Performance of the LI²SA-Soot-Sensor for ultra-low concentration levels in comparison to conventional PM measurement methods

S. Schraml

ESYTEC Energie- und Systemtechnik GmbH, Am Weichselgarten 6, 91058 Erlangen, Germany

R. Sommer, and A. Leipertz Lehrstuhl für Technische Thermodynamik (LTT) Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg Am Weichselgarten 6, 91058 Erlangen, Germany

L.-E. Schulte

RWTÜV Fahrzeug GmbH Institut für Fahrzeugtechnik Adlerstr.7, 45307 Essen, Germany

INTRODUCTION

Especially sensitivity is one of the most important features of suitable measurement systems for future engine and exhaust gas aftertreatment concepts. Besides the sensitivity and limit of detection which in future most likely has to be close to immission levels, some other important aspects like repeatability and ability of calibration have to be kept in mind. This is, however, not only a question of the measurement system alone. Conditioning of the unit under test, dilution and influence of sampling systems are very important issues in this context. Additionally, it has been shown that the nature of the measurement quantity itself exhibits the source for some significant instationarities. As a specific example, it has been shown that the total PM mass including volatiles is much more fluctuating than the solid PM fraction, e.g., like the EC mass emission.

In this contribution these aspects are discussed in detail for the LI²SA system, relying on time-resolved laser-induced incandescence in comparison to conventional methods. The technique evaluates thermal radiation of soot particles after rapid laser heating and has been shown to be selective just on the EC component of the PM emission. Consequently, as the appropriate calibration tool the CAST Aerosol Standard together with coulometric analysis of the aerosol is favoured.

RESULTS

Experimental results are presented for different vehicles and engines with advanced aftertreatment and combustion concepts within different driving cycles, both under stationary and transient conditions. Especially engine concepts with emission levels well below Euro IV have been in the focus of the presented trials. These are including engines with DPF systems (PSA FAP and heavy duty CRT system) as well as gasoline direct injection (GDI) concepts. The repeatability of the results at those low emission levels has

been determined and compared for the gravimetric method (standard and US2007), the CPC and the LI²SA system. The analysis of the variances shows a non-uniform behaviour: whereas the LI²SA and the CPC results for heavy duty applications are (dependent on the driving cycle) generally more repeatable than the standard and the US2007 gravimetry, the light duty measurements are strongly influenced by both, the driving cycle and also the combustion and aftertreatment concept and thus yield inconsistent results.

Especially for ultra low emission levels, achieved for heavy duty measurements, about 6 times greater values for the variance of the standard gravimetric method as compared to the LI²SA results have been obtained which most likely indicate that the volatile particle fraction is one of the main sources for measurement uncertainties. This is in particular remarkable as total filter loads below the suggested minimum of 0.5mg (for the 47mm filters) have been observed and the variance is considered not to be acceptable in this case. The solid fraction (the EC fraction in this case) has been proven to be much more repeatable. However, especially for the heavy duty CRT system some remaining fluctuations in the EC mass emission are clearly obvious, caused by the engine itself despite of carefully being conditioned.

CONCLUSIONS

The main conclusions drawn from these results are:

- There are principle limitations for the repeatability of all instruments. These are mainly given by fluctuations of the engine and/or the aftertreatment system, the test protocol employed and the sampling system. Further, even fluctuations given by statistical noise have to be considered for different measurement systems, like the CPC and also for the LI²SA system.
- Heavy duty measurements (on engine test benches) have been consistently shown to be much better repeatable than light duty measurements (on chassis dynamometers).
- The employed sampling system has an essential influence on the repeatability of gravimetric and CPC results, but not on the LI²SA results.
- Most likely, volatile exhaust components are one major source for measurement uncertainties, especially for the gravimetric method.

PERFORMANCE OF THE LI²SA SOOT SENSOR FOR ULTRA-LOW CONCENTRATION LEVELS IN COMPARISON TO CONVENTIONAL PM MEASUREMENT METHODS

S. Schraml, R. Sommer, A. Leipertz, L.-E. Schulte



THEORY OF LASER-INDUCED INCANDESCENCE



- Particle heating by means of a laser pulse to temperatures >4000K
- Optical measurement of enhanced thermal radiation by a highspeed







Highly specific on Elemental Carbon (EC), no cross-sensitivities to other exhaust components

No need for dilution to prevent particle condensation, raw exhaust gas measurements feasible

RESULTS

CRT equipped heavy duty engine (EURO III)



- Emission level not very stable (for total PM <u>and</u> EC)
- Filter loads (ETC test cycles) of 0.15 - 0.3 µg (recommended filter load >0.5 µg!)

Performance characteristics

- simultaneous measurement of soot mass concentration (EC) and soot surface area / primary particle diameter
- High sensitivity below $10\mu g/m^3$ to meet future regulations
- High temporal resolution of up to 20Hz for analysis of extremely transient processes
- Flexible adaptation by availability of different detector heads
- CVS detector head for diluted or undiluted partial flow measurements
- Water-cooled detector heads for a direct application into the exhaust pipe (full-flow raw measurements, light duty and heavy duty versions) available
- 0.0035-0.0055 g/kWh
 (<<EURO 4: 0.03 g/kWh)
- Moderate correlation coefficient caused by different metrics
- ~50% (variable) EC fraction of total PM

EC mass concentration during an ETC (European Transient Cycle) test of a CRT equipped heavy duty truck engine – sampling from CVS dilution tunnel



Repeatability of results (CRT equipped heavy duty engine (EURO III)

					_				
	LI ² SA	Standard	2007	CPC		LI ² SA	Standard	2007	CPC
	raw	Gravimetry	Gravimetry	(10 ⁵ /cm ³)		raw	Gravimetry	Gravimetry	(10 ⁵ /cm ³)
	(mg/m ³)	(g/kWh)	(g/kWh)			(mg/m ³)	(g/kWh)	(g/kWh)	
WHTC 1	0.269	-	-	1.93	ETC 1	0.276	0.0042	0.0054	-
WHTC 2	0.250	0.0049	0.0070	1.82	ETC 2	0.248	-	-	-
WHTC 3	0.257	0.0056	0.0060	1.90	ETC 3	-	0.0054	0.0065	-
WHTC 4	0.269	0.0064	0.0054	1.90	ETC 4	0.274	0.0043	0.0040	1.86
WHTC 5	0.281	0.0048	0.0055	1.90	ETC 5	-	-	-	-
WHTC 6	0.281	-	0.0054	1.95	ETC 6	0.256	0.0028	-	2.16
WHTC 7	0.275	0.0052	0.0051	2.09	ETC 7	0.253	0.0031	-	1.99
mean value	0.2687	0.0054	0.0057	1.93	mean value	0.2616	0.0040	0.0053	2.00
COV	4.03%	10.80%	10.71%	3.95 %	COV	4.40%	23.51%	18.74%	6.13 %

• Fully-automatic 'simply press button'-system - integrated LI²SoP Software Package allows operation with no need for further user interaction

CONCLUSIONS

- LII is suitable for EC characterization of ultra low emission engines
- Principle limitations of repeatability <u>for all instruments</u> are given by:
 - fluctuations of the engine / aftertreatment system
 - influence of sampling system
 - and even signal statistics
- Heavy duty measurements (on engine test bench) are likely to be better repeatable than light duty measurements (on chassis dynamometer)
- Sampling system has essential influence on repeatability of CPC and gravimetric results, but not on LII results
- Most likely, volatiles are a major source for measurement uncertanties

Other studies

	LI ² SA	2007	Standard	CPC	Swice DN/D (UD)	LI ² SA	Standarc
	diluted	Gravimetry	Gravimetry			diluted	Gravimet
ETC	13.7%	8.5%	19.1%	26.2%	ETC	7.6%	20%
WHTC	12.0%	10.9%	20.4%	31.2%			
FTP	4.6%	6.1%	22.0%	14.7%			

Light duty measurements

	-			-		-		
	LI ² SA	COV	2007	COV	Standard	COV	CPC	COV
	raw		Gravimetry		Gravimetry		(10 ⁵ /cm ³)	
	(mg/m ³)		(mg)		(mg)			
FTP Vehicle 1	0.352	12.49%	-	-	0.00349	17.74%	-	-
FTP Vehicle 3	0.128	50.85%	0.0514	14.95%	0.0570	19.03%	7.58	66.37%
FTP Vehicle 4	0.030	4.85%	0.1478	29.69%	0.2810	34.22%	0.40	14.21%
NEDC Vehicle 2	0.097	7.34%	-	-	0.0026	9.62%	82.4	14.60%
NEDC Vehicle 4	0.037	7.02%	0.0880	7.78%	0.0696	17.81%	0.37	7.83%

	work principle	Emission status	Aftertreatment
Vehicle 1	Diesel	Euro III, PM< Euro IV	CRT wit reagent
Vehicle 2	GDI	Euro III	EGR, TWC
Vehicle 3	GDI	Euro IV	EGR, TWC, N O _x storage
Vehicle 4	Diesel	Euro II, PM< Euro IV	autark DPF

limit of Detection	
German PMP (at RWTÜ\	, Essen, D)
CPC (80nm, n~60	1/cm ³) 0.23 μg/m
Standard Gravimetry	4.5 μg/m
_l²SA (raw)	5 μg/m

CPC

24%

Swiss PMP (at EMPA, Dübendorf, CH)					
CPC	(80nm, n~4000 1/cm ³)	15 μg/m³			
Standa	189 µg/m³				
LI2SA (d	iluted)	37 µg/m³			

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Parts of the work have been supported by:

Bavarian Research Foundation (BFS)
RWTÜV Institute (Essen, Germany)
FhG-ITA Institute (Hannover, Germany)
EMPA Institute (Zürich, Switzerland)
Robert Bosch GmbH (Stuttgart, Germany)
Ricardo Consulting Engineers (Shoreham by Sea, UK)

within different cooperations.