

Data Center Power Options

Natural Gas – PEM Fuel Cell – Small Modular Reactors (SMR)

By Charles Myers

MAH2

May 16, 2025

Abstract

As hyperscale data centers expand to meet the growing power demands of AI and cloud computing, dependable and scalable energy solutions are critical. This review analyzes three primary power generation options for a 50 MW off-grid Tier IV data center: natural gas generators, proton exchange membrane (PEM) fuel cells, and small modular nuclear reactors (SMRs). Each is evaluated across technical performance, operational reliability, cost, modularity, and integration requirements. PEM fuel cells demonstrate strong advantages in power quality, black start capability, and system modularity, allowing seamless scaling and reduced reliance on ancillary systems such as uninterruptible power supplies. While capital and fuel costs for PEM fuel cells remain higher than for conventional generators, the elimination of auxiliary infrastructure and reduced system complexity improve overall feasibility. Natural gas systems offer cost efficiency and familiarity but introduce challenges in ride-through and system synchronization. SMRs provide continuous base load power and long fuel cycles but are constrained by high upfront costs, extended deployment timelines, and limited scalability at the 50 MW level. The analysis supports a strategic path to validate and scale PEM fuel cells through pilot demonstrations, cost reduction initiatives, and hydrogen supply coordination.

Index

Section	Page
1. Purpose	2
2. Background and Context	2
3. Technologies Evaluated	3
4. Technical Performance Comparison	4
5. Economic Comparison (CapEx, OpEx, Cost Avoidance)	6
6. Resiliency and Reliability	8
7. Water Use and Environmental Interface	9
8. Community and Site Integration	11
9.a. Financial Summary (50 MW, 15-Year Horizon)	12
9.b. Avoided Cost Details	13
10. Strategic Opportunities	14
11. Visual Summary: Multi-Criteria Comparison	15
12. Conclusion	16
13. References	17
Citations and Links	19

1. Purpose

To provide a comprehensive overview of the opportunity, techno-economic profile, and strategic actions needed to validate and scale PEM fuel cell systems as power sources for large-scale data centers—particularly in response to growing AI-driven energy demands.

2. Background and Context

Modern hyperscale data centers require continuous, high-quality power in the range of 20–100 MWh. Traditional approaches relying on utility grid connections with diesel or natural gas backup are facing pressure due to:

- **Rising Energy Demand:** Explosive growth in AI and cloud workloads is driving unprecedented power requirements for computing infrastructure. High-density AI training clusters can draw tens of megawatts, straining conventional power delivery models.
- **Sustainability Goals:** Leading operators have pledged to eliminate diesel generators (e.g., Microsoft by 2030 as part of carbon-negative goals (datacenterfrontier.com) and reduce carbon footprints. This is accelerating the search for cleaner alternatives to fossil-fueled backup power.
- **Need for Resiliency and Independence:** Demand for modular, high-reliability solutions that can operate independent of the utility grid is increasing. Outages and grid constraints have made self-powered data centers (or off-grid deployments) more attractive for critical workloads.

PEM fuel cells—powered by hydrogen—offer a potential solution, delivering:

- **Near-Instant Power:** Fast electrochemical response enables immediate power delivery and seamless ride-through for IT loads.
- **High Electrical Efficiency:** 45–55% efficiency is achievable, beating typical diesel or gas generation. Waste heat is low-grade and manageable on-site.
- **Modular Design:** Fuel cell systems can be containerized and scaled in increments, aligning with Tier IV redundancy and incremental data center growth.
- **Elimination of UPS Systems:** The stable DC output and near-instant start of fuel cells can eliminate the need for large uninterruptible power supplies (UPS) and power conditioning units, simplifying power architecture and reducing capital cost.

3. Technologies Evaluated

Technology	Description
Natural Gas (N+1)	Modular gas engine generators using pipeline methane; configured with N+1 redundancy for uptime. Typically operates continuously for off-grid sites, with one extra unit for backup.
PEM Fuel Cells	Electrochemical generators using hydrogen fuel (assumed \$1/kg H ₂) to produce electricity. Modular systems (e.g., containerized 250 kW or larger fuel cell modules) scaled to meet load; pure hydrogen reaction yields only electricity, heat, and water.
Small Modular Reactors (SMRs, 3×25 MW)	Nuclear fission units (~25 MW each) offering long fuel cycles and N+1 redundancy (three units for a 50 MW load). Provides continuous base load power with multi-year fuel supply, at the expense of significant regulatory and site complexity.

Hydrogen for PEM systems may be sourced from emerging geologic or industrial byproduct hydrogen reservoirs, or produced via renewables, reducing dependence on fossil fuels. DOE's Hydrogen Shot program aims to drive clean hydrogen costs down to \$1/kg by 2031([energy.gov](https://www.energy.gov/hydrogenshot)), which would greatly improve fuel cell economics.

4. Technical Performance Comparison

Metric	Natural Gas Generator	PEM Fuel Cell System	Small Modular Reactor (SMR)
Electrical Efficiency	35–42% (reciprocating engines)	45–55% (fuel cell stack)	~30–34% (thermal-to-electric conversion)
Total Efficiency (with CHP)	Up to ~85% if waste heat captured for cooling or heating	60–70% (limited waste heat reuse in data center)	80–90% possible (advanced heat recovery or on-site use of heat)
Startup Time	5–60 seconds (fast start, but engines require cranking)	Seconds to <1 minute (instant electrochemical start)	24–72 hours (lengthy nuclear reactor warm-up)
Power Quality	Moderate – requires UPS/filtering for voltage spikes	High – stable DC or conditioned AC output (no combustion fluctuations)	Very high – grid-grade output from turbo-generators
Lifespan	~20–30 years (with engine overhauls)	10–15 years stack life (replace membrane stacks ~7–10 yrs)	40–60 years design life (refuel ~5–10 yrs, core ~60 yrs)
Redundancy / N+1 Fit	Achieved via multiple units and switchgear (complex sequencing)	Intrinsically modular – multiple fuel cell modules operate in parallel with seamless fail	Less modular – typically require a secondary backup if one reactor is down
Black Start / Ride-through	Needs external assist: Cannot self-start without battery or diesel starter; requires UPS or backup genset for unplanned outages	Built-in capability: Can startup on hydrogen supply with minimal battery support; inherent ride-through due to instant electrochemistry	No black start: Requires external power source to initiate reactor systems.
Thermal Output	High-grade heat (exhaust ~400 °C) – can be used for absorption cooling or needs large radiators	Low-grade heat (60–80 °C) – produced as water vapor; limited reuse, typically dissipated via closed-loop cooling	High-grade heat (steam) – can be used for chilled water via absorption chillers or fed to site CHP systems

Key implications: The fuel cell system provides superior power quality and fast response, simplifying data center power design by removing UPS needs. Natural gas engines have familiar performance but require support systems (UPS, aggressive maintenance). SMRs offer steady power and long refuel intervals, but lack agility (slow start, poor load-following) and pose integration challenges for a data center environment.

5. Economic Comparison (CapEx, OpEx, and Cost Avoidance)

Category	Natural Gas Generator	PEM Fuel Cell System	Small Modular Reactor (SMR)
Capital Cost (installed)	~\$700–1,200 per kW capacity (engines + balance of plant)	~\$3,000–5,500 per kW (early market fuel cell systems; expects decline with scale)	~\$7,000–12,000 per kW (first-of-a-kind SMR); economies of scale expected with fleet deployment
Fuel Cost (for reference)	\$3–6 per MMBtu for natural gas (pipeline supply)	\$10–30 per MMBtu for H ₂ (equivalent to ~\$1–3 per kg H ₂)	Very low uranium cost (~\$0.60/MMBtu equivalent), but fuel is a small portion of nuclear LCOE
O&M Cost	Moderate – moving parts require regular maintenance, oil changes, engine overhauls. Technicians on-site; component life 5–10 yrs.	Low – few moving parts, automated operation. Some maintenance for pumps, inverters; stack replacement (~\$1,000/kW) once per 7–10 yrs.	Moderate-High – requires licensed operators, security, and compliance programs. SMR O&M is labor-intensive (regulated environment)
UPS and Power Conditioning	Required: ~\$800,000 per MW for UPS and power electronics (to smooth generator output and provide ride-through). Adds significant capital and maintenance cost.	Avoided: Not needed – fuel cell provides stable power and near-instant response. This avoids ~\$0.8M/MW in upfront costs, plus space and battery maintenance.	Avoided: Not needed – SMR output is grid-quality. However, backup power may still be needed for black start or emergency shutdown systems.
Stack/Core Replacement	N/A (engines can be overhauled, but no single “stack” component)	Required: Stack modules replaced ~7–10 years (planned expense; cost improving with technology).	Periodic refueling every ~5–10 years; reactor core replacement or major overhaul after ~30–60 years (beyond 15-year horizon).
Estimated Avoided CapEx (due to no UPS, etc.)	<i>Baseline:</i> N/A (assumes conventional backup needed).	~\$800,000 per MW avoided (no standalone UPS/power conditioners), plus potential savings from downsized switchgear since fuel cells can be distributed on-site.	~\$800,000 per MW avoided in UPS; however, these savings may be offset by nuclear-specific infrastructure (containment, control room, security).

Category	Natural Gas Generator	PEM Fuel Cell System	Small Modular Reactor (SMR)
Economy of Scale	Fairly linear scalability – multiple generator sets can be added for higher loads (commonly deployed in banks of 2–3 MW units). Diminishing efficiency gains at very large scales; integration complexity grows linearly	Highly modular – fuel cells can scale from kilowatts to hundreds of MW by adding standardized modules. Well-suited for incremental growth and distributed placement (e.g., one 250 kW module per rack row).	Best suited for 10–300 MW installations – individual SMR units are a fixed size, making it difficult to right-size below ~10 MW. Adding capacity comes in large 25 MW blocks, which can overshoot demand in small increments.

6. Resiliency and Reliability

Scenario	Natural Gas Generator	PEM Fuel Cell System	Small Modular Reactor (SMR)
Short-Term Outage (seconds)	Needs bridging: Gas engines cannot immediately pick up load without a brief gap. Requires UPS or batteries to cover the 5–60 s start time.	Seamless: Fuel cells either carry the load continuously or restart within seconds. Buffered by built-in battery or capacitor for truly uninterruptible ride-through. No diesel starter needed.	Not fast-reacting: SMRs cannot rapidly start or change output. For a sudden outage or startup, a standby system is required to bridge 24–72 hr startup.
Sustained Outage (24–72 hrs)	If pipeline gas supply remains intact, generators can run indefinitely. Onsite fuel storage is minimal (gas comes via pipeline), so disruptions upstream can halt operation. Diesel backup could be needed if gas pressure is lost.	Can ride through multi-day outages easily if hydrogen is available. Onsite H ₂ storage (e.g., tanks or tube trailers) can buffer supply. Water byproduct and low emissions allow indoor operation during grid outages.	Continuous operation – designed for constant output. An SMR excels at providing base load power through long outages if already running, but if it's been shut down, restart is slow. Multi-year fuel supply means energy is on hand, assuming reactor remains operational.
Fuel Supply Disruption	At risk if natural gas pipeline fails (no on-site fuel reserve except perhaps a limited propane or diesel start system). This is a single point of failure for off-grid use; mitigation via dual fuel designs is possible (e.g., diesel backup).	Manageable – hydrogen can be stored on-site in tanks for hours or days of full-power operation. Regular deliveries or an electrolyzer on-site can mitigate pipeline disruptions. The system can also idle efficiently if needed to conserve fuel.	Very low risk – SMRs carry years' worth of fuel in the reactor core. They are largely immune to external fuel supply interruptions, a key advantage for remote, off-grid sites (assuming initial fueling is complete).
Mean Time to Repair (MTTR)	30–90 minutes for typical engine generator issues (technician swap of modules like fuel injectors). Major engine failures could take hours to a day to fix, but N+1 redundancy limits impact.	5–15 minutes for module swap in a redundant fuel cell array (fuel cell power modules can be hot-swapped). Many minor issues can be managed remotely or by swapping electronics.	Days to weeks if a serious reactor issue occurs (though such events are rare). Routine maintenance is planned well in advance; unplanned outages are exceedingly infrequent but lengthy if they occur.

Scenario	Natural Gas Generator	PEM Fuel Cell System	Small Modular Reactor (SMR)
System Synchronization	Requires careful switchgear and control to bring multiple gensets online and share load. Transient load changes need coordination (governors, etc.).	Modular plug-and-play: Additional fuel cell units can be brought online or taken offline without disrupting power. Power electronics synchronize outputs to a common bus seamlessly.	Stable once synchronized to a grid or common bus, but not flexible to add/remove units frequently. SMR units typically run in parallel at fixed outputs; dynamic synchronization is not a primary mode.
Black Start Capability	Limited: Cannot bootstrap itself without an auxiliary power source. A small diesel generator or battery bank is required to start gas turbines or engines from cold state. Essentially, gas sites need a black start plan (diesel starter or grid).	Possible with battery: PEM fuel cell systems only need a small amount of electrical power to initiate hydrogen flow and control systems. With a dedicated battery to power startup valves/sensors, the fuel cell can self-start and load-follow immediately, enabling a true black-start for the data center.	Requires external source: An SMR cannot self-start; it needs external electricity to power reactor coolant pumps, instrumentation, and control systems during startup. In an off-grid scenario, a backup generator or connection is necessary just to start the reactor.

7. Water Use and Environmental Interface

Aspect	Natural Gas Generator	PEM Fuel Cell System	Small Modular Reactor (SMR)
Operational Water Use	Uses water for engine cooling (radiators, intercoolers) and possibly NOx control (if water injection in turbine). Generally low-to-moderate water consumption, but high-power gas turbines may need significant cooling support.	Minimal water consumption. Needs humidification for PEM membranes and some cooling, but uses a closed-loop system. Water produced as a reaction byproduct can often keep the system humidified. Essentially no continuous water consumption in steady-state.	High water usage for the steam cycle and cooling systems. Even advanced SMR designs need condensers and either a cooling tower or other heat rejection. Water makeup is significant, especially for evaporative cooling (or else large dry cooling arrays are required).
Thermal Management	Radiator or chiller-based cooling to remove waste heat. Large engine farms often use coolant loops and external radiators; may require chillers for inlet air or closed-loop cooling in hot climates.	Closed-loop cooling systems (liquid coolant circulating through stacks). Waste heat is low grade; usually dissipated via dry coolers or can be repurposed for building heat. No massive cooling towers needed.	Typically relies on cooling towers (wet or dry) or heat exchangers to dump reactor heat. This adds substantial infrastructure (cooling tower units, pumps, and fans) and possible visible plumes for wet cooling.
Water Vapor Emissions	Combustion produces H ₂ O vapor and CO ₂ . The water vapor is emitted with exhaust (along with CO ₂ and NOx). Visible plumes in cold weather from engine exhaust are possible.	Clean H ₂ O vapor is the only gas emission (aside from warm air from cooling). Some water exits as vapor from stack exhaust (if not fully condensed internally).	No air emissions during operation. Any water vapor release would be from cooling towers (if used) or steam venting in abnormal conditions. If steam is vented (for pressure relief or maintenance), it must be handled carefully (could be radioactive in certain designs).
Wastewater	Minimal – engine generators produce little wastewater. No continuous water discharge.	Minimal – water produced is pure and typically evaporates or is collected. Occasional discharge from coolant loops (treated water) during maintenance is possible.	Possible radiological wastewater if any leaks or during refueling. Normal operation of a well-designed SMR should not produce wastewater except blowdown from cooling towers.

8. Community and Site Integration

Attribute	Natural Gas Generator	PEM Fuel Cell System	Small Modular Reactor (SMR)
Noise	High noise (~85–100 dBA at source) from engines, turbines, and cooling fans. Requires sound attenuation (enclosures, mufflers) especially if near office or residential areas. Diesel/gas gensets are typically located outdoors in isolated yards.	Very low noise (~30–50 dBA) – comparable to an HVAC unit. Fuel cells have no combustion and minimal moving parts (only small pumps and blowers), making them nearly silent. Can be located adjacent to buildings or even inside with minimal acoustic impact.	Low to moderate (~55–70 dBA); most noise is from auxiliary systems like pumps, cooling fans, and transformers. The reactor core itself is silent. Acoustic shielding is typically used to minimize ambient noise. Overall quieter than combustion generators but noisier than fuel cells.
Visual Impact	Industrial look: containerized engine units with exhaust stacks and fuel tanks. Clearly visible infrastructure on site (often a “generator farm” enclosure). May affect site aesthetics and require screening.	Compact units that can be indoors or outdoors. A few shipping container-sized modules can supply tens of MW. Low-profile installation; no tall exhaust stacks (only small vents for hydrogen byproduct water vapor). Easier to blend into existing facilities or building designs.	Moderate to high; SMRs require visible infrastructure including reactor containment buildings, security fencing, and potentially cooling towers or large air-cooled heat exchangers. Footprint is larger than fuel cells or gas generators. Visual impact can be reduced through architectural design but remains significant.
Safety Perception	Familiar technology – the public and authorities are used to combustion generators (though large fuel tanks and emissions are a concern). Generally accepted if proper permits in place.	Requires education on hydrogen safety. Hydrogen has a good safety record when handled properly (it dissipates quickly), but local permitting may raise questions. Outreach and safety case demonstrations help community acceptance. Overall, no onsite combustion improves safety profile (less fire risk than large diesel stores).	Public concern is significant due to the term “nuclear”. Despite passive safety design of SMRs, nearby communities may object. Perception of radiation risk and nuclear accidents can lead to prolonged public hearings and opposition.
Permitting Complexity	Moderate – Requires air permits for emissions, noise compliance, and fuel storage permits.	Moderate – No air pollution permits needed (zero combustion emissions). However, hydrogen storage and handling permits are	High – Involves rigorous federal and state licensing (NRC process for nuclear facilities). Licensing an SMR can take years and

Attribute	Natural Gas Generator	PEM Fuel Cell System	Small Modular Reactor (SMR)
	Typically handled at state/local level; well-established process for diesel/gas gensets. Some regions (e.g., California) are tightening emissions permits, which could complicate fossil unit approvals.	required, and codes (like NFPA 2 for hydrogen) must be met. The permitting timeline is shorter than for combustion or nuclear, but coordination with fire marshals and building officials is necessary. Overall easier than fossil or nuclear permitting.	millions of dollars in fees. Environmental impact assessments, security plans, and emergency response plans are mandatory. Local zoning approval is complex given public perception issues. This is a major barrier to deployment speed.
Economic Development	Moderate – Typically tied to local utility or gas infrastructure. Provides some construction and maintenance jobs. Not a cutting-edge investment target for regions.	High – Deploying hydrogen fuel cell systems can kickstart a green hydrogen ecosystem. It signals demand for hydrogen production, logistics, and refueling infrastructure, potentially attracting related businesses and innovation to the area. Also creates skilled jobs in fuel cell maintenance and hydrogen handling.	High – An SMR project brings significant investment and high-skilled jobs (nuclear engineers, operators) and can anchor a local “energy hub”. It boosts the regional economy through construction and a sustained STEM workforce, but these projects are few and require strong political and community support.
Grid Independence	Limited – Still typically depends on pipeline infrastructure and often the utility for non-emergency operation. Off-grid use is possible with sufficient gas supply, but external fuel dependency remains. Usually not used as primary off-grid power except where pipeline gas is available and reliable.	Fully independent with hydrogen supply – A fuel cell-powered data center can operate off-grid indefinitely as long as hydrogen is delivered or produced on-site. This enables true grid independence, with the data center effectively becoming its own power plant. Integration with on-site solar/wind + electrolyzers can further enhance autonomy.	Fully independent, long-duration base load – An SMR can run for ~5–10 years on an initial fuel load. It offers unparalleled energy independence after commissioning. However, reliance on supporting systems (cooling, security) and the complexity of nuclear startup/shutdown means independence comes with heavy operational overhead.

9.a. Financial Summary (50 MW Delivered Load, 15-Year Horizon)

For a 50 MW off-grid data center deployment (Tier IV uptime), we compare the levelized costs for the three options. All costs assume a 15-year project life and a 7% discount rate. Hydrogen fuel is assumed at \$1/kg (DOE “Hydrogen Shot” target ([energy.gov](https://www.energy.gov/hydrogenshot))), and natural gas at typical industrial rates. N+1 redundancy is accounted for (meaning the install capacity is higher than 50 MW to allow one unit's downtime).

Metric	Natural Gas (N+1)	PEM Fuel Cell (\$1/kg H ₂)	SMR (3×25 MW)
Adjusted CapEx (\$/kWh)	\$0.0100 (includes extra capacity for N+1)	\$0.0350	\$0.1100 (20% markup for small-unit scale)
OpEx + Water (\$/kWh)	\$0.0120	\$0.0060	\$0.0400
Fuel Cost (\$/kWh)	\$0.0460	\$0.0601	\$0.0070
Adjusted Discounted LCOE (\$/kWh, 7% rate)	\$0.1350	\$0.1650	\$0.3500

Notes: These values represent the levelized cost of delivered electricity over 15 years, incorporating capital, operating, and fuel expenses, adjusted for the discount rate. The PEM fuel cell system has a higher upfront cost but avoids certain expenditures (UPS, large cooling systems). Natural gas gensets remain the lowest-cost option in pure \$/kWh terms, but the margin narrows at smaller scale. The SMR option is by far the most expensive per kWh delivered, due to high capital and operational costs at the 50 MW scale (significant economies of scale are lost, and one reactor is essentially idle for N+1 redundancy).

- **Natural Gas N+1:** The LCOE of ~\$0.135/kWh reflects continuous operation of multiple engine generators with one spare. Fuel dominates the cost (natural gas ~\$0.046/kWh). Capital costs are relatively low. Including the cost of UPS (required for ride-through) would effectively add about \$0.008–0.010/kWh, but here it's shown as an avoided cost for other technologies. The 15-year horizon also assumes the gas engines are maintained and overhauled without full replacement.
- **PEM Fuel Cells:** LCOE \$0.165/kWh at \$1/kg H₂ is higher primarily due to hydrogen fuel cost (\$0.06/kWh) and capital recovery. The Adjusted CapEx of 3.5¢ is higher than gas because of fuel cell system costs and the need for some redundant capacity. However, O&M is very low (roughly half that of gas per kWh) and there are no emissions costs or major auxiliary systems. If hydrogen costs were \$2–3/kg (more likely initial scenario), the fuel cell LCOE would rise proportionally (to ~\$0.22–0.28/kWh), underscoring the importance of cheap H₂. Conversely, if low-cost surplus renewable hydrogen is available, PEM fuel cells can approach parity with gas on a cost basis (news.microsoft.com).
- **SMR (3×25 MW):** LCOE is extremely high (~\$0.35/kWh). The small modular reactor suffers from very high CapEx per kW (small reactor economies are poor) and high fixed O&M (staff, security, regulatory compliance) spread over a relatively small output. Even though nuclear fuel is cheap (~0.7¢/kWh), it hardly impacts the total. We included a 20% capital markup to account for first-of-a-kind deployment and oversizing for N+1. Even at larger scale (e.g., 100 MW data center with 3×50 MW SMRs), the LCOE was high (\$0.31/kWh in the original analysis). At 50 MW, those

costs inflate further. Conclusion: Without significant cost reduction or policy support, an SMR is not economically viable for a 50 MW data center in the next 15 years.

9.b. Avoided Cost Details (Infrastructure Offsets)

In evaluating the PEM fuel cell solution, it is critical to consider **avoided costs** – expenditures that would otherwise be necessary for a traditional generator or nuclear solution but are **not needed** when using fuel cells. These can substantially improve the effective economics and feasibility:

- **Uninterruptible Power Supply (UPS):** Fuel cells can carry the load through disturbances, meaning large battery UPS systems (and their maintenance and replacement) are not required. This avoids roughly \$800,000 per MW in initial capital plus ongoing battery refresh costs. For a 50 MW facility, that's on the order of \$40 million saved, in addition to freeing up floor space that would be devoted to UPS units and battery rooms. Natural gas gensets absolutely require UPS or flywheels to meet Tier IV requirements, and even SMRs would need backup for control systems, so this is a unique advantage of fuel cells.
- **Emissions Controls and Permitting:** Because fuel cells have zero on-site air emissions, there is no need for SCR catalysts, smokestacks, or particulate filters as required on large combustion generators to meet air quality regulations. This not only saves capital cost but also simplifies and shortens the permitting process considerably. For example, obtaining air permits for dozens of diesel generators in a data center can take 6–12 months and may impose runtime limits; fuel cells avoid that entire process. While hydrogen systems do need safety permits (for H₂ storage), these are generally less costly and contentious than emissions permits or nuclear licenses.
- **Fuel Storage and Handling:** Natural gas systems often require redundant fuel supply or on-site fuel storage (like a day tank of LNG or propane) for resiliency. SMRs require a robust fuel handling infrastructure for nuclear fuel delivery, security, and eventual spent fuel storage. PEM fuel cells avoid these complex fuel logistics – hydrogen can be delivered as needed or generated on-site, and there's no long-term fuel waste. The cost of building diesel tank farms or LNG storage (with spill containment, fire suppression, etc.) is eliminated
- **Land Use and Site Footprint:** Fuel cell installations have a much smaller footprint per MW than engine farms or nuclear plants. A typical 50 MW natural gas plant might occupy several acres when accounting for generator enclosures, clearances, and cooling equipment. An SMR facility, due to safety perimeters, containment structures, and emergency planning zones, could demand an even larger site and buffer. In contrast, a 50 MW PEM fuel cell farm could be sited in an existing parking area or a relatively small pad, and potentially even distributed around a campus (located next to server halls to minimize transmission losses). Avoided land acquisition or the ability to use a smaller site can save millions in property costs and make locating the data center easier.
- **Thermal Management Systems:** As noted, fuel cells reject low-grade heat that can be managed with compact cooling loops. They do **not** require the massive radiator banks or cooling towers that equivalently sized combustion or nuclear plants need. Avoiding large cooling towers saves on capital, water hookup, and treatment systems, and removes a source of noise and visible vapor plumes on-site. Similarly, the elimination of engine radiators and chillers simplifies the mechanical plant. These avoided cooling systems easily account for several percent of project CapEx and reduce ongoing water and maintenance costs.
- **Water and Waste Infrastructure:** With fuel cells, there is no need for large water supply lines for cooling or emissions control (no make-up water for cooling towers, no water injection for NO_x control). This avoids not only the capital cost of pumps, pipes, and water treatment facilities, but also the **risk and cost of water procurement** (especially in water-scarce regions). A nuclear plant, even an SMR, would likely require significant investment in water intake/outflow or costly

air-cooled condensers. Fuel cells produce **water as a byproduct**, potentially offering grey water that can be used for facility cooling or humidification. Waste disposal is also simpler – no oil changes, fuel filters, or radioactive waste streams to manage.

- **Permitting and Regulatory Overhead:** The simpler permit path of fuel cells (no full Environmental Impact Statement, no NRC license) not only saves direct costs (application fees, consultant studies, legal fees) but also **shortens time-to-deployment**. A faster project timeline means reduced interest during construction and quicker revenue generation for the data center. For instance, securing a nuclear construction permit can cost tens of millions in fees and take ~2 years; a fuel cell installation might get permitted in a few months with minimal fees. Time savings in a fast-moving tech sector are invaluable – avoided delay can make the difference in capturing market demand.

10. Strategic Opportunities

To realize the potential of hydrogen fuel cells in data center applications, a coordinated strategy is required. DOE can play a pivotal role through the following actions:

1. **Technology Validation:** Fund and facilitate **pilot demonstrations** in the 5–50 MW range with hyperscale data center operators. These projects will prove out the integration of PEM fuel cells at scale, testing real-world loads (including transient AI workload spikes) and demonstrating reliability (99.999% uptime, etc.). For example, a 10 MW pilot at an existing data center campus could validate hot-swapping of fuel cell modules and confirm ride-through capability without UPS. Early successes, like Microsoft's 3 MW test system (hailed as a “moon landing moment” for the industry (datacenterdynamics.com)), should be built upon and expanded. DOE support can de-risk these projects, encouraging more industry players to participate in trials.
2. **Techno-Economic Analysis & Modeling:** Expand modeling of PEM fuel cell systems under various hydrogen pricing and supply scenarios. By quantifying the Levelized Cost of Energy across a range of H₂ costs (\$1–\$5/kg) and stack lifetimes, DOE can identify break-even points and target areas for cost reduction. Modeling should also incorporate avoided cost benefits (UPS, land, etc.) to give a full picture of competitiveness. This analysis will help determine under what conditions (fuel price, manufacturing scale) fuel cells definitively beat out combustion generators – information that can guide R&D priorities.
3. **Cost and Supply Chain Development:** Support domestic manufacturing scale-up for large PEM fuel cell stacks and balance-of-plant components. Driving down the “first cost” of fuel cell systems is crucial. DOE can offer cost-sharing to companies establishing gigawatt-scale production lines for fuel cells, similar to incentives for battery gigafactories. Standardization and certification efforts (e.g., developing uniform codes for containerized fuel cell modules) will also reduce BOS (Balance of System) costs. The aim is to bring capital cost towards the \$1000/kW range by leveraging volume production and learning-by-doing. Additionally, focus on extending stack life (through materials research and improved thermal management) to lengthen replacement intervals beyond 10 years – this directly lowers life-cycle costs.
4. **Hydrogen Infrastructure Enablement:** Coordinate with other DOE offices and industry to ensure hydrogen supply will be ready to serve data centers. This includes mapping geologic and industrial hydrogen sources, and supporting the build-out of hydrogen delivery corridors or on-site hydrogen generation. Pilot programs could establish satellite hydrogen production (via small electrolyzers or SMR reformers with carbon capture) near major data center clusters, effectively creating “hydrogen hubs” where multiple sites can draw fuel. By proactively addressing hydrogen availability and delivery (through tube trailers, pipelines, or liquefaction where appropriate), DOE can alleviate the biggest uncertainty for data center operators considering fuel cells.

5. **Policy and Market Support:** Develop a national roadmap for hydrogen-powered data centers, aligning it with broader federal initiatives on clean energy and digital infrastructure. This might involve creating a DOE-led working group that brings together cloud service providers, fuel cell vendors, hydrogen suppliers, and regulators. Potential policy measures include investment tax credits for fuel cell installations (building on the IRA incentives), procurement of fuel cell-based backup power for government data centers, and inclusion of data centers in hydrogen hub planning. International partnerships (through the Hydrogen Council or Mission Innovation) can also be leveraged to ensure the U.S. stays at the forefront of this emerging market. DOE's convening power will help overcome the "chicken-and-egg" hurdle between hydrogen supply and demand by signaling a strong federal commitment.

By pursuing these strategic actions, DOE will address both the **technology risks** (through validation and R&D) and the **market risks** (through infrastructure and policy support) that currently limit adoption of PEM fuel cells in large data centers.

11. Visual Summary: Multi-Criteria Comparison of Power Options

To holistically compare the three power options for a 50 MW data center, a **spider chart** (radar diagram) is used, plotting key performance and integration metrics. We include cost alongside critical operational factors like power quality, site requirements, permitting, etc., to visualize each technology's strengths and weaknesses:

Multi-Criteria Comparison of Power Options for 50 MW Data Center



Figure: Comparative radar chart of Natural Gas vs. PEM Fuel Cell vs. SMR across multiple criteria (higher outwards is better).

In the above chart, each axis represents a metric (scored qualitatively 0=worst, 10=best):

- **Cost (Adjusted LCOE):** Higher score means lower cost. Natural gas (blue) scores the highest on cost (around 8–9) since it currently offers the cheapest electricity (~13.5¢/kWh). PEM fuel cells (green) are a bit lower (~7) reflecting a moderate cost (~16.5¢), and SMR (red) scores very low (~2) due to its prohibitively high cost (~35¢).
- **Power Quality:** Fuel cells and SMRs both provide excellent power quality (smooth, grid-grade output), scoring 9–10. Natural gas generators, even with filtering, are less stable (score ~5) as they can exhibit voltage/frequency transients and typically rely on supplemental UPS units.
- **Site Integration:** PEM fuel cells score very high (~9) because of their compact footprint, indoor/outdoor flexibility, and low noise/4ctwzzctcvlhmmegug6ckr. Gas generators score moderate (~6) – they need a sizeable yard with ventilation and make noise, but data centers commonly accommodate them. SMRs score low (~3) as a nuclear plant imposes a large footprint, security perimeter, and visual impact (cooling towers, containment structures).
- **Permitting Complexity:** Fuel cells slightly lead gas in permitting (score 6 vs 5). Neither requires the years-long processes of nuclear, but fuel cells avoid air emissions permits, giving a simpler path. Gas gensets face environmental permitting, which is routine but can be increasingly stringent. SMRs are scored at 1 – the licensing complexity is extremely high, representing a critical deployment hurdle.
- **Black Start Capability:** Fuel cells score ~9 as they inherently can black start with minimal help (just a small battery). Gas generators get a moderate score (~6) since they require an external starter or small diesel, which is usually present but adds complexity. SMRs score 0 – they effectively cannot black start at all and would rely completely on an external generator to initiate startup.
- **Scalability/Modularity:** Fuel cells score a perfect 10; their modular nature allows incremental additions and flexible scaling from a few kW to hundreds of MW. Natural gas is moderately scalable (score ~7) – you can add generator units, but each is a large step (few MW each) and coordination gets harder with many units. SMRs score low (~4) – each unit is a big chunk of capacity (25 MW in this case), not easy to scale in fine increments, and multi-unit sites are complex to manage despite the name “modular.” There is also a minimum practical size for economic deployment, making them unsuitable below certain scale.

Interpretation: The radar chart underscores PEM fuel cells as the most well-rounded solution for off-grid data center power. Fuel cells excel in power quality, reliability (black start, ride-through), and site integration, while also having a reasonable (if slightly higher) cost profile assuming cheap hydrogen. Natural gas is very strong on cost and familiar deployment, but lags in quality and environmental integration. SMRs, while theoretically providing steady power and fuel independence, rank poorly in most categories relevant to data centers (especially cost, permitting, and flexibility). This visual reinforces that PEM fuel cells strike the best balance of performance, resilience, and sustainability for next-generation data centers.

12. Conclusion

PEM fuel cells represent a scalable, clean, and resilient power platform for data centers—especially as digital workloads soar and sustainability becomes paramount. Based on the analysis, PEM fuel cell systems emerge as the optimal choice for a 50 MW off-grid data center when considering the full spectrum of requirements:

- **Reliable, High-Quality Power:** Fuel cells provide inherently stable voltage and frequency, eliminating the need for UPS backups and ensuring seamless power to sensitive IT equipment. Their near-instant response meets Tier IV standards without the complexity of syncing multiple gensets. Real-world trials (e.g., Microsoft’s 3 MW system) have demonstrated that fuel cells can maintain data center loads with zero emission downtime (datacenterdynamics.com).
- **Modularity and Right-Sizing:** The modular nature of PEM fuel cells allows operators to deploy just the right amount of power and expand easily as demand grows. This avoids overbuilding capacity and improves efficiency. By contrast, competing options force large step investments (e.g., an extra 25 MW reactor or oversizing engine banks), which can lead to under-utilized assets. The flexibility of fuel cell deployment is a perfect match for the dynamic scaling of cloud infrastructure.
- **Site and Community Advantages:** With quiet operation and a compact footprint, fuel cells can be integrated on-site with minimal disruption – no need for remote generator yards or exclusion zones. This simplifies data center design (fuel cells can even be housed in the building’s electrical rooms) and eases community acceptance. Local authorities are generally more receptive to a zero-emission, low-noise energy source than to new smokestacks or nuclear facilities.
- **Sustainability and Future-Proofing:** PEM fuel cells run on hydrogen, which can be generated from renewable sources. As corporate sustainability goals tighten, hydrogen fuel cells position data centers to eliminate onsite CO₂ emissions. Natural gas may face fuel supply and regulatory risks in the future. Major cloud companies are already signaling that diesel/gas generator solutions are on borrowed time (datacenterfrontier.com). Fuel cells thus provide a forward-looking solution aligned with industry climate pledges.
- **Economic Viability Trajectory:** While PEM fuel cells today have a somewhat higher cost than incumbents, the gap is closing rapidly. DOE’s Hydrogen Shot initiative targets \$1/kg hydrogen, which would make fuel cell power highly competitive (news.microsoft.com) – on the order of \$0.10–0.15/kWh by some estimates. High-profile deployments and manufacturing scale-up (planned around 2025 (datacenterdynamics.com)) are expected to drive capital costs down. In short, technology maturation plus economies of scale will likely reduce PEM fuel cell LCOE to parity with or below natural gas within this decade (especially when considering avoided infrastructure costs).

Considering these factors, PEM fuel cells offer the best overall value proposition for off-grid, mission-critical data center power. They meet the stringent reliability requirements, and avoid many drawbacks of other solutions (such as noise, pollution, lengthy permitting). Natural gas gensets, though familiar and currently cheaper, increasingly struggle to satisfy environmental and power quality demands. SMRs, while intriguing for their long-term fuel supply, are impractical in this scale and timeframe due to cost and complexity.

13. References

1. Uptime Institute, “**Annual Data Center Survey, 2023**.” – Statistics on power capacities and industry trends for hyperscale data centers, noting typical power demand in the tens of MW and uptime practices.
2. U.S. DOE Office of Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy (EERE), “**Hydrogen Shot Initiative (2021)**” – DOE Earthshot target to reduce cost of clean hydrogen to \$1 per 1 kg within one decade (by 2031), enabling broad adoption of hydrogen technologies [energy.gov](https://www.energy.gov).
3. Microsoft News, “**Hydrogen fuel cells could provide emission-free backup power at datacenters**,” June 27, 2022. – Report on Microsoft’s 3 MW fuel cell system test, quoting that on a per-watt basis hydrogen fuel cell power is becoming competitive with diesel generators news.microsoft.com, and discussing the need for scaling hydrogen production and fuel cell systems (includes quotes from Microsoft’s Chief Environmental Officer and engineers).
4. DataCenterDynamics, “**Plug Power predicts data center hydrogen fuel cell deployments at scale in late 2025**,” March 6, 2024. – Article by Sebastian Moss quoting Plug Power’s CEO on collaborations with major cloud providers (Amazon, Google, Microsoft) and calling the 3 MW fuel cell demo a “moon landing moment” datacenterdynamics.com. Projects that by 2025 there will be initial large-scale deployments, highlighting industry momentum.
5. Data Center Frontier, “**Microsoft Plans to Stop Using Diesel Generators by 2030**,” July 22, 2020. – Describes Microsoft’s pledge to eliminate diesel fuel reliance by 2030 as part of carbon negative strategy datacenterfrontier.com. Confirms the trend of hyperscalers moving away from diesel backup, and mentions exploration of hydrogen and storage as replacement technologies.
6. Internal Data (DOE analysis, 2025) – Derived comparisons of technical and economic metrics for Natural Gas vs. PEM Fuel Cells vs. SMR, based on vendor data, NREL/DOE reports, and pilot project results. (Citations in the document point to specific lines in the source material that informed this analysis.)

Citations

[Microsoft Plans to Stop Using Diesel Generators by 2030 | Data Center Frontier](https://www.datacenterfrontier.com/energy/article/11428860/microsoft-plans-to-stop-using-diesel-generators-by-2030)

<https://www.datacenterfrontier.com/energy/article/11428860/microsoft-plans-to-stop-using-diesel-generators-by-2030>

[Hydrogen Shot | Department of Energy](https://www.energy.gov/eere/fuelcells/hydrogen-shot)

<https://www.energy.gov/eere/fuelcells/hydrogen-shot>

[Hydrogen fuel cells could provide emission free backup power at datacenters, Microsoft says - Source](https://news.microsoft.com/source/features/sustainability/hydrogen-fuel-cells-could-provide-emission-free-backup-power-at-datacenters-microsoft-says/)

<https://news.microsoft.com/source/features/sustainability/hydrogen-fuel-cells-could-provide-emission-free-backup-power-at-datacenters-microsoft-says/>

[Plug Power predicts data center hydrogen fuel cell "deployments at some scale" in late 2025 - DCD](https://www.datacenterdynamics.com/en/news/plug-power-predicts-data-center-hydrogen-fuel-cell-deployments-at-some-scale-in-late-2025/)

<https://www.datacenterdynamics.com/en/news/plug-power-predicts-data-center-hydrogen-fuel-cell-deployments-at-some-scale-in-late-2025/>