

# 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 H<sub>2</sub> 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**