

# Manufacturing Competitiveness Analysis for Hydrogen Refueling Stations

Ahmad Mayyas, Margaret Mann (P.I.)  
National Renewable Energy Laboratory  
June 14, 2018

DOE Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program  
2018 Annual Merit Review and Peer Evaluation Meeting

Project ID # MN017

# Overview

## Timeline

- Project start date: April 2015
- Project end date: June 2018
- Percent complete: 90%

## Budget

- Total project funding
  - DOE share: \$719 K
  - Contractor share: n.a.
- Funding received in FY18: \$0

## Technical Barriers

### Cross-Cutting Fuel Cell Barriers

- F. Manual Stack Assembly
- I. Lack of Standardized Balance-of-Plant Component

### Hydrogen Generation by Water Electrolysis

- F. Capital Cost
- K. Manufacturing


## Collaborators

- Argonne National Laboratory
- Sandia National Laboratories
- Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
- Other Industry Advisors and Experts

# Relevance & Goals


- To develop detailed bottom-up manufacturing cost analysis for key systems/parts in the hydrogen refueling station (HRS).
- To identify cost drivers for key systems in the hydrogen refueling stations (e.g., compressors, storage tanks, dispenser, coolers and heat exchanger)
- To identify cost drivers for onsite hydrogen production systems (PEM and alkaline electrolyzers)
- To investigate effect of economies of scale and learning experience on the cost of the onsite hydrogen production systems

# Approach



# Accomplishment- Global HRS Trade Flows

Updated Map



United States		Japan		Germany		United Kingdom		France		Denmark		Norway		Other Western Europe Countries		Rest of the World	
Active	Planned	Active	Planned	Active	Planned	Active	Planned	Active	Planned	Active	Planned	Active	Planned	Active	Planned	Active	Planned
62	18	92	3	38	37	11	13	4	5	10	1	7	5	31	6	22	13
78%	23%	97%	3%	51%	49%	46%	54%	44%	56%	91%	9%	58%	42%	84%	16%	63%	37%

# Comparison Between PEM And Alkaline Electrolyzers


PEM electrolyzers have larger current and power densities, shorter startup time and higher system price (in \$/kW)

Characteristics	Alkaline	PEM	Unit	Notes
Current Density	0.2 - 0.7	1.0 - 2.2	A/cm <sup>2</sup>	
Power Density	0.32 - 1.12	1.4 – 3.52	W/cm <sup>2</sup>	Reference voltage = 1.6 volt
Operating Temperature	60 – 80	50 – 84	°C	
Electricity Consumption (Median)	50 – 73 (53)	47 – 73 (52)	kWh/kg-H <sub>2</sub>	Electrolysis system only. Excluding storage, compression and dispensing
Min. Load	20 - 40%	3 – 10%		
Startup Time from Cold to Min. Load	20 min - 60+	5 – 15	minutes	
System Efficiency (LHV) (Median)	45-67% (63%)	45 – 71% (63%)		
System Lifetime (Median)	20-30 (26)	10-30 (22)	Year	
System Price	\$760 – \$1,100 (\$930)	\$1,200-\$1,940 (\$1,570)		Including power supply, system control and gas drying. Excluding grid connection, external compression, external purification and H <sub>2</sub> storage

Sources of data: Bertuccioli et al., 2014, NREL analysis 2017

# PEM Electrolyzer System Design


Stack is the core of the PEM electrolysis system. Balance of plant parts usually outsourced from reliable vendors



# Accomplishment- PEM Electrolyzer Functional Specifications for Analysis

Current and power densities are key parameters in the cell design

Stack Power	10	20	50	100	200	500	1,000	2,000	5,000	10,000	kW
single cell amps	1224										A
current density	1.80										A/cm <sup>2</sup>
reference voltage	1.619										V
power density	2.913										W/cm <sup>2</sup>
Pt-Ir loading- Anode	7.0										g/m <sup>2</sup>
PGM loading Cathode	4.0										g/m <sup>2</sup>
single cell power	1981.0										W
Cells per system	5	10	25	50	101	252	505	1010	2524	5048	cells
stacks per system	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	4	10	20	stacks
cells per stack	5	10	25	50	101	252	252	252	252	252	cells



Part	Assumptions	Notes
Membrane	Nafion 117 (Purchased)	PFSA (PEEK, PBI)
Pt	Pt-price= \$1500/tr.oz	DOE current value
CCM	Spray Coating	Platinum loadings: Anode= 7g/m <sup>2</sup> (Pt) Cathode= 4g/m <sup>2</sup> (Pt-Ir)
Porous Transport Layer	Sintered porous titanium Ti-price= \$4.5/kg	Porosity=30%
Seal/Frame	Screen printed PPS-40GF or PEEK seal	Seal: 0.635 cm from each side for MEA bonding
Plates	Stamped stainless steel 316L	Coated plates (plasma Nitriding)

PPS-40GF: poly Phenylene Sulfide (40% Glass fiber filled)



# Accomplishment- Alkaline Electrolyzer Functional Specifications for Analysis


Current and power densities are key parameters in the cell design

	Stack power	10	20	50	100	200	500	1,000	2,000	5,000	10,000	kW
Avg. H <sub>2</sub> production rate		2	4	10	15	22	56	110	220	550	1,100	Nm <sup>3</sup> /hr
Avg. H <sub>2</sub> production rate		4	9	22	32	48	120	237	475	1,187	2,373	kg/day
Total plate area		3,000						10,000				cm <sup>2</sup>
Total plate solid area		400						800				cm <sup>2</sup>
Electrode active area		2,600						9,200				cm <sup>2</sup>
Electrolyte		H <sub>2</sub> O+ 30% KOH						H <sub>2</sub> O+ 30% KOH				cm <sup>2</sup>
Single cell amps		520	520	520	520	520	520	1840	1840	1840	1840	A
Current density		0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	A/cm <sup>2</sup>
Reference voltage		1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	V
Power density		0.336	0.336	0.336	0.336	0.336	0.336	0.336	0.336	0.336	0.336	W/cm <sup>2</sup>
Single cell power		873.6	873.6	873.6	873.6	873.6	873.6	3091.2	3091.2	3091.2	3091.2	W
Cells per system		12	23	58	115	229	573	324	647	1,618	3,235	cells
Stacks per system		1	1	1	1	2	3	2	4	9	17	stacks
cells per stack		12	23	58	115	115	191	162	162	180	191	cells
Additional Parasitic	Air blower/ Liquid pump	0.3	0.5	1.5	2	3	7	10	15	30	50	kW
	Other paras. loads	0.2	0.3	0.5	1	1.5	3	5	8	10	15	kW
	Parasitic loss	0.50	0.80	2.00	3.00	4.50	10.00	15.00	23.00	40.00	65.00	kW

- Commercial alkaline electrolyzers can have large cells (~1.6m in diameter<sup>†</sup>)
- Electrolyte solution (Water+30% KOH)

<sup>†</sup> See Vogt et al., 2014

## Functional Cell Design



Part	Materials	Notes
Membrane	m-PBI	Cast membrane using doctor-blade machine
Electrodes	Raney-nickel	PVD + Leaching to get the required porosity
Porous Transport Layer	Pure Nickel Sheets	Corrosion resistance in alkaline solution
Frame	PPS-40GF or PEEK	Injection molding
Plates	Nickel plates	Surface treatment of high purity sheets


PVD: physical vapor deposition

PPS-40GF: poly Phenylene Sulfide (40% Glass fiber filled)


# Accomplishment- PEM - Bipolar Plate Cost Model

Nitriding or other special coating processes used to improve durability of bipolar plates in acidic environment


## Case Hardening (Nitriding)



### Bipolar Plate Cost (\$/pcs) - 200 kW system




### Bipolar Plate Cost (\$/pcs) - 1 MW system



# Accomplishment- PEM Stack Assembly Cost Model

Stack assembly is still semi-manual and there is good room for improvements (robots, flexible assembly line)


- Semi-Automatic assembly line
- 3 workers/line
- PPS-40GF Adhesive Materials for MEA
- Compression bands or tie rods
- Stainless steel 316L end plates (thickness 30 mm)




# Accomplishment- PEM Stack Assembly Cost Model

Stack assembly is a labor-intensive process. Capital and building cost dominate at low production rates


## Stack Assembly Cost (\$/kW)- 200 kW



## Stack Assembly Cost (\$/kW)- 1 MW




## Stack Assembly Cost (\$/kW)- 200 kW



65 kg H<sub>2</sub>/day

## Stack Assembly Cost (\$/kW)- 1 MW




385 kg H<sub>2</sub>/day

# Accomplishment- PEM Electrolyzer Stack Cost

U.S. based manufacturers have advantages of 1) longer experience (i.e., learning rate), and 2) lower energy cost except for China and Mexico (still has smaller effect in the stack cost)


PEM Electrolyzer Stack Cost  
(1 MW @ 10 unit/yr)



- Relative cost of the stack is higher in Europe because of the higher labor and energy costs
- Relative cost of the stack is higher in Japan and Canada (in relative to U.S.) because of the higher labor costs


- China's advantage relative to the U.S. is driven by lower labor (including stack assembly), building, and energy costs
- Mexico's advantage relative to the U.S. is driven by lower labor (including assembly), and building costs

PEM Electrolyzer Stack Cost  
(1 MW @ 10 unit/yr)




# Accomplishment- PEM Electrolyzer Stack Cost

Larger production rates could also play role in reducing the cost (economies of scale for the stack modules) and balance of plant (*not shown in these charts*)




- China's advantage relative to the U.S. is driven by lower labor (including assembly), low material cost, building and energy costs
- Mexico's advantage relative to the U.S. is driven by lower labor (including assembly), and building costs

- Relative cost of the stack is higher in Europe because of the higher labor and energy costs
- Relative cost of the stack is higher in Japan and Canada (in relative to U.S.) because of the higher labor costs



# Accomplishment- PEM Electrolyzer System Cost

PEM Electrolyzer System Cost  
(1 MW @ 10 unit/yr)




## System cost by component (stack & BOS)

- Unlike the stack, balance of plant is not manufactured in house and most of its parts are outsourced from reliable vendors
- Balance of plant shares >50% of total system cost, and assumed to have same cost across all countries in the list

- Power electronics dominate the balance of plant cost (AC/DC rectifiers are very expensive compared to the DC/DC converter)
- Connecting electrolyzer to DC source (e.g., wind, PV) may reduce the cost of power electronics in the electrolysis system (e.g., AC-DC rectifier cost vs. DC-DC convertor cost)

PEM Electrolyzer System Cost  
(1 MW @ 100 unit/yr)



# Electrolysis Systems Value Chain



Currently Shipped	Shipped globally	Shipped globally	Shipped regionally	Shipped globally	Shipped globally
Value Share* [Cumulative]	15% [15%]	7% [22%]	5% [27%]	73% [100%]	n/a [100%]

<b>U.S. Strengths</b>	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>R&amp;D Innovation</li> <li>Manufacturing experience</li> <li>Educated workforce</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Educated workforce</li> <li>Synergistic industries and clustering (benefiting from fuel cell manufacturing)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Availability of suppliers</li> <li>Import and export policies (no tariffs)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Availability of manufacturers</li> <li>Support from federal and state programs (e.g., California and Northeast hydrogen infrastructure)</li> </ul>
<b>Areas Need Work</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supply chain security for critical materials (e.g. platinum, Iridium, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cost of manufacturing</li> <li>Automation/ advanced manufacturing (e.g., roll-to-roll)</li> <li>Low-cost labor availability (compared to China and Mexico)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quality and performance of products</li> <li>Cost of manufacturing</li> <li>Automation of assembly process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standardization of parts</li> <li>Cost of power electronics</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of coordinated incentives and facilitation in some states</li> </ul>

\* Assuming 1 MW PEM electrolyzer system and 100 unit/yr production rate



# Conclusions

- Alkaline water electrolyzers have lower current and power densities, but have lower system cost (per kW basis) because of lower electrode materials cost (no precious materials) and larger cell size
- PEM electrolyzers have higher power density which requires smaller stack areas in relative to alkaline stack. This could contribute to lower stack costs with economies of scale
- U.S. based manufacturers have advantages of low energy cost, availability of skilled workers, and intellectual property
- Emerging manufacturing technologies (e.g. roll-to-roll catalyst coating, plates nitriding/coating, full automated assembly line, etc.) in association with economies of scale will have great impact on the capital cost of onsite H<sub>2</sub> production systems and cost of H<sub>2</sub> generation

# Remaining Challenges and Barriers

Our team is still working on several areas that could improve the impact of our analysis:

- Involve more organizations (industry, part suppliers, regulation agencies, etc.) in the hydrogen refueling station study
- Make new collaboration with industry in the ongoing project (manufacturing competitiveness analysis for onsite hydrogen production systems)
- Expand the cost study framework to cover CAPEX and OPEX and to compare cost of HRS to gas stations
- Benchmark our results with actual installations in several countries/regions
- There is a strong need to study manufacturing cost for balance of plant parts (e.g. AC-DC rectifier shares >20% of total PEM electrolysis system cost)

# Proposed Future Work

- Complete manufacturing cost analysis onsite H<sub>2</sub> production systems
  - PEM electrolyzers
  - Alkaline electrolyzers
- Study effect of emerging manufacturing technologies and economies of scale on the onsite hydrogen production systems capital cost and impacts on hydrogen production cost
- Study effects of the change in capital cost on the cost of hydrogen production (CAPEX & OPEX)
- Benchmark our results with station installers and state/countries sponsoring new installations

“Any proposed future work is subject to change based on funding levels.”

# Responses to 2017 AMR Reviewer Comments

There was no discussion about the cost of a “gasoline refueling station,” which, although clearly less, is far from zero. It is interesting that gasoline is almost always dispensed from buried tanks, which are conveniently out of sight and have no footprint.

- Good point, this can be included in the total cost of ownership model in case we have time and resources to do so.

Hydrogen tanks tend to be inconveniently large and troublesome. The polymer electrolyte membrane (PEM) electrolyzer costs were interesting, especially the cost variation with volume. It would have been interesting to include costs of contemporary commercial electrolyzers at times that high-current devices have some predictive insight into the scaling issue.

- Cost models for PEM and alkaline electrolysis are being developed and refined this year. New PEM electrolyzers with high pressure and/or current capabilities will be studied if time allows.

It is not clear how margin is applied/varies with manufacturing rate. The basis of manufacturing rate cost reduction (“20% discount per 10x increase in purchased quantity”) is not explained.

- This assumption is based on some discussions we had with fuel cell and H<sub>2</sub> compressor manufacturers. It’s sort of rule-of-thumb and may not get a wider acceptance in the fuel cell community. Also, we found something similar to this assumption when we collected the quotes from different vendors with different discount ranging between 5-35% in most cases.

Dispenser cost analysis has focused on H35 and dual H35/H70. It is not clear why the team did not focus on single-hose dispenser H70.

- H35 is still used for FC buses and trucks and H35/H70 is the current technology of dispensers which can fuel FCEV, FC-forklifts and FC-buses. H70 single hose dispenser will be added to the analysis.

There is not enough industry participation. This would be helpful in understanding what market conditions would bring more players into these new markets. OPEX is not taken into account with CAPEX. For example, the DCHE may be more expensive, but refrigeration power costs could be greatly reduced. It is unclear how the project team would address this. The project seems to be wandering in many directions and should be focused on HRS costs.

- That’s really good point. While we are focusing on manufacturing cost in this work, we think that OPEX is also important to consider in the total cost of hydrogen stations. We did include this in the work for electrolysis systems

# Collaborations

- David Hart, Franz Lehner, E4Tech, United Kingdom
  - Provided data for manufacturing cost analysis for PEM and alkaline electrolyzers
- Syed Saba, Forschungszentrum Jülich (FZJ), Germany
  - Provided cost data for PEM electrolyzer to validate our cost model
- Brian James, Strategic Analysis Inc.
  - Provided cost data for PEM electrolyzers
- Kevin Harrison, Bryan Pivovar, Guido Bender, Mark Ruth, Owen Smith, NREL
  - Provided critical inputs for cost model and discussed cost model results
- Industry stakeholders: provided estimates for dispenser cost (AEG and Magna Power (power supplies), Grundfos (water pumps), etc.)

# Summary

- **Relevance:** to provide a framework for technoeconomic and supply chain analyses for hydrogen refueling stations and onsite hydrogen production systems
- **Approach:** Bottom-up cost analysis cost models and detailed supply chain maps.
- **Technical Accomplishments and Progress:**
  - Manufacturing cost models for onsite hydrogen production systems (alkaline and PEM)
  - Trade flow maps for global HRS's
- **Collaboration:** E4Tech, FZJ Institute
- **Proposed Next-Year Research:**
  - Complete manufacturing cost models for alkaline electrolyzer
  - Investigate effect of qualitative factors in the manufacturing competitiveness

# Technology Transfer Activities

- Not applicable for this cost analysis

# Thank You

---

[www.nrel.gov](http://www.nrel.gov)

NREL/PR-6A20-71304

This work was authored by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, operated by Alliance for Sustainable Energy, LLC, for the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) under Contract No. DE-AC36-08GO28308. Funding provided by the U.S. Department of Energy Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Fuel Cell Technologies Office. The views expressed in the article do not necessarily represent the views of the DOE or the U.S. Government. The U.S. Government retains and the publisher, by accepting the article for publication, acknowledges that the U.S. Government retains a nonexclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, worldwide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this work, or allow others to do so, for U.S. Government purposes.






# Technical Back-Up Slides

---


# Alkaline Electrolyzer System

Preliminary



# Porous Transport Layer Cost (PEM Electrolyzer)

Titanium layer performs better in the corrosive environment inside the stack. Could have lower cost at higher production rates




Cost curves for porous transport layers (also called GDL): 1) carbon paper on anode side and Ti-plate on cathode side, and 2) Titanium layer from both sides. Outsourced carbon layer, and Pt-PTL is manufactured in-house (30% porosity by volume).

Annual production rate represents number of produced electrolyzers per year (200 kW system)


# Balance of Plant Cost -PEM (Parts Only)

Parts only at low order quantities. Discounts are expected with larger quantities


### BOP Cost Breakdown- 200kW System




### BOP Cost Breakdown- 500kW System



### BOP Cost Breakdown- 1MW System




### BOP Cost Breakdown- 10MW System



# Sensitivity Analysis – Alkaline Electrolyzer Stack

**1 MW Alkaline Electrolyzer Stack**  
(Cost = \$133/kW @ 10 units/yr)



	Yield	Power Density	Wages	Membrane Cost	Electrode Material Cost
■ +20%	-\$7	-\$10	\$5	\$5	\$1
■ -20%	\$32	\$15	-\$5	-\$5	-\$1


## Stack Only:

- Yield (scrap rate) (Base=95% for plates; 90% for membrane casting, 99.5% for stack assembly) dominates the stack cost at lower production rates

## Stack Only:

- At higher production rates, power density and labor cost start to make larger impacts

**1 MW Alkaline Electrolyzer Stack**  
(Cost = \$58/kW @ 1,000 units/yr)



	Yield	Power Density	Wages	Membrane Cost	Electrode Material Cost
■ +20%	-\$3	-\$9	\$5	\$2	\$1
■ -20%	\$15	\$13	-\$5	-\$2	-\$1