

Structurally Inhospitable: Why Methanol Will Not Power Japan's Passenger Cars and Where It Belongs Instead

By Leon Toki

AUTHOR BIO

Leon Toki is a senior at the American School in Japan. He is deeply interested in political environmental science, he explores the implications of methanol in Japan. His research is on whether implementing methanol in Japan is feasible.

ABSTRACT

Methanol is frequently promoted as a low-carbon “bridge fuel” for road transport: it is liquid at ambient conditions, burns cleanly, integrates into existing fuel-handling infrastructure, and can be produced from renewable hydrogen and captured carbon dioxide. Yet in Japan, one of the world’s largest and most technologically capable automotive markets, methanol has virtually no presence in passenger vehicles, and current policy makes a future presence unlikely. This essay argues that Japan’s passenger-car market is structurally inhospitable to methanol along four reinforcing dimensions: the physical and materials properties of the fuel, which impose cost and durability penalties on light vehicles; the economics of fuel distribution, which defeated methanol passenger programs elsewhere; a policy architecture that commits the passenger segment to electrification while steering alternative liquid fuels toward ethanol blending, aviation, and commercial vehicles; and the strategy of the automakers themselves, none of which is developing methanol drivetrains. Contrasting Japan with China, the essay shows that the divergence reflects feedstock endowment and industrial policy rather than any technical superiority of the Chinese approach. It concludes that methanol nonetheless has a defensible and growing role in Japan, not in passenger cars but in maritime shipping, heavy-duty fleets, and the chemical feedstock chain. The question is not whether Japan should adopt methanol, but where.

Keywords: *methanol, alternative fuels, Japan, decarbonization, transport policy, e-fuels, energy transition, automotive strategy, maritime shipping, green methanol, industrial policy*

DISCLOSURE OF AI USAGE

During the preparation of this paper, I utilized a generative AI tool to edit and aid in selecting and organizing secondary references as well as assist with language edits (grammar, word selection and

clarity). I thoroughly vetted each revision and source recommended by the generative AI and also compared these suggested changes with the actual document, making all edits.

INTRODUCTION

Methanol periodically re-enters the alternative-fuel discussion as though it were an easy fix to a difficult problem. The rationale is simple. Transportation, both on land and at sea, is very hard to decarbonize. Batteries are heavy and slow to recharge, and hydrogen carries significant storage costs. Methanol, the simplest alcohol and a clear liquid at room temperature, sidesteps most of these difficulties. It can be produced from natural gas, coal, biomass, or, in “green” form, from renewable electricity and captured carbon dioxide. It fits into existing tanks, piping, and pumps, and it emits significantly less sulfur oxide and particulate matter than diesel or gasoline (Hoang et al., 2026). This is why methanol is so often offered up as a bridge fuel for the transition away from petroleum.

In this paper I take that proposal seriously and then reject a specific version of it: that methanol should be introduced into Japan’s passenger-car market. I do not believe methanol is a poor fuel; in the correct application it is an outstanding one. However, I argue that Japan’s passenger segment is a structurally incorrect application for methanol. “Structural” refers to the fact that the impediments are not the result of insufficient enthusiasm or a marketing failure that an energetic manufacturer could correct. Rather, they are rooted in the physical properties of the fuel itself, in the economic realities of distributing it, in the design of Japanese energy and transportation policy, and in how the automakers themselves have structured their strategies. Each of these is a significant barrier individually; collectively they constitute a nearly insurmountable one.

This paper makes two contributions. First, it gathers the relevant technical, historical, and policy evidence into a single coherent case rather than addressing each of methanol’s disadvantages separately. Second, it resists the urge to leave the reader with a purely negative conclusion. Having demonstrated where methanol cannot go in Japan, namely passenger cars, I show where it can go: maritime shipping, commercial and heavy-duty vehicle segments, and the chemical feedstock chain. I argue that such a refocusing offers greater utility to both policymakers and industry than either an unconditional endorsement of methanol or its complete rejection.

My perspective on this subject was shaped in part by my internship at Mercedes-Benz Japan, in a division focused on product and charging-infrastructure strategy. In that role, the practical question of which decarbonization options a premium automaker can realistically pursue within the Japanese market was a live one. That experience motivated the analysis but did not supply its evidence; all claims below are supported by publicly available policy documents, peer-reviewed articles, and the historical record.

THE CASE FOR METHANOL, STATED FAIRLY

The vision of a “methanol economy,” in which methanol functions as both a transport fuel and a carbon-carrying chemical feedstock, has been advanced most prominently by Olah et al. (2018). An honest argument must therefore begin with methanol’s genuine strengths. The first advantage is that

methanol can be transported and distributed as a liquid at ordinary room conditions. Hydrogen must be pressurized or cooled to cryogenic temperatures before it can be moved or stored, and ammonia is highly toxic and cannot be handled safely except under considerable pressure. Methanol, by contrast, can be moved and dispensed much like conventional gasoline (World Economic Forum, 2025). This is a significant advantage relative to other alternative fuels.

The second advantage is that methanol's combustion is significantly cleaner than that of many traditional fuels. Because methanol contains no sulfur, it emits virtually no sulfur oxides during combustion, and it produces less particulate matter than conventional fuels. Studies of methanol engines report roughly a 70% reduction in nitrogen oxide emissions and an over 90% reduction in particulate matter compared with traditional diesel engines (Hoang et al., 2026). These represent meaningful improvements in air quality.

A third advantage is that methanol has a research octane number of approximately 109 and a high latent heat of vaporization. Both characteristics favor spark-ignition engine efficiency and reduce the risk of engine knock (Guo et al., 2026).

Finally, and most relevant to the climate debate, methanol can in theory be made carbon-neutral. "Green" or "e-methanol" is produced by reacting hydrogen, generated by electrolyzing water with renewable electricity, with carbon dioxide captured from biogenic sources or directly from the atmosphere. Because the carbon in e-methanol is drawn from atmospheric carbon dioxide, its combustion returns roughly the same amount of carbon that would otherwise have been released anyway (World Economic Forum, 2025).

THE FUEL FIGHTS THE VEHICLE: PHYSICAL AND MATERIALS BARRIERS

The first structural problem is that the very properties that make methanol attractive in some settings work against it in a light passenger vehicle.

ENERGY DENSITY

A methanol-fueled vehicle stores far fewer megajoules of energy per litre than a comparable gasoline vehicle. Methanol provides roughly 15.8 megajoules per litre of volumetric energy, against nearly double that for gasoline at approximately 31.6 megajoules per litre, and it has a lower heating value, about 22.7 megajoules per kilogram versus roughly 44.5 for gasoline ("Methanol Fuels," n.d.). The practical result of this difference is less energy available from a given tank. A methanol vehicle therefore needs a larger tank, accepts a shorter range than a comparable gasoline vehicle, or both. This is acceptable in heavy-duty and marine settings, where duty cycles are predictable and vehicles are large. For a competitive mass-market passenger car, however, doubling tank volume is a serious challenge of packaging and cost.

CORROSION AND MATERIALS COMPATIBILITY

Methanol is chemically aggressive and attacks common automotive materials, including aluminum, zinc, and many plastics, and its tendency to absorb moisture accelerates corrosion (“Methanol Fuels,” n.d.). The acidic by-products of methanol combustion, chiefly formic acid and formaldehyde, damage engine components over time. Recent bench testing has shown that even with advanced anti-corrosion coatings, preventing corrosion-wear failure in the friction surfaces of methanol engines requires higher-grade materials and more durable coatings, both of which add cost (Zhang et al., 2025). Aluminum alloys, the preferred materials in modern engines precisely because they are light and otherwise corrosion-resistant, are among the metals most vulnerable to methanol. Designing a reliable methanol passenger car therefore means redesigning the fuel system and engine internals with costlier materials, yet another expense the mass market resists.

DIFFICULTY STARTING IN COLD CONDITIONS

Methanol’s low vapor pressure gives it poor cold-weather ignition characteristics. It typically cannot vaporize quickly enough to reliably ignite a spark-ignition engine below roughly 10°C, a problem well documented throughout the history of methanol-vehicle development (Guo et al., 2026). Historically this was addressed by blending methanol with a small amount of gasoline to produce an M85 blend (85% methanol), or by adding a secondary starting fuel or an onboard catalyst to assist decomposition, each of which adds complexity and cost. In parts of Japan, particularly the north and mountainous regions, winters are cold enough to make this concern relevant.

TOXICITY AND SAFETY

Methanol is acutely toxic: ingestion or prolonged exposure can cause blindness or death, and it is both flammable and corrosive, requiring carefully specified storage (Lloyd’s Register, n.d.). In Japan it is regulated as a deleterious substance under the country’s poisonous- and deleterious-substances framework, which imposes handling obligations on any network where the public would refuel their own vehicles. These hazards are manageable in a controlled industrial or marine environment staffed by trained personnel, but distributed across tens of thousands of unattended self-service forecourts used by the general public, they represent a genuine regulatory and liability barrier. Although both methanol and gasoline are hazardous, gasoline’s hazards have been managed for more than a century through established industry practice.

The combination of these four characteristics explains why methanol has consistently found acceptance in large commercial and marine vehicles and consistently struggled to gain acceptance in privately owned passenger cars.

THE DISTRIBUTION TRAP: A LESSON ALREADY LEARNED

Beyond the technical limitations discussed above lies a second structural barrier that is economic and historical. Even if methanol’s physical shortcomings could be fully engineered away, a methanol passenger vehicle would still face an infrastructure, or distribution, problem resembling the classic

chicken-and-egg dilemma. And here there is a recent, real-world example, California, that shows how such an effort plays out, and loses.

California once ran the largest methanol passenger-vehicle program in the Western Hemisphere. Beginning in the late 1980s and continuing until it was terminated in 2005, the program was funded by the state, backed by the federal Department of Energy, and supported by several large automakers that built methanol-capable “flexible-fuel” vehicles. Yet even at its peak in 1997, only slightly more than 20,000 such vehicles were registered in total, roughly 15,000 of them in California, served by only about 100 stations offering methanol (“Methanol as an Alternative Transportation Fuel,” n.d.).

The program failed not because of any defect in the vehicles, which reportedly performed as well as comparable gasoline models, but because there were simply too few stations offering methanol, and many were located far from where people lived. Drivers could operate their cars but struggled to obtain fuel (“Methanol as an Alternative Transportation Fuel,” n.d.; MasterResource, 2023).

This experience also helps explain why ethanol, rather than methanol, became the dominant alcohol-based fuel in the United States. Ethanol has a domestic production base in corn and an established pathway for blending into conventional gasoline; methanol has neither (MasterResource, 2023).

The broader lesson is that a new energy source requiring its own separate distribution network faces an extremely difficult path to widespread adoption. Consumers will not buy vehicles they cannot conveniently refuel, and station owners will not install equipment to serve vehicles that do not yet exist. Gasoline and diesel each overcame this obstacle over the course of a century, with the considerable advantage of incumbency. Battery-electric vehicles are overcoming it now, with the advantage of drawing on the existing electrical grid and home charging. Methanol enjoys none of these benefits.

POLICY HAS ALREADY CHOSEN: JAPAN’S ARCHITECTURE

Japanese methanol passenger-car development faces three reinforcing barriers. The first is technological: as discussed above, there is no commercially proven methanol passenger-car platform available today.

The second concerns political and industrial feasibility. There is little institutional will to build an alternative to electrified vehicles in the passenger segment. Japanese automakers such as Toyota and Honda are leading players in the global electrified-vehicle market, and suppliers such as Denso, Aisin, and JTEKT are among the world’s leaders in electric-drive components; these firms increasingly tie their growth prospects to continued electrification. Government bodies, including the New Energy and Industrial Technology Development Organization (NEDO), the Japan Automobile Research Institute (JARI), and the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism (MLIT), are likewise oriented toward promoting electrified passenger vehicles (IEA-AMF, n.d.).

PASSENGER CARS ARE COMMITTED TO ELECTRIFICATION

The third barrier is policy itself. Japan's climate policy for light passenger vehicles targets electrified vehicles, battery-electric (BEV), plug-in hybrid (PHEV), conventional hybrid (HEV), and fuel-cell (FCEV), at 100% of new passenger-car sales by 2035 (InfluenceMap, 2025; IEA-AMF, n.d.). A methanol internal-combustion passenger car does not qualify as an electrified vehicle and therefore counts toward none of this target and fits within none of the central policy instruments governing the segment. The policy does not prohibit methanol passenger cars so much as render them irrelevant to the metrics that matter.

LIQUID ALTERNATIVE FUELS ARE DIRECTED ELSEWHERE

Japan has not ignored liquid fuels; it has deliberately channeled them toward specific uses. When choosing an alcohol for gasoline blending, Japan selected ethanol over methanol. The Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI) and its energy agency have outlined a roadmap to introduce E10 gasoline (10% ethanol) by approximately 2030 and E20 (20% ethanol) by approximately 2040, each requiring new fuel standards and corresponding vehicle-certification systems (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 2025). It is telling that when Japan sought an alcohol to add to its passenger-vehicle fuel supply, it chose ethanol and built a certification pathway around it, leaving methanol no parallel entry point into the passenger sector.

SYNTHETIC FUELS ARE PROMOTED, BUT NOT FOR PASSENGER CARS

Japan's "GX2040" vision and Green Growth Strategy do pursue a range of options, including hydrogen and synthetic e-fuels. The emphasis, however, is telling: fuel-cell deployment is directed primarily at commercial vehicles, and synthetic fuels are framed as tools for hard-to-electrify and commercial sectors rather than as replacements for the passenger mainstream. The national synthetic-fuel program aims for large-scale production technology by 2030 and commercialization around 2040 (IEA-AMF, n.d.; Agency for Natural Resources and Energy, 2021).

EVEN THE FAVORED FUELS FACE DIFFICULT ECONOMICS

These policies are comparatively favorable to liquid alternatives, yet even the favored fuels are straining. In early 2026, ENEOS, Japan's largest oil company and a developer of one of the country's first domestic synthetic-fuel demonstration projects, informed METI that it would halt the commercial scale-up of its carbon-dioxide-based synthetic-fuel project, citing rising construction costs and persistently high hydrogen-production expenses, and would instead focus on advanced biofuels ("Japan's ENEOS Produces Synthetic Fuel," 2026). If the economics of e-fuels are stressing the plans of Japan's most experienced incumbent for the very fuels the government favors, the economic case for an unsupported methanol passenger pathway is weaker still.

THE CHINA COUNTEREXAMPLE, AND WHY IT DOES NOT TRANSFER

Any claim that Japan's market is inherently unfavorable to methanol must confront the one nation that has successfully built and deployed a large-scale methanol-vehicle program: China. Understanding how China succeeded, and what that success actually consists of, clarifies why the model does not transfer to Japan.

China's methanol-vehicle effort is the product of sustained, deliberate industrial policy. The Ministry of Industry and Information Technology launched a national methanol-vehicle pilot in 2012, and in 2019 eight central-government bodies jointly issued guidance to promote methanol-fueled vehicles in suitable regions (Methanol Institute, 2019; CarNewsChina, 2026). The automaker Geely became the pioneer, developing methanol engines from the mid-2000s and building a working fleet, most notably the methanol taxi fleet of Guiyang, where over time the vast majority of the city's taxis came to run on methanol, accumulating tens of millions of kilometres of service and reducing the city's dependence on imported oil (Zhejiang Geely Holding Group, 2024).

Two features explain China's success, and both are absent in Japan. The first is feedstock. China possesses abundant coal, from which methanol can be produced cheaply and domestically; methanol thus doubles as an energy-security measure, converting a domestic resource into transport fuel and reducing reliance on imported petroleum. Japan has no comparable feedstock advantage; to pursue methanol it would have to import either the fuel or its inputs, eliminating the energy-security rationale that anchors China's program. The second feature is the structure of state-led industrial policy: China's government could coordinate vehicle, fuel, and refueling infrastructure simultaneously in targeted regional markets, through policy direction and partnerships with local governments, solving the chicken-and-egg problem by design in designated areas (Methanol Institute, 2019). No equivalent coordinating mechanism exists within Japan's more market-driven economy.

It is particularly telling that China's own champion is now shifting methanol away from private passenger cars. In 2026, Geely stated publicly that it views methanol primarily as an option for commercial and heavy-duty applications, where high energy density offers advantages in mass, lifecycle cost, and duty cycle, rather than for private passenger vehicles, and it began marketing methanol heavy trucks as flagship products (CarNewsChina, 2026). This trajectory, chosen by the world's leading proponent of methanol vehicles, simply reflects the principles set out in the previous section. If the passenger car is a poor fit for methanol even in the country that built a national methanol-vehicle program, there is little reason to believe Japan could adapt the Chinese model without duplicating China's feedstock endowment or its policy machinery.

THE AUTOMAKERS HAVE VOTED

The fourth structural barrier is the deliberate strategy of the manufacturers. A favorable fuel and supportive policy alone cannot place methanol on production lines unless automakers choose to build methanol cars. To date they have chosen not to, and the industry's direction continues to move away from any methanol option rather than toward one.

The premium segment is especially instructive, since premium buyers are, in principle, the most able to absorb the cost premium a methanol drivetrain would entail. Yet, like their mass-market counterparts, premium manufacturers have moved decisively toward electrification, more recently tempered by a pragmatic retention of combustion and hybrid models, never by any interest in alcohol fuels. Mercedes-Benz, for example, announced in 2021 that it would go “EV-only” where market conditions allowed by the end of the decade, committing tens of billions of euros to battery-electric vehicles (Mercedes-Benz Group, 2021). As battery-electric sales slowed, the company softened this to an “electric-first” posture, retaining sophisticated combustion engines and hybrids in its lineup into the early 2030s (Mexico Business News, 2025). This is often read as a retreat from electrification; for this paper, the more important point is what it was not a retreat toward. At no point did Mercedes-Benz, or any comparable manufacturer, treat methanol as part of its non-electric options. The realistic non-electric fallback for premium automakers is efficient gasoline combustion and hybridization, supplemented over time by drop-in carbon-neutral fuels compatible with existing engines, not a purpose-built methanol drivetrain requiring corrosion-hardened components and a nonexistent fuel network.

The absence of research activity is itself evidence. Because methanol represents a plausible alternative to a fully electric future, one would expect at least exploratory development programs from manufacturers hedging their bets. The complete absence of such programs, across both the volume and premium segments operating in Japan, indicates that the industry has independently arrived at the conclusion this paper reaches on other grounds.

WHERE METHANOL BELONGS ANYWAY

To stop here would be to commit the opposite error to the one this paper began by criticizing. The case against methanol passenger cars in Japan is strong; the case against methanol in general is not. Recognizing where methanol does belong is what turns a critique into something useful.

MARITIME SHIPPING

This is methanol’s clearest opportunity. Shipping accounts for roughly three percent of global greenhouse-gas emissions and is extremely difficult to electrify, because vessels need dense, storable energy for long voyages (World Economic Forum, 2025; Hoang et al., 2026). At sea, methanol’s automotive drawbacks become virtues: ships are large enough to absorb the lower energy density, are operated by trained crews who can manage toxicity and corrosion, and can be retrofitted to run on methanol without the cryogenic complexity of hydrogen or ammonia (Hoang et al., 2026). The market has already moved, with major shipping lines ordering methanol-capable vessels, and Japan, a leading shipbuilding and shipping nation with established port infrastructure, is well positioned to supply methanol bunkering and vessels. Maritime methanol is precisely the kind of option a “variety of options” policy is meant to capture.

HEAVY-DUTY AND COMMERCIAL ROAD TRANSPORT

As Geely’s pivot illustrates, trucks and buses accept methanol far more readily than passenger cars. Their size accommodates larger tanks, their professional operation manages the fuel’s hazards, and

their depot-based refueling sidesteps the retail-distribution trap that doomed the California passenger program (CarNewsChina, 2026; “Methanol as an Alternative Transportation Fuel,” n.d.). Japanese policy already treats commercial vehicles as a distinct decarbonization problem with its own timeline and its own openness to decarbonized fuels (IEA-AMF, n.d.). Methanol deserves serious consideration within that commercial frame, particularly for regional logistics and captive fleets that return to a central depot, exactly where it has no place in passenger transport.

CHEMICAL FEEDSTOCK AND THE GREEN-METHANOL SUPPLY CHAIN

Methanol is already one of the world’s most widely produced industrial chemicals, serving as a precursor to formaldehyde, acetic acid, olefins, and many downstream products. Decarbonizing existing methanol demand, by shifting from fossil-derived to green methanol, is a major climate opportunity in its own right, independent of any transport application (World Economic Forum, 2025). Several Japanese trading houses and energy firms are already investing in e-methanol and synthetic-fuel supply chains designed with this dual role, fuel and feedstock, in mind (“Japan’s ENEOS Produces Synthetic Fuel,” 2026; World Economic Forum, 2025). Building competence in green-methanol production and trading may offer Japan greater strategic value than any vehicle program, positioning the country within a supply chain that serves shipping, chemicals, and export markets at once.

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

It was the wrong question that prompted this study, should methanol be introduced into Japan’s passenger-vehicle market? Ultimately, the fact that the answer is “no” matters less than the reasons behind it and the better question it points toward.

The “no” is overdetermined. Energy density, corrosion, cold-start difficulty, and toxicity all weigh against methanol in small, privately operated vehicles. The economics of a dedicated fuel-distribution network already defeated a serious, well-funded methanol passenger program in California, and nothing about Japan’s fuel-retail sector suggests a different outcome. Government policy has committed the passenger segment to electrification, chosen ethanol over methanol for blending, and directed synthetic fuels toward commercial and industrial use on a long timeline, even as those favored fuels strain against cost. And no automaker, including the premium brands best able to absorb a cost premium, has shown interest in methanol drivetrains; they have retreated from all-electric plans toward hybrids and efficient combustion instead. Each of these is a formidable barrier on its own. Together they show that the market is not merely indifferent to methanol but structurally hostile to it.

The more useful framing is locational. Methanol is not a poor fuel; it is simply a superior option in certain niches, maritime shipping and heavy-duty and commercial fleets among them, and an inferior one, relative to the alternatives, in the passenger car. Japan’s own policy language, with its “variety of options” and its tilt toward commercial applications, already gestures at this allocation. Rather than forcing methanol into the application where it fits worst, advocates should accelerate its adoption where it fits best, and, above all, work to decarbonize the methanol Japan already consumes.

SCHOLARLY DEBUT

— by Scholarly Review

Fall 2026

For automakers operating in Japan, and especially for premium brands navigating an uncertain transition, the practical implication is that methanol should be understood not as a candidate drivetrain but as an element of a broader energy landscape: a competitor and complement to hydrogen and electrification in commercial and marine applications; a potential source of drop-in fuels for legacy internal-combustion fleets drawn from a carbon-neutral supply chain; and a reminder that the right decarbonization pathway is almost always specific to the application. The bridge methanol build does not lead to the passenger showroom. It leads to the harbour, the freight depot, and the chemical plant, and those are bridges worth building.

REFERENCES

- Agency for Natural Resources and Energy. (2021). *Japan's sixth strategic energy plan toward carbon neutrality by 2050*. https://www.enecho.meti.go.jp/en/category/special/article/detail_168.html
- CarNewsChina. (2026, April 12). *Geely doubles down on methanol, says lithium EVs too heavy for future transport*. <https://carnewschina.com/2026/04/12/geely-doubles-down-on-methanol-says-lithium-evs-too-heavy-for-future-transport/>
- Guo, X., Luo, H., Liu, L., Liu, K., Ge, J., & Nishida, K. (2026). Towards green marine engines: A review of methanol fueled internal combustion engine. *Green Energy and Resources*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gerr.2026.100168>
- Hoang, A. T., Chen, W. H., López-Escalante, M. C., Guerrero-Pérez, M. O., Rodríguez-Castellón, E., Kowalski, J., Le, T. T., Bui, V. G., & Nguyen, X. P. (2026). Methanol for decarbonization of the maritime sector: From ideological strategy to practical solutions. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 229, Article 116638. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2025.116638>
- IEA-AMF. (n.d.). *Advanced motor fuels in Japan*. Advanced Motor Fuels Technology Collaboration Programme. https://iea-amf.org/content/publications/country_reports/japan
- InfluenceMap. (2025). *2035 vehicle electrification target*. <https://japan.influencemap.org/policy/2035-vehicle-electrification-target-5357>
- Japan's ENEOS produces synthetic fuel from air-captured CO₂ and water. (2026, March 30). *The Defense News*. <https://www.thedefensenews.com/news-details/Japans-ENEOS-Produces-Synthetic-Fuel-from-Air-Captured-CO-and-Water/>
- Lloyd's Register. (n.d.). *Methanol: Compare zero carbon fuels*. <https://www.lr.org/en/knowledge/research/zcfm/methanol/>
- MasterResource. (2023, April 4). "Fuel of the future" methanol: Remembering a California energy failure. <https://www.masterresource.org/transportation-policy/methanol-politics-1980s-1990s/>
- Mercedes-Benz Group. (2021). *Strategy update: Electric drive*. <https://group.mercedes-benz.com/company/strategy/mercedes-benz-strategy-update-electric-drive.html>
- Methanol as an alternative transportation fuel in the US: Options for sustainable and/or energy-secure transportation*. (n.d.). MIT Physical Sciences and Sequestration Forum. <https://www.ourenergypolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/methanol.pdf>

Methanol fuels: An overview. (n.d.). In *ScienceDirect topics*.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/materials-science/methanol-fuels>

Methanol Institute. (2019). *A brief review of China's methanol vehicle pilot and policy*.
<https://methanol.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/A-Brief-Review-of-Chinas-Methanol-Vehicle-Pilot-and-Policy-20-March-2019.pdf>

Mexico Business News. (2025). *Mercedes-Benz adjusts EV production amid misjudged demand*.
<https://mexicobusiness.news/automotive/news/mercedes-benz-adjusts-ev-production-amid-misjudged-demand>

Olah, G. A., Goeppert, A., & Prakash, G. K. S. (2018). *Beyond oil and gas: The methanol economy* (3rd ed.). Wiley-VCH. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9783527805662>

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Foreign Agricultural Service. (2025). *Action plan to introduce E10 and E20 in Japan* (GAIN Report No. JA2025-0035).
https://apps.fas.usda.gov/newgainapi/api/Report/DownloadReportByFileName?fileName=Action+Plan+to+Introduce+E10+and+E20+in+Japan_Tokyo_Japan_JA2025-0035

World Economic Forum. (2025, February 24). *E-methanol: The game changer for decarbonizing shipping*.
<https://www.weforum.org/stories/2025/02/emethanol-a-game-changer-for-decarbonizing-shipping>

Zhang, W., Gao, H., Wang, Q., Liu, D., & Zhang, E. (2025). Study on the corrosion and wear mechanism of a core friction pair in methanol-fueled internal combustion engines. *Materials*, 18(9), Article 1966. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ma18091966>

Zhejiang Geely Holding Group. (2024). *Geely's e-fuels solution to a carbon neutral future*.
<https://www.geely.com/en/news/2024/geely-e-fuel-solution-carbon-neutral-future>