



Higher renewable blends in gasoline: Challenges and opportunities

ETIP Bioenergy WG3 2023 Q1 webinar - 10th March 2023

Roland Dauphin, Science executive Fuels Quality and Emissions

Reproduction permitted with due © Concawe acknowledgement

RED II / RED III / RePowerEU: Opportunities and challenges

- Neither E10 nor 'E20' allows to meet the RED II / RED III / RePowerEU requirements in the gasoline pool












	E10	'E20'	RED II	RED III / RePower EU	Cap Food & Feed crops (‘1G’) biofuels	Advanced biofuels mandate
% volume	10%	20%				
% energy	6.6%	13.3%	> 14%		< 7%	> 2.2%
% GHG reduction	~4.5%	~9%		> 13% / 16%		

Panel of solutions considered

	Solutions	Effects	Constraints	
1	More FAME in 'EN590' (e.g. B10) & EtOH in 'EN228' (e.g. E20)	Increase biofuels incorporation rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing fleet's compliance - F&F cap + FQD revision (for EN228) - Does not meet renewable targets 	Less expensive biofuels but slow (15-20 years)
2	More E85 and B100 in the mix	Leverage effect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop fleets - Develop infrastructures - F&F cap 	
3	Replace F&F by advanced biofuels	- CO ₂ abatement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Constraints in EN228 and EN590 for oxygenated compounds - Cost - Does not meet renewable targets 	Expensive biofuels but immediate effect
4	Drop-in biofuels	Unlimited incorporation	Cost	
5	Renewable electricity	X2 benefit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop fleets - Develop infrastructures 	

Map of know types of biofuels



	F&F (1G)		Advanced	
Non drop-in (oxygenated compounds limited by EN228 and EN590)	Gasoline Ethanol Methanol ETBE Isobutanol... 	Diesel FAME 	Gasoline Ethanol  	Diesel 
Drop-in	Gasoline Bionaphtha 	Diesel HVO  Gas Biomethane 	Gasoline MtG EtG 	Diesel BtL  Gas Biomethane 

Should 'E10+' have a minimum ethanol content?

- **Ongoing discussions on a Technical Specification (TS) for E10+ at CEN level**
 - *Discussions stalled regarding the minimum oxygen / oxygenate / ethanol content*
 - *Some stakeholders are in favour of a minimum ethanol content (10% v/v or 15% v/v)*
 - *Resulting in a narrow E10+ specification (10-20% v/v ethanol or 15-20% v/v ethanol)*
 - *Other stakeholders stand against the principle of a minimum oxygen / oxygenate / ethanol content*
 - *Resulting in a broader E10+ specification (0-20% v/v ethanol)*
- **Pros of a minimum ethanol content**
 - *« Kind of guarantees » a minimum renewable content in the fuel to the end customer and to the authorities (note that it is out of the CEN scope)*
 - *A narrower fuel specification can result in more optimized engine calibration for the OEMs (and is generally easier to manage from the ECU perspective)*
- **Cons of a minimum ethanol content**
 - *Fuel retailers may refuse to roll out E10+ because of threats on the supply chain (note that it is out of the CEN scope)*
 - *E.g. 15% v/v ethanol corresponds to 10% energy, well above the 7% cap on food and feed crops biofuels*
 - *What happens if you have not secured the supply advanced ethanol?*
 - *A narrower fuel specification for optimized engine calibration purpose does not make any sense as long as the concerned vehicles are also allowed to refuel with E5 and E10.*



www.concawe.eu

**Thank you for
your attention**

Roland Dauphin
roland.dauphin@concawe.eu