

<u>Note 94</u>

Grand Prix 1.5L TC engines developed from F2 2L NA

Some interesting comparisons between Normally Aspirated (NA) and TurboCharged (TC) engines can be made from the 1977-1988 developments by Renault, BMW and Honda of their F2 2L NA engines into Grand Prix 1.5L TC units, in each case the basic changes being to shorten the Stroke and lower the Compression Ratio (apart from adding the TurboCharger, of course, feeding into a plenum chamber from which individual and tuned inlet tracts fed the cylinders as in the NA application).

Data are tabled below. In each case the F2 engine is the fully-developed specification and the TC is the initial version.

| All engines, NA or TC, running on 102RON "real" petrol | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|--------------------|--|--|
| | F2 NA i.e. Manifold Density Ratio (MDR) = 1 | | | | |
| <u>Year</u> | <u>1977</u> | <u>1982</u> | <u>1983</u> | | |
| Make | Renault | BMW | Honda | | |
| Туре | CH1 | M12/7 | RA263 | | |
| Data Sources | 910 | 454 | 680,929,931 | | |
| | | | | | |
| Configuration | 90V6 | IL4 | 80V6 | | |
| Valves per Cylinder | 4v/c | 4v/c | 4v/c | | |
| @ Included Angle (VIA) | 21 .5 ⁰ | 40 ⁰ | 40 ⁰ | | |
| Bore/Stroke (B/S) | 86mm/57.3 | 89.2mm/80 | 90mm/52.3 | | |
| | = 1.501 | = 1.115 | `= 1.721 | | |
| Swept Volume (V) cc | 1,997 | 1,999 | 1,996 | | |
| Compression Ratio (R) | 11 | 11 | 11? | | |
| | | | | | |
| Peak Power (PP) HP | 310 | 301 | 350 | | |
| @ NP RPM | 11,000 | 9,250 | 12,000 | | |
| PP/V HP/L | 155.2 | 150.6 | 175.4 | | |
| Brake Mean Effective | | | | | |
| Pressure @ NP (BMPP) Bar | 12.63 | 14.56 | 13.08 | | |
| @ Mean Piston Speed | | | | | |
| (MPSP) m/s | 21.01 | 24.67 | 20.92 | | |
| | | | | | |
| Mean Gas Velocity at Inlet @PP | | | | | |
| (MGVP) m/s | 64.53 | 76.57 | 69.16 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | 4 steel or Ni-alloy valves per cylinder | | | | |
| | with steel Coil-spring Valve Return System (CVRS) | | | | |
| Mean Valve Speed @ PP | | | | | |
| (MVSP) m/s | 4.54 | 3.89 | not available (na) | | |
| BNP m/s | 15.77 | 13.75 | 18.00 | | |
| | 12.00 | 44.07 | 42.25 | | |
| BMPA/MDR* Adj. Bar | 12.90 | 14.87 | 13.35 | | |
| | | | | | |
| *For potrol opgings, where: | | | | | |
| *For petrol engines, where:- | | | | | |
| Air Standard Efficiency = ASE = $[1 - 1/(R)^{0.4}]$, then | | | | | |
| $\frac{BMPA}{MDR} = \frac{BMPP}{MDR} \times \left(\frac{ASE @ R = 12}{ASE @ specified R} \right) = 24 \times (EV \times EC \times EM) Adjusted Bar;$ | | | | | |
| MDR MDR CASE @ specified RJ | | | | | |
| where: EV - Volumetric efficiency: | | | | | |
| where:- EV = Volumetric efficiency; | | | | | |

EC = Combustion efficiency;

EM = Mechanical Efficiency.

The reasoning behind this expression is given more fully in <u>Analysis</u> Part 2 Page 8

| | Grand Prix 1.5L TC | | | |
|--|--|----------------------|-------------------|--|
| Year | 1977 | <u>1982</u> | <u>1983</u> | |
| Make | Renault | BMW | Honda | |
| Туре | EF1 | M12/13 | RA163E | |
| Data Sources | 571,909 | 741 | 573,933 | |
| | | | | |
| Configuration - | | | | |
| Valves per Cylinder | All as for the F2 engines | | | |
| @ Included Angle (VIA) | | | | |
| Bore/Stroke (B/S) | 86mm/42.8 | 89.2mm/60 | 90mm/39 | |
| | = 2.009 | = 1.487 | = 2.308 | |
| Swept Volume (V) cc | 1,492 | 1,499 | 1,489 | |
| Compression Ratio (R) | 7 | 6.7 | 7? | |
| Manifold Density Ratio (MDR) | 2.5 | 2.58 | na | |
| | | | | |
| Peak Power (PP) HP | 510 | 575 | 600 | |
| @ NP RPM | 10,500 | 10,500 | 12,000 | |
| PP/V HP/L | 341.8 | 383.6 | 403.0 | |
| Brake Mean Effective | | | | |
| Pressure @ NP (BMPP) Bar | 29.13 | 32.69 | 30.05 | |
| @ Mean Piston Speed | | | | |
| (MPSP) m/s | 14.98 | 21.00 | 15.60 | |
| (MPSP relative to value of F2 NA) | (-29%) | (-14.9%) | (-25.4%) | |
| | | | | |
| Mean Gas Velocity at Inlet @PP | 46.01 | CE 10 | F1 F0 | |
| (MGVP) m/s Note (1) | 46.01 | 65.18 | 51.58 | |
| | 4 steel or N | i-allov valves per (| cylinder | |
| 144 | 4 steel or Ni-alloy valves per cylinder with steel Coil-spring Valve Return System (CVRS) | | | |
| Mean Valve Speed @ PP | | | loystelli (evilo) | |
| (MVSP) m/s | na | na | na | |
| BNP m/s | 15.05 | 15.61 | 18.00 | |
| (BNP relative to value of F2 NA) | (-4.6%) | (+13.5%) | (0%) Note (2) | |
| | (4.070) | (*13.370) | | |
| BMPA/MDR Adj. Bar | 13.57 | 14.98 | na | |
| (BMPA/MDR relative to value of F2 N | | | | |
| | (105.2%) | (100.7%) | na Note (3) | |
| Note (1), accurating come (most) (also | | (1)(D) in the Dam | | |

Note (1): assuming same Inlet Valve Head Diameters (IVD) in the Renault and Honda TC engines as in the NA.

Note (2): Speed-Limiting factor

It will be seen that a limiting Mean Valve Speed in the TC engines, represented by the surrogate parameter 'BNP' (see <u>Note 13 Part III</u>), was controlling the value of NP in the cases of the highly over-square Renault and Honda TC engines to the same level as the NA engines. Therefore, TC powers were not as high as might have been expected.

Note (3): BMPA/MDR: TC versus NA

The similarity of this value for the BMW suggests that the TurboCharger was not very efficient, since the TC value should have been relatively higher, as is the Renault TC (see <u>Note 96</u>). <u>Constructional features of NA and TC engines</u>

CH1 and EF1 had belt-driven camshafts.

Renault and Honda had wet Al-alloy Nikasil-coated liners in thinwall cast-iron blocks.

BMW had cast-iron unlinered blocks taken from high-mileage production 89mm bore engines from which all the residual casting strains had relaxed. Therefore, after boring to 89.2mm the bores stayed perfectly round and so minimised friction.