

### **Reversible Fuel Cells for Long Duration Storage** Thomas Zawodzinski, University of TN-Knoxville Team Members: Peroxygen Systems Inc

**Project Vision** 

Not your grandfather's Fuel Cell! Peroxide as a Product enables high efficiency, low cost Virtually no self-discharge over long periods!



### **Reversible Fuel Cells**

### Peroxide Enabled Long Duration Electrochemical Energy Storage (PELoDEES)

Thomas Zawodzinski, University of Tennessee-Knoxville Team Members: Peroxygen Systems Inc, Electrosynthesis Inc

### **Project Vision**

#### Not your grandfather's Fuel Cell EES System!

Peroxide as a Product enables high efficiency, low cost Virtually no self-discharge over long periods!

Total project cost:	\$1.5M	
Length	24 mo.	

## **ARPA-e Project Overview**

#### **Technology Summary**

- Advanced reversible two-electron catalyst, implemented as a high surface electrode.
- Tailored OH<sup>-</sup> conducting membranes.
- Flow fields for mixed phase air electrodes.
- Demonstrated as peroxide generation cells and as Znperoxide batteries.

#### **Technology Impact**

- Dramatic lowering of cost of peroxide, allowing on-site generation.
- High efficiency batteries with reversible air electrode.

#### **Proposed Targets**

Metric	State of Art	Proposed
Air electrode cycling, loss at 100 mA/cm <sup>2</sup>	>300 mA/cm <sup>2</sup>	<100 mA/cm <sup>2</sup>
Peroxide production	<100 <u>mA/cm<sup>2</sup></u> <u>@1.2</u> V	400 <u>mA/cm<sup>2</sup></u> <u>@1.2</u> V
Battery single cell cycling efficiency	<50% RT	80% RT



O<sub>2</sub> saturated
 N<sub>2</sub> saturated

0.8

Reversible ORR to be

translated to high surface

area electrodes uA/cm<sup>2</sup> A/cm<sup>2</sup>

Co-Salen Complex

Ketjen Black

Advanced flow field Final C



Final Goal: Stack

Demonstrated High Efficiency Air Electrode for Multiple Applications

Highly conductive OHconducting membranes tailored to use





Air electrodes for High Energy Density Batteries

# PELoDEES: A Path to Efficient Cycling to Leverage H<sub>2</sub> Storage Innovations in Catalysts-Cell-Stack-System





Reversible Fuel Cell (with a twist)



Stack at PSI Now Phase2 Chemicals

#### Electrode performance



Hydrogen and Oxygen in charged statecheap, easily available, near zero selfdischarge!

#### BUT

Conventional fuel cells are inefficient with expensive catalysts.

#### **ENTER PELoDEES**

We discovered cheap catalysts to produce peroxide with *electrochemical reversibility* 

#### High efficiency

Possible long-term storage with extremely low self-discharge: in charged state we store  $H_2$  and  $O_2$ 





Room Temp Kodak CLAM 40mA/cm2 3hr Charge/ 3hr Discharge cycles 1mgSF15-70 Catalyst (or equiv) /cm2 with 28% and 16% AS4 in the electrode 100ml/min Air (0.57A/cm2) with 10ml/min 2.5M NaOH w/ 1M  $H_2O_2$  (6.5A/cm2) 100µL/hr 30% H2O2 added (0.01A)

### The Team

- Tom Zawodzinski, PI: 30 years experience as a leader in electrochemical S&T fuel cells, batteries, flow batteries, etc.
- UTK team—senior scientists: Shane Foister (chemical synthesis), Gabriel Goenaga (testing), Ramez Elgammal (material development)
- **PSI**: small (but growing) company commercializing peroxide catalyst technology
- New partner (projected): Electrosynthesis Co.--~40 years experience testing and scaling electrochemical technology.
- Unique consulting and 'ecosystem' infrastructure: Former GM fuel cell stack and system design for manufacturing doing design and TEA; small polymer company makes batches of starting materials; coating at scale at Kodak





### Emma (Woodhouse) Zawodzinski



### **Project Objectives**

- Technical Risks
  - 1. Catalyst performance on hydrogen electrode.
  - 2. Managing two-phase flow in stacks.
  - 3. For 'one-stack' design, achieving proper balance of material properties under reverse polarity.
- Prototype Size: In this phase of the work, we aim for proof of concept on 100 cm<sup>2</sup> cells and possibly a short stack.
- Scaling: The larger cell design is essentially a modular array of the 100 cm<sup>2</sup> cells. We have previously developed stacks using this concept. System design is relatively straightforward.



### **Results: Long term stability**

#### **Peroxide stability**

- Concern based on literature values of decay rate in alkaline solution
- More recent additive package shows stability of ~97% over 10 hours
- TEA shows minimal cost from 'make-up'
- Stability in fully charged state is essentially unlimited (self-discharge minimal)
  - This enables long duration between cycles



#### Peroxide Stability, 30 °C, 10 hours



### **Results: Performance in 'single cell' systems**

- Scaled-up to 100 cm<sup>2</sup> cells; results match those in 5 cm<sup>2</sup> cells
- Polarization curves (left) indicated that two different electrode constructs (labeled UTK and PSI) needed for positive and negative electrodes
- Hydrogen polarization curve indicate promising reversibility (hydrogen electrode shown) for single cell
  operation



- Performance targets (cell current density) can be met or exceeded but some difficulty with catalyst reproducibility.
- Cycling is beginning at this time.



### Technoeconomic Analysis









CHANGING WHAT'S POSSIBLE

### **Technoeconomic Analysis: Costs**

For system components, the following cost inputs were used:

- compressor/pump efficiency = 60%
- compressor/pump costs = \$1000 + \$1000/kW compressor/pump power
- low-pressure tank (balloon) cost = \$4/m<sup>2</sup> tank material. Commodity prices for aluminum coated mylar range from 0.5 to 2 \$/m<sup>2</sup>. The higher price allows for fabrication cost.
- solution tank cost = \$2/kg tank material with density of 8,000 kg/m<sup>3</sup> and thickness of 3 mm.
- O&M = 20% of Cp, capital cost for power-specific components.

#### Additional Cost Input for Part 2

- DC-DC boost = \$200/kW which was added to the power costs
- Miscellaneous = 10% of capital costs (both power and energy)
- Covers for storage balloons = \$20/m<sup>2</sup> footprint sized at 2x the gas storage balloons added to the energy costs
- Building Rent = \$60/m<sup>2</sup> footprint size at 100 m<sup>2</sup> plus 2 m<sup>2</sup> per stack which was added to the O&M costs
- Labor = \$100,000/yr which was added to the O&M costs

$$LCOS = \left[ \left( \frac{1}{\eta_{RTE}} - 1 \right) P_c \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{n_c(t)}{(1+r)^t} + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{O\&M(t)}{(1+r)^t} + \left( \frac{C_E}{\eta_D} + \frac{C_P}{d} \right) \right] * \left[ \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{n_c(t)}{(1+r)^t} \right]^{-1}$$
[1]



### **Technoeconomic Analysis**

- Detailed and complete breakdown of stack parts, costs
- Performance based on our SOTA

H2/O2 tank (each) (m³)554Solution tank (m³)11.4discharge parasitic (% of stack power)0.6charge parasitic (% of stack power)0.02discharge efficiency (%)90round trip efficiency (%)81stack costs (\$k) Internal Stack Cost60stack costs (\$k) NREL Stack Cost34power costs (\$k) (w/ NREL Stack Cost)37energy (tank) costs (\$k)5LCOS (\$/kWhr) Internal Stack Cost0.053LCOS (\$/kWhr) NREL Stack Cost0.034	Total Stack size (m <sup>2</sup> active area)	122
Solution tank (m³)11.4discharge parasitic (% of stack power)0.6charge parasitic (% of stack power)0.02discharge efficiency (%)90round trip efficiency (%)81stack costs (\$k) Internal Stack Cost60stack costs (\$k) NREL Stack Cost34power costs (\$k) (w/ NREL Stack Cost)37energy (tank) costs (\$k)5LCOS (\$/kWhr) Internal Stack Cost0.053LCOS (\$/kWhr) NREL Stack Cost0.034	H2/O2 tank (each) (m <sup>3</sup> )	554
discharge parasitic (% of stack power) 0.6 charge parasitic (% of stack power) 0.02 discharge efficiency (%) 90 round trip efficiency (%) 81 stack costs (\$k) Internal Stack Cost 60 stack costs (\$k) NREL Stack Cost 34 power costs (\$k) (w/ NREL Stack Cost) 37 energy (tank) costs (\$k) 5 LCOS (\$/kWhr) Internal Stack Cost 0.053 LCOS (\$/kWhr) NREL Stack Cost 0.034	Solution tank (m <sup>3</sup> )	11.4
discharge parasitic (% of stack power)0.6charge parasitic (% of stack power)0.02discharge efficiency (%)90round trip efficiency (%)81stack costs (\$k) Internal Stack Coststack costs (\$k) Internal Stack Cost60stack costs (\$k) NREL Stack Cost34power costs (\$k) (w/ NREL Stack Cost)37energy (tank) costs (\$k)5LCOS (\$/kWhr) Internal Stack CostLCOS (\$/kWhr) NREL Stack Cost0.053LCOS (\$/kWhr) NREL Stack Cost0.034		
charge parasitic (% of stack power)0.02discharge efficiency (%)90round trip efficiency (%)81stack costs (\$k) Internal Stack Cost60stack costs (\$k) NREL Stack Cost34power costs (\$k) (w/ NREL Stack Cost)37energy (tank) costs (\$k)5LCOS (\$/kWhr) Internal Stack Cost0.053LCOS (\$/kWhr) NREL Stack Cost0.034	discharge parasitic (% of stack power)	0.6
discharge efficiency (%)90round trip efficiency (%)81stack costs (\$k) Internal Stack Cost60stack costs (\$k) NREL Stack Cost34power costs (\$k) (w/ NREL Stack Cost)37energy (tank) costs (\$k)5LCOS (\$/kWhr) Internal Stack Cost0.053LCOS (\$/kWhr) NREL Stack Cost0.034	charge parasitic (% of stack power)	0.02
round trip efficiency (%) 81 stack costs (\$k) Internal Stack Cost 60 stack costs (\$k) NREL Stack Cost 34 power costs (\$k) (w/ NREL Stack Cost) 37 energy (tank) costs (\$k) 55 LCOS (\$/kWhr) Internal Stack Cost 0.053 LCOS (\$/kWhr) NREL Stack Cost 0.034	discharge efficiency (%)	90
stack costs (\$k) Internal Stack Cost60stack costs (\$k) NREL Stack Cost34power costs (\$k) (w/ NREL Stack Cost)37energy (tank) costs (\$k)5LCOS (\$/kWhr) Internal Stack Cost0.053LCOS (\$/kWhr) NREL Stack Cost0.034	round trip efficiency (%)	81
stack costs (\$k) Internal Stack Cost60stack costs (\$k) NREL Stack Cost34power costs (\$k) (w/ NREL Stack Cost)37energy (tank) costs (\$k)5LCOS (\$/kWhr) Internal Stack Cost0.053LCOS (\$/kWhr) NREL Stack Cost0.034		
stack costs (\$k) NREL Stack Cost34power costs (\$k) (w/ NREL Stack Cost)37energy (tank) costs (\$k)5LCOS (\$/kWhr) Internal Stack Cost0.053LCOS (\$/kWhr) NREL Stack Cost0.034	stack costs (\$k) Internal Stack Cost	60
power costs (\$k) (w/ NREL Stack Cost) 37 energy (tank) costs (\$k) 5 LCOS (\$/kWhr) Internal Stack Cost 0.053 LCOS (\$/kWhr) NREL Stack Cost 0.034	stack costs (\$k) NREL Stack Cost	34
energy (tank) costs (\$k) 5 LCOS (\$/kWhr) Internal Stack Cost 0.053 LCOS (\$/kWhr) NREL Stack Cost 0.034	power costs (\$k) (w/ NREL Stack Cost)	37
LCOS (\$/kWhr) Internal Stack Cost 0.053 LCOS (\$/kWhr) NREL Stack Cost 0.034	energy (tank) costs (\$k)	5
LCOS (\$/kWhr) Internal Stack Cost0.053LCOS (\$/kWhr) NREL Stack Cost0.034		
LCOS (\$/kWhr) NREL Stack Cost 0.034	LCOS (\$/kWhr) Internal Stack Cost	0.053
		0.004

#### Size Matters

	0.1 A/cm <sup>2</sup>	0.2 A/cm <sup>2</sup>
100 kW	0.304	0.289
1 MW	0.084	0.069
10 MW	0.062	0.046

#### LCOS (\$/kWhr) using NREL stack costs

A ~100x increase in size was needed to reduce the impact of labor costs to an acceptable LCOS value. Doubling of stack performance reduced the cost by 0.015 /kWhr.



### **Results: Cost**

- Cost estimates (all-in) show clear paths to meeting cost targets
  - Enabled by low cost materials, high efficiency
- Many configurations, ways of using system possible





#### Solar farm storage use case:

10 MW system had an LCOS of **0.039** \$/kWhr\*. Based on recent results, we have small gains on this figure.

\*Operating at 0.2 A/cm<sup>2</sup> (1.1 V charge, 0.71 V discharge) with 10 hr discharge, 9.75 hr charge and 4.25 hr idle with 2.5% peroxide decomposition and  $H_2$  and  $O_2$  makeup, without labor or DC-DC boost,



### **Results: Cost**

17

- Cost estimates (all-in) show clear paths to meeting cost targets
  - Enabled by low cost materials, high efficiency
- Many configurations, ways of using system possible





#### Solar farm storage use case:

10 MW system had an LCOS of **0.039** \$/kWhr\*. Based on recent results, we have small gains on this figure.

\*Operating at 0.2 A/cm<sup>2</sup> (1.1 V charge, 0.71 V discharge) with 10 hr discharge, 9.75 hr charge and 4.25 hr idle with 2.5% peroxide decomposition and  $H_2$  and  $O_2$  makeup, without labor or DC-DC boost,



### **Challenges and Potential Partnerships**

- Known issues that we attacked
  - Proving sufficient peroxide stability and cost of mitigation. *Solved*
  - Stack design issues. *We have functioning solutions*.
  - Getting to a system understanding, supply chain. *Baked into project*.
- Known unknowns: Coulombic efficiency issues (catalysts).
- Unknown unknowns: (Accelerating development and/or deployment) Cycling performance; Solving stack design challenges and getting to system implementation; Identification of long-duration use cases. Teaming with integrators.
- Partnerships: Eventually plan to form a joint-venture company for next stage of development beyond next BP.' Options open.



### **Technology-to-Market**

### Our ultimate goal

Provide inexpensive and flexible LDS based on hydrogen and oxygen, including a wholesystem concept and paths to manufactured system.

### ► Timeline

We are still fairly early stage in development; hardware design is modular and all work is directly connected to system considerations.

### Getting Beyond the Current Status

Some teaming with system developers/integrators. Improved catalyst synthesis. An end to COVID-based restrictions (to allow some planned material scale-up)!

### Possible commercial applications and market entry options:

Applications: transportable LDS for disaster response and related. Possibilities for seasonal  $H_2$  storage.

Market Entry Approach: Options open; PSI is key partner now but spin-off likely.



### Summary: PELoDEES Innovations in Catalysts-Cell-Stack-System



### Status

- Stack-sized cell modules built and tested; material, catalyst issues being addressed.
- · Cycling of cells imminent.
- System design in hand. Next phase would include 'brassboard' system.

Possible commercial applications and early options: transportable LDS for disaster response and related. Possibilities for seasonal H<sub>2</sub> storage.







https://arpa-e.energy.gov

Thanks to Scott, Max and Sean for helpful discussions throughout.

