

Notes on test method to establish hydrogen compatibility of materials for fuel cell vehicles

GTR no. 13 Phase 2 IWG

October 2020

Prepared by:

Chris San Marchi, Sandia National Laboratories

How do we standardize materials selection methods for high-pressure H₂ service?

- **Design-based method:** *ASME pressure vessels*
 - Measure reliable *design data*
 - Prescribed component design methodology
 - Data often included in the code or standard
- **Performance-based method:** *vehicle systems*
 - Establish materials *performance metrics*
 - Design information/method is not specified
 - Often used in the context of system performance and specific application requirements

Goal: Establish performance-based test metrics consistent with the requirements of fuel-cell vehicles

Fatigue was determined by SAE committees to be critical and relevant performance metric

- **SAE J2579 requires evaluation of fatigue (eg, pressure cycling)**
 - Therefore, the test metrics for H-effects must include fatigue assessments
 - NASA screening data, for example, does not include fatigue assessment and should not be the basis of materials selection for fatigue resistance
 - NASA tables only consider tensile data, while design of high-pressure systems will consider potential failure modes (such as fatigue and fracture)

SAE has determined that a fatigue performance is necessary to evaluate materials for high-pressure service on vehicles

Results of so-called 'SAE round robin' testing were published

- C. San Marchi, J. Yamabe, M. Schwarz, H. Matsunaga, S. Zickler, S. Matsuoka, H. Kobayashi: "Global harmonization of fatigue life testing in gaseous hydrogen", (PVP2018-84898), Proceedings of the 2018 ASME Pressure Vessels & Piping Conference, 15-20 July 2018, Prague, Czech Republic
- Testing requirements are NOT extensive
 - Option 1
 - 3 notched fatigue tests: about 28 hours each
 - Can be completed in a little over one (1) week
 - Option 2
 - Not required if option 1 is completed
 - Smooth fatigue testing requires about 3x effort

Testing requirements are not onerous

- Compare testing requirements in ASME, for example, which are much more difficult and require many months of testing

Additional (personal) perspectives

- **Safety should not be compromised because something is ‘difficult’**
- **If commercial testing services are not adequate, industry must invest in developing those services**
 - It is not appropriate to forgo due diligence on safety critical hardware for lack of investment
- **Other options exist:**
 - Full-scale hydrogen pressure cycling
 - Development of design-based methods or adoption of the ASME Code

SAE method is an efficient test methodology, which is significantly less intensive than other industries