	Karl-Fischer water titration . . . . .	130
73	Electrical water detection in E-0 . . . . .	132
74	Zeolite water absorption experiment . . . . .	134
75	Zeolite water absorption evaluation . . . . .	135
76	Flight profile for comparative LCA studies . . . . .	138
77	ROTAX exhaust temperatures with ethanol admixed fuels . . . . .	139
78	ROTAX NO <sub>x</sub> emissions with ethanol admixed fuels . . . . .	140
79	Pathways and by-effects for biogenic ethanol production . . . . .	140
80	Well to tank greenhouse gas emission analysis results . . . . .	141
81	Well to propeller greenhouse gas emission analysis results . . . . .	142
82	Graphical compilation of European General Aviation aircraft numbers . . . . .	155
83	Comparison of realized vs. potential MOGAS aircraft (Germany) . . . . .	155
84	German and United Kingdom numbers for the aircraft categories of interest. No distinction is made with respect to used fuel type. . . . .	157
85	Estimated European total numbers for the aircraft categories of interest . . . . .	157
86	German MOGAS operated aircraft engines . . . . .	158
87	Graphical display of the distribution of small aircraft in Europe . . . . .	159
88	Ethanol contents of 23 random commercial vehicle gasoline samples . . . . .	198
89	AcUAS' flying laboratory MORANE MS 893 E-D . . . . .	200
90	Schematic of the MORANE fuel system . . . . .	201
91	ROTAX 912 ULS on test rig . . . . .	203
92	ROTAX 912 ULS measurement points for temperature drop and exhaust gas com- position determination . . . . .	204

93	Schematic of the vapour lock test rig with its fuel conditioning instrumentation . .	205
94	Actual vapour lock test rig with its fuel conditioning elements in place . . . . .	207
95	Example screen for the parameter setting of automatized test runs of the test rig . .	209
96	Bubble nascence of pure substances compared to calibration curves . . . . .	211

## List of Tables

1	National targets for renewable sources utilization in 2020 . . . . .	22
2	German quotas for biogenic fuel admixtures for the years 2007 — 2015 . . . . .	22
3	Properties of DIN EN 228 “Super lead-free” and “Super Plus lead-free” gasolines .	28
4	Physical and chemical properties of usual gasolines and frequent additives (Data compiled from various sources). . . . .	29
5	Volatility classes according to DIN EN 228 . . . . .	31
6	Fugacity classes effective in the course of the year in Germany . . . . .	31
7	Typical densities of vehicle gasolines . . . . .	32
8	Octane numbers and densities of typical gasolines and other pure substances . . . .	34
9	Octane number of various pure substances or mixtures relevant to gasolines . . . .	35
10	Different polymer classes . . . . .	95
11	Common Elastomers . . . . .	96
12	Exemplary Trade Marks of Elastomers . . . . .	97
13	Exemplary Trade Marks of Elastomers (continued) . . . . .	98
14	Properties of elastomers . . . . .	99
15	Properties of elastomers (continued) . . . . .	100
16	Common thermoplastics . . . . .	104
17	Exemplary trade marks of thermoplastics . . . . .	105
18	Exemplary trade marks of thermoplastics (continued) . . . . .	106
19	Exemplary trade marks of thermoplastics (continued) . . . . .	107
20	Exemplary trade marks of thermoplastics (continued) . . . . .	108
21	Properties of thermoplastics . . . . .	109
22	Properties of thermoplastics (continued) . . . . .	110
23	Properties of thermoplastics (continued) . . . . .	111
24	Properties of thermoplastics (continued) . . . . .	112
25	Common thermosettings . . . . .	115
26	Abundancy matrix for zeolite water absorption tests . . . . .	133
27	Tabular compilation of European aircraft numbers . . . . .	156
28	Fuel certificate values for the SIOBIA experimentation base fuel . . . . .	197
29	Physical and chemical composition of custom mixed Exx gasolines . . . . .	199
30	Locations and types of sensor instrumentation as applied to the MORANE . . . . .	202
31	Boiling pressures of test rig calibration substances . . . . .	211

## Acknowledgements

This report was compiled by a consortium of cooperation partners headed by Aachen Institute of Applied Sciences, consisting of Aachen University of Applied Sciences, Bosch General Aviation Technology GmbH, BRP-Rotax GmbH & Co KG, g.o.e.the, ISP GmbH, Ludwig Bolkow Systemtechnik GmbH, PetroLab GmbH, SGS Institut Fresenius GmbH, and Total Deutschland GmbH.

The work was supervised by an international project steering committee headed by Mr. Kleine-Beek (EASA). Further committee participants were Clément Audard (EASA), Stefan Ebert (EASA), Erika Herms (EASA), Werner Hoermann (EASA), Barry Plumb (Historic Aircraft Association, Light Aircraft Association, United Kingdom), Henk Pruis (EASA), Walter Schiller (Luftfahrtbundesamt, Germany), Rudi Schuegraf (Europe Air Sports and Deutscher Aero Club e.V.), and John Thorpe (General Aviation Safety Council, United Kingdom).

In addition, an advisory circle of EASA supported the information collection for some of this report's topics.

Many cooperation partners contributed material necessary for the experimentation documented in this report: Total Deutschland GmbH supplied the experimenters with a sufficient amount of MOGAS (principally vehicle gasoline of Super Plus specification, but stringently certified for aviation purposes, see also Appendix F) as well as statistical data free of charge and supported the FMEA with fuel and lubrication experts. Crop Energies provided the required amount of pure bioethanol necessary for custom admixing, also free of charge. Experts of Robert Bosch GmbH cross-checked the study of SGS on fuel system material properties and suggestions. The German Mineralöl-Wirtschaftsverband provided valuable up-to-date statistical data on the consumption of gasoline sorts. W. Maul contributed an gasoline ethanol admixture test box free of charge. The Chair for Technical Thermodynamics, RWTH Aachen, supported the work by providing experimental facilities and support for the zeolite experiments on water absorption from gasoline.

# 1 Introduction and Outline of Work

Biofuels potentially interesting also for aviation purposes are predominantly liquid fuels produced from biomass. The most common biofuels today are biodiesel and bioethanol. Since diesel engines are rather rare in aviation this survey is focusing on ethanol admixed to gasoline products.

The Directive 2003/30/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of May 8<sup>th</sup> 2003 on the promotion of the use of biofuels or other renewable fuels for transport encourage a growing admixture of biogenic fuel components to fossil automotive gasoline. Some aircraft models equipped with spark ignited piston engines are approved for operation with automotive gasoline, frequently called “MOGAS” (motor gasoline). The majority of those approvals is limited to MOGAS compositions that do not contain methanol or ethanol beyond negligible amounts. In the past years (bio-)MTBE or (bio-)ETBE have been widely used as blending component of automotive gasoline whilst the usage of low-molecular alcohols like methanol or ethanol has been avoided due to the handling problems especially with regard to the strong affinity for water. With rising mandatory bio-admixtures the conversion of the basic biogenic ethanol to ETBE, causing a reduction of energetic payoff, becomes more and more unattractive. Therefore the direct ethanol admixture is accordingly favoured.

Due to the national enforcements of the directive 2003/30/EC more oxygenates produced from organic materials like bioethanol have started to appear in automotive gasolines already. The current fuel specification EN 228 already allows up to 3 % volume per volume (v/v) (bio-)methanol or up to 5 % v/v (bio-)ethanol as fuel components. This is also roughly the amount of biogenic components to comply with the legal requirements to avoid monetary penalties for producers and distributors of fuels.

Since automotive fuel is cheaper than the common aviation gasoline (AVGAS), creates less problems with lead deposits in the engine, and in general produces less pollutants it is strongly favoured by pilots. But being designed for a different set of usage scenarios the use of automotive fuel with low molecular alcohols for aircraft operation may have adverse effects in aviation operation. Increasing amounts of ethanol admixtures impose various changes in the gasoline's chemical and physical properties, some of them rather unexpected and not within the range of flight experiences even of long-term pilots.

After a frame-setting failure mode and effects analysis (FMEA) that highlighted the predominant threats of ethanol present in future MOGAS sorts the most problematic objectives have been investigated in further detail, both by theoretical investigations and practical exemplary flight and test rig experiments. Even if the general level of pollutant emissions is usually reduced by utilization of biogenic components in the fuel it cannot be excluded straight away that also undesired side-effects, both on a local and global scale, may be incurred, e.g. by super- or sub-stoichiometric combustion typical in aviation operation. Accordingly, another aspect under investigation is the life cycle analysis of the usage of ethanol admixed gasoline for aviation purposes.

Lastly, prior reports identified water as one of the most problematic substances for fuel handling and utilization in the area of aviation. There is no simple, practical measurement tool for the assessment of solved water content in gasoline so far, however. Accordingly it is one of the aims of this report to identify potential respective measurement procedures that deem promising for a development of such instrumentation.

The EASA call for tenders, based on previous information gathering, already collected most of these issues and formulated several basic objectives. The results of this report necessitated a

slightly different internal logical structure to adequately organize the acquired knowledge, though. Therefore the referencing of the tender's topics is included in the individual section headings:

- T 1:** Literature scan and statistical data gathering
- T 2a:** Phase separation
- T 2b:** Icing
- T 2c:** Long term storing of gasoline
- T 3:** Vapour locking
- T 4:** Compatibility of materials
- T 5:** Life cycle analysis of ethanol admixed gasolines
- T 6:** Potential methods of water in gasoline detection
- T 7:** FMEA on functions and parts

The sections have been assembled in a different order that is more oriented towards easier reading and logical interconnection of topics. The main part of the report is followed by a series of annexes documenting the immediate work of cooperation partners, and additional tabulated results referenced in the main part.

## 2 Summary and Recommendations

In its effort to introduce regenerating and hence sustainable energy resources into the existing combustibles mix, recent European legislation enforces the admixture of biogenic fuels into conventional fossil gasoline. For economic reasons this is, as of today, mainly ethanol. Compared to the fossil gasoline ingredients ethanol has a different chemical structure, leading to a potentially dangerous physico-chemical behaviour, especially in the presence of water. As there is a stronger economically driven tendency to use vehicle gasolines as aviation fuel this may lead to potentially dangerous scenarios especially in the operation of the smaller General Aviation aircraft.

The SIOBIA study addresses these scenarios by an in-depth study on the various potential threats imposed by ethanol admixtures up to 15 % v/v.

First, a failure mode and effects analysis has been performed. For the current fleet of General Aviation aircraft the associated individual threats (phase separation, vapour locking, icing, material compatibility) were confirmed on the parts and functional levels by an expert group. The span of risks covers the range of “just a nuisance” to “deadly dangerous if not adequately and pro-actively handled”. For the major threats a clustering of recommendations for a further treatment of the identified issues has been given.

A statistical analysis of European aircraft numbers and types, reconciling several base data sets on European General Aviation, lead to an assessment of the number of potentially affected aircraft. About 20,000 aircraft ( $\approx 10\%$ ) throughout Europe are either directly or potentially endangered by the various negative effects of an ethanol admixture in the nearer future.

The consecuting theoretical and practical work highlighted the most prominent threats in parallel tasks, namely water-induced phase separation, carburettor icing, vapour locking by gasoline brand mixing, construction material compatibility, and proactive water detection in the fuel system. These threat investigations were flanked by a life cycle analysis on the environmental impacts of ethanol addition to aircraft fuels.

Especially for the vast majority of existing carburettor engines there are various general threats stemming from ethanol-admixed gasolines, potentially leading to disrupted engine operation. Some of them are readily encountered by sensitive operation and increased maintenance efforts, while others may occur rather unexpectedly during a flight mission, even to the point that the engine(s) will stall and not start again, so an unpowered emergency landing has to be performed.

Main issues are

- the material compatibility of hitherto only gasoline-exposed fuel system parts, especially elastomers and sealants,
- the danger of phase separation in water containing gasoline if the fuel is stored for prolonged periods in vented aircraft tanks, and if it is inevitably cooled down during a flight,
- the increased likelihood of a vapour lock due to increased vapour pressure of gasolines mixtures of different ethanol abundancies if the first fuel pressure raising pump is not in a cold section of the fuel system, and the
- carburettor icing due to raised enthalpy of evaporation for ethanol-admixed gasolines if there is no additional heat input into the intake air,

The experiences from vehicle technology may, to a rather great extent, be transferred to the operating conditions of ultralights. Here rather modern engine technology prevails, and the usually

low service ceiling keeps temperature change effects below an acceptable bound. Other types of General Aviation aircraft are more prone to run into difficulties due to their markedly higher service ceiling and the resulting major differences in temperature and ambient pressure, as well as their longer conceptual histories, leading predominantly to material compatibility problems. For those major threats intensive studies and results, as well as respective guidelines, are given in this report. Further recommended activities are listed below.

Material incompatibilities should be explicitly addressed in airworthiness qualification and certification processes, even for replacement parts. A comprehensive study of all materials used in the past 50 years for certified aircraft construction is not feasible. Only general guidelines for future material selection or replacement can be given in this report.

A crucial point in phase separation avoidance is a strict proactive control on the occurrence of *solved* water in the gasoline. Unluckily there is no practical and affordable test procedure at hand as of today even though some measurement principles indicate the potential of creating a respective tool.

Life cycle analysis showed that substantial green-house gas (GHG) savings are possible if ethanol is admixed to conventional gasoline in the amounts discussed in this report. This effect is mostly related to the old, but reliable technology and the non-existence of exhaust gas catalyzers in aviation: While the savings through replacing fossil fuel by biogenically produced ethanol are at least detectable the major effect stems from the combustion process itself, as it is cleaner and produces less GHG emissions in the presence of ethanol.

Most of the endangering issues would presumably vanish if butanol would be deployed as biogenic supplement of the fossil fuels as its longer hydrocarbon tail provides much more affinity to the non-polar gasoline majority ingredients. Butanol would exhibit other advantages as well: Compared to ethanol its energy content is larger, and it would presumably have less effect on the vapour pressure if gasolines of different admixture levels are mixed. Presently there is no commercially viable biogenic supply path, even though some promising exploratory efforts exist [16]. Should this alternative of biogenic admixing be pursued in future its effects should be studied in detail in a follow-up project as there is no practical experience on butanol-admixed gasolines deployment in aviation as of today.

The SIOBIA study sheds light on the present status of the most problematic issues with respect to ethanol admixtures in aviation gasoline, but partially only up to the point that further investigations and research should be undertaken to get in-depth and directly practical information. The following topics are suggested for further activities:

- **Investigations on the bubble creation behaviour (threat of vapour locking) of a larger number of commercially sold gasolines and their potential mixtures.** Different compositions of gasolines are likely to affect the vapour bubble creation, especially so if encountering unforeseen amounts of ethanol due to a mixing of residues in the aircraft's tank. As a result a matrix of potential mixing scenarios should be collected and progressively filled over time as new brands with differing ethanol content appear on the market. The tests should be performed especially with raised temperatures in a dynamic manner, simulating those of common aircraft fuel systems. If possible, a maximum operation temperature and/or maximum service ceiling should be identified and published on a work-in-progress basis on a freely accessible web site.
- **Determination of the temperature-depending maximum solved water abundancies for a larger number of commercially sold gasolines, potentially in combination with random**

**sampling results on water content.** The outcome of these investigation could yield a definition of a conservative envelope of tolerable water in gasoline contents. This value is becoming more and more of interest as the bearing capability increases with increasing amount of ethanol there is no normative numerical upper limit of water content in gasolines as of today.

- **Quantitative determination of water absorbed out of the tank venting air.** Temperature inversion in the tank of a descending aircraft may lead to a significant absorption of humidity due to the rather large air volume throughput rates of venting. Here experiments for temperature and humidity niveau determination, in combination with a theoretical study taking into account knowledge of the atmospheric states and compositions, should be performed to determine quantitative water balances.
- **Research and/or development of a practical sensor for water solved in gasoline.** The water content of present gasolines is reportedly well above zero and a potential object of future economical optimization with respect to gasoline price fixations as there is no normative quantified upper limit in the gasoline composition definitions. Reported field tests with hydrous E-15 [21], saving the expenses of providing super-azeotropic ethanol provision for gasoline admixing, already point in this direction. As this will foreseeably not create a problem for ground based locomotion, contrary to aviative purposes with its strong temperature decrease in the gasoline tanks, the pilot should be equipped with a practical method of solved water determination.