INFOMANIA: THE RESEARCH JOURNAL
Volume 2, Issue 2, May - June 2026
https://infomaniajournal.com **ISSN:3108-0006**

"A Comparative Analysis of Hydrogen, Ammonia, and LNG as Zero-Carbon Marine Fuels"

Vijay.D.Patil
(B.Tech Marine Engineering Department, MANET, MIT Art, Design and Technology University, Pune - 412201, India)
Email- vijay.patil@mituniversity.edu.in
ORCID iD – 0009-0004-0938-268X

Eknath.B.Pore
(B.Tech Marine Engineering Department, MANET, MIT Art, Design and Technology University, Pune - 412201, India)
Email- eknath.pore@mituniversity.edu.in
ORCID iD – 0009-0009-7738-7892

Nilesh.S.Kamthe
(B.Sc Nautical Science Department, MANET, MIT Art, Design and Technology University, Pune - 412201, India)
Email- nilesh.kamthe@mituniversity.edu.in
ORCID iD – 0009-0006-4337-2156

Abstract

The maritime industry is under increasing pressure to decarbonize in response to global climate targets and stricter environmental regulations. Alternative marine fuels such as hydrogen, ammonia, and liquefied natural gas (LNG) have emerged as potential solutions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from shipping. This study presents a comparative analysis of these three fuels based on key parameters including energy density, storage and handling requirements, safety considerations, infrastructure readiness, economic feasibility, and lifecycle emissions. While hydrogen and ammonia are widely regarded as zero-carbon fuels at the point of use, challenges related to production methods, storage complexity, and safety risks persist. LNG, although not entirely carbon-free, offers a transitional pathway with lower emissions compared to conventional marine fuels. The paper evaluates the advantages and limitations of each fuel and assesses their suitability across different vessel types and operational profiles. The findings aim to support stakeholders in selecting sustainable fuel alternatives and contribute to the broader transition toward decarbonized maritime transport.

Keywords: Hydrogen fuel; Ammonia fuel; Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG); Marine decarbonization; Alternative fuels; Zero-carbon shipping; Energy density; Fuel comparison; Maritime sustainability; Emissions reduction.

I. Introduction

The global maritime sector plays a crucial role in international trade, yet it is also a significant contributor to greenhouse gas emissions. With increasing regulatory pressure and commitments toward decarbonization, the industry is actively exploring alternative fuels to replace conventional heavy fuel oil. Among the most promising options are hydrogen, ammonia, and liquefied natural gas (LNG), each offering distinct advantages and challenges in the transition toward sustainable shipping. While hydrogen and ammonia are often categorized as zero-carbon fuels due to their potential for carbon-free combustion, LNG is considered a transitional fuel with comparatively lower emissions.

This study focuses on a comprehensive comparative analysis of these three marine fuels to better understand their feasibility and performance across multiple dimensions. It examines their physical and chemical properties, along with energy efficiency and energy density, which are critical for determining their suitability in maritime operations. Additionally, the research evaluates storage, transportation, and onboard handling requirements, given the technical complexities associated with each fuel. Safety risks and operational challenges are also analyzed, particularly in relation to toxicity, flammability, and infrastructure constraints.

Furthermore, the study compares lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions, considering production, distribution, and end-use phases, to provide a holistic environmental assessment. Economic feasibility and cost implications are assessed alongside the current state of infrastructure development and technological readiness. Finally, the research aims to identify the most suitable fuel options for different vessel types and operational routes, offering practical recommendations for policymakers and industry stakeholders to support the transition toward sustainable and low-carbon maritime transport.

II. Literature Review

The American Bureau of Shipping (ABS) Fuel Technology Reports, it provides a comprehensive assessment of emerging marine fuels, focusing on hydrogen, ammonia, LNG, methanol, and biofuels. The reports emphasize fuel safety, regulatory compliance, and technology readiness levels (TRLs) for decarbonizing shipping. ABS highlights LNG as the most commercially mature alternative, while hydrogen and ammonia are identified as long-term zero-carbon solutions requiring further infrastructure and safety development. The studies also analyse lifecycle emissions, engine compatibility, and storage challenges. Overall, ABS reports serve as a key industry reference for guiding shipowners and policymakers in selecting viable pathways toward sustainable maritime energy transition.

The International Energy Agency (IEA) report The Future of Hydrogen, it provides a global assessment of hydrogen's role in the clean energy transition, including its potential application in hard-to-decarbonize sectors such as shipping. It highlights hydrogen as a versatile, zero-carbon energy carrier when produced from renewable sources. The report evaluates production pathways, cost trends, infrastructure requirements, and policy frameworks needed for large-scale adoption. It emphasizes that green hydrogen currently faces high production and distribution costs but is expected to become more competitive with technological advancements and economies of scale. Overall, the IEA positions hydrogen as a key long-term solution for deep decarbonization.

The *Fourth IMO Greenhouse Gas Study* by the International Maritime Organization (IMO), it provides a comprehensive global assessment of greenhouse gas emissions from international shipping. It analyzes historical emission trends and projects future scenarios under different policy and technological pathways. The study highlights that CO_2 emissions from shipping continue to rise without strong mitigation measures and emphasizes the urgent need for alternative low- and zero-carbon fuels such as hydrogen, ammonia, and biofuels. It also evaluates lifecycle emissions, energy efficiency improvements, and regulatory strategies aligned with IMO decarbonization targets. Overall, it serves as a foundational reference for global maritime climate policy and fuel transition planning.

The DNV Maritime Forecast to 2050, it provides a long-term outlook on the decarbonization of the global shipping industry, analyzing fuel transition pathways, technology adoption, and emission reduction scenarios. It emphasizes that achieving net-zero emissions will require a shift from conventional fuels to a mix of LNG as a transition fuel and zero-carbon fuels such as hydrogen and ammonia in the long term. The report evaluates energy efficiency, fuel availability, infrastructure development, and cost trajectories. It also highlights that regulatory pressure and carbon pricing will accelerate fuel switching. Overall, DNV identifies ammonia and hydrogen as key future marine fuels, with LNG playing a bridging role.

III. Objectives of the Study

1. To analyze and compare the physical and chemical properties of hydrogen, ammonia, and LNG as marine fuels.
2. To evaluate the energy efficiency and energy density of each fuel in maritime applications.
3. To assess storage, transportation, and onboard handling requirements for each fuel type.
4. To examine safety risks and operational challenges associated with hydrogen, ammonia, and LNG.
5. To compare lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions, including production, distribution, and combustion stages.
6. To evaluate the economic feasibility and cost implications of adopting each fuel.
7. To analyze the current level of infrastructure development and technological readiness.
8. To identify the most suitable fuel options for different categories of ships and routes.
9. To provide recommendations for policymakers and industry stakeholders for sustainable fuel adoption.

IV. Research Methodology

This study adopts a **comparative and analytical research methodology** combining both qualitative and quantitative approaches.

Research Design

- **Comparative analysis** of three alternative marine fuels: hydrogen, ammonia, and LNG
- **Descriptive and evaluative framework** based on technical, environmental, and economic criteria

Data Collection

- **Secondary data sources**:
    - Peer-reviewed journals
    - Industry reports (IMO, IEA, classification societies)

  - Government and maritime authority publications

- **Technical datasets**:
  - Fuel properties (energy density, calorific value, storage conditions)
  - Lifecycle emission data
  - Cost and infrastructure statistics

Analytical Methods

- **Comparative matrix analysis** for fuel properties and performance
- **Lifecycle Assessment (LCA)** to evaluate greenhouse gas emissions
- **Cost-benefit analysis** for economic feasibility
- **SWOT analysis** for each fuel
- **Multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA)** for ranking suitability

V. Compare the Physical and Chemical Properties of Hydrogen, Ammonia, And LNG As Marine Fuels

Table 1

Property	Hydrogen (H_2)	Ammonia (NH_3)	LNG (Liquefied Natural Gas)
Chemical Formula	H_2	NH_3	Mainly CH_4 (methane)
Molecular Weight (g/mol)	2.016	17.031	~16 (methane)
Physical State (Ambient)	Gas	Gas	Gas
Storage State (Marine Use)	Compressed gas / Cryogenic liquid	Liquefied under moderate pressure	Cryogenic liquid

Property	Hydrogen (H_2)	Ammonia (NH_3)	LNG (Liquefied Natural Gas)
Boiling Point (°C)	-253	-33	-162
Density (kg/m^3)	~0.089 (gas), ~70 (liquid)	~0.73 (gas), ~682 (liquid)	~430–470 (liquid)
Lower Heating Value (LHV)	~120 MJ/kg	~18.6 MJ/kg	~50 MJ/kg
Energy Density (Volumetric)	Very Low	Moderate	High
Flammability Range (in air)	4–75%	15–28%	5–15%
Auto-Ignition Temperature (°C)	~585	~651	~540
Carbon Content	None (Zero carbon)	None (Zero carbon)	High (contains carbon)
Toxicity	Non-toxic	Highly toxic	Low toxicity
Corrosiveness	Non-corrosive	Corrosive (especially to copper alloys)	Non-corrosive
Odor	Odorless	Strong pungent smell	Odorless (odorant added for detection)
Flame Visibility	Nearly invisible	Visible (yellow flame)	Visible (blue flame)
Storage Pressure	Very high (350–700 bar) or cryogenic	Moderate (~10 bar at ambient temperature)	Low (cryogenic storage, near atmospheric)

VI. The Energy Efficiency and Energy Density of Each Fuel in Maritime Applications

Energy efficiency and energy density are critical parameters in evaluating the suitability of alternative marine fuels, as they directly influence vessel performance, range, fuel storage requirements, and overall operational feasibility. Hydrogen, ammonia, and liquefied natural gas (LNG) differ significantly in these aspects, leading to distinct advantages and limitations in maritime applications.

Hydrogen is characterized by an exceptionally high **gravimetric energy density**, approximately 120 MJ/kg, which is nearly three times higher than conventional marine fuels. This makes it highly attractive in terms of energy per unit mass. However, its **volumetric energy density** is extremely low, even in liquefied form. Liquid hydrogen requires cryogenic storage at around -253°C and still occupies significantly more space compared to LNG or ammonia for the same energy output. In maritime operations, where cargo space is economically valuable, this presents a major constraint. From an energy efficiency perspective, hydrogen performs very well when used in **fuel cells**, which can achieve efficiencies of 50–60%, significantly higher than traditional internal combustion engines. This high conversion efficiency partially compensates for its storage disadvantages, making hydrogen particularly suitable for short-sea shipping or vessels where space constraints are less critical.

Ammonia offers a different balance between energy density and efficiency. Its **gravimetric energy density** is much lower than hydrogen, at around 18.6 MJ/kg, meaning more fuel mass is required to deliver the same energy. However, its **volumetric energy density** is considerably higher than hydrogen and closer to LNG, making it more practical for onboard storage. Ammonia can be stored as a liquid under moderate pressure or at -33°C, which is far less demanding than hydrogen's cryogenic requirements. In terms of energy efficiency, ammonia is less efficient than hydrogen, especially in combustion engines, due to its slower flame speed and higher ignition temperature. Engine efficiencies are typically lower, and combustion may produce nitrogen oxides (NOx), requiring additional emission control systems. However, ammonia can also be used in fuel cells (such as solid oxide fuel cells), which can improve overall efficiency, though this technology is still under development for maritime use.

LNG, primarily composed of methane, has a **moderately high gravimetric energy density** of about 50 MJ/kg and a high **volumetric energy density** compared to hydrogen and ammonia.

Stored as a cryogenic liquid at approximately -162°C, LNG is far more compact than hydrogen and slightly more energy-dense than ammonia in volumetric terms. This makes LNG highly suitable for long-distance shipping, where fuel storage efficiency is crucial. In terms of energy efficiency, LNG benefits from **mature engine technologies**, including dual-fuel engines, which can achieve thermal efficiencies comparable to or slightly better than conventional marine diesel engines (around 45–50%). However, LNG suffers from **methane slip**, where unburned methane is released into the atmosphere, reducing its overall environmental efficiency despite good combustion performance.

In comparative terms, hydrogen excels in energy efficiency, particularly in fuel cell applications, but is hindered by poor volumetric energy density. Ammonia provides a compromise with easier storage and moderate volumetric density, though at the cost of lower efficiency. LNG offers the best balance of energy density and operational efficiency with existing technologies, but it falls short of being a zero-carbon solution. Therefore, the choice among these fuels depends heavily on vessel type, voyage length, and technological readiness, with each fuel presenting a unique trade-off between efficiency and storage practicality.

VII. Assess Storage, Transportation, and Onboard Handling Requirements for Each Fuel Type

The adoption of hydrogen, ammonia, and LNG as marine fuels depends heavily on how easily they can be stored, transported, and safely handled onboard ships. Each fuel presents distinct technical and operational challenges due to its physical and chemical characteristics.

1. Hydrogen (H_2)

Storage Requirements:
Hydrogen is the most challenging fuel to store due to its very low volumetric energy density. It must be stored either:

- As **compressed gas** at very high pressures (350–700 bar), or
- As a **cryogenic liquid** at around -253°C

Both methods require advanced tank designs, such as double-walled, vacuum-insulated tanks. These systems are bulky and significantly reduce available cargo space.

Transportation Requirements:

Transporting hydrogen involves specialized infrastructure:

- Cryogenic tanker trucks or ships for liquid hydrogen
- High-pressure cylinders or pipelines for gaseous hydrogen
- Risk of **boil-off losses** during transport

Global hydrogen supply chains are still underdeveloped, making large-scale distribution difficult.

Onboard Handling:

- Requires continuous monitoring for leaks due to its small molecular size
- Highly flammable with a wide ignition range
- Needs advanced ventilation and gas detection systems
- Fuel cells or modified engines must be used

Overall Assessment:

Hydrogen has **high technical complexity** and **low infrastructure readiness**, making it more suitable for future adoption rather than immediate large-scale deployment.

2. Ammonia (NH_3)

Storage Requirements:

Ammonia is easier to store than hydrogen:

- Liquefies at **-33°C** or under moderate pressure (~10 bar at ambient temperature)
- Requires refrigerated or pressurized tanks, similar to LPG storage systems
- Higher volumetric energy density reduces storage space requirements compared to hydrogen

Transportation Requirements:

- Already transported globally in large quantities as a fertilizer feedstock
- Existing infrastructure (tankers, terminals, pipelines) can be partially adapted
- Lower boil-off issues compared to hydrogen

Onboard Handling:

- Major concern: **high toxicity and corrosiveness**
- Requires:
  - Specialized safety systems (gas detectors, protective equipment)
  - Crew training for hazardous material handling
  - Materials compatible with ammonia to prevent corrosion

Overall Assessment:

Ammonia offers a **balanced storage solution** with **moderate infrastructure readiness**, but safety concerns are a significant barrier.

3. LNG (Liquefied Natural Gas)

Storage Requirements:

- Stored as a cryogenic liquid at **-162°C**
- Requires insulated tanks (Type C, membrane, or Moss tanks)
- Higher volumetric energy density allows more compact storage than hydrogen

Transportation Requirements:

- Well-established global supply chain
- Transported via LNG carriers, tanker trucks, and terminals
- Efficient handling with minimal losses compared to hydrogen

Onboard Handling:

- Mature handling systems and operational procedures
- Requires:
  - Cryogenic safety measures
  - Gas detection systems
- Risk of **methane leakage (methane slip)**

Overall Assessment:

LNG has **high technological maturity**, **established infrastructure**, and **relatively easy onboard handling**, making it the most practical option currently.

Comparative Summary

Table 2

Aspect	**Hydrogen**	**Ammonia**	**LNG**
Storage Complexity	Very High	Moderate	Moderate
Storage Conditions	High pressure / -253°C	-33°C or moderate pressure	-162°C
Infrastructure	Limited	Developing	Well-established
Transport Feasibility	Difficult	Moderate	Easy
Onboard Safety	Flammable	Toxic & corrosive	Flammable (manageable)
Handling Maturity	Low	Medium	High

- Hydrogen poses the greatest challenges in storage and handling due to extreme conditions and safety risks.
- Ammonia provides a practical alternative with easier storage but introduces toxicity concerns.
- LNG remains the most feasible option in the short term due to its mature infrastructure and handling systems, despite not being fully carbon-free.

VIII. Safety Risks and Operational Challenges Associated with Hydrogen, Ammonia, And LNG

The transition to alternative marine fuels introduces new safety considerations and operational complexities. Hydrogen, ammonia, and LNG each present distinct risks due to their chemical properties, storage conditions, and handling requirements. Understanding these challenges is essential for safe maritime adoption.

1. Hydrogen (H_2)

Safety Risks:
Hydrogen is highly flammable and has a **wide flammability range (4–75% in air)**, making it more prone to ignition than most conventional fuels. Its **low ignition energy** means even small sparks can trigger combustion. Additionally, hydrogen flames are nearly **invisible**, complicating fire detection.

Due to its very small molecular size, hydrogen can **leak easily** through joints and materials, increasing the risk of undetected gas accumulation. It can also cause **material embrittlement** in metals, weakening storage tanks and pipelines over time.

Operational Challenges:

- Requirement for **high-pressure or cryogenic storage systems**
- Continuous **leak detection and ventilation systems**
- Limited crew familiarity and training requirements
- Integration of **fuel cells or modified engines**
- Lack of standardized maritime safety regulations (still evolving)

Overall: Hydrogen demands **advanced engineering controls and strict safety protocols**, increasing operational complexity.

2. Ammonia (NH_3)

Safety Risks:
Ammonia is **highly toxic**, posing serious health risks even at low concentrations. Exposure can cause respiratory damage, eye irritation, and in severe cases, fatality. Unlike hydrogen, ammonia is less flammable but can still burn under certain conditions.

It is also **corrosive**, particularly to copper-based materials, which limits material selection for storage and fuel systems. Accidental leaks can create hazardous environments for crew and surrounding ecosystems.

Operational Challenges:

- Need for **specialized personal protective equipment (PPE)**
- Installation of **toxic gas detection systems**

- Strict handling and emergency response procedures
- Crew training for hazardous chemical management
- Engine and fuel system modifications due to combustion characteristics

Overall: Ammonia’s main challenge lies in **toxicity and safe handling**, requiring rigorous operational discipline.

3. LNG (Liquefied Natural Gas)

Safety Risks:

LNG is flammable and stored at **cryogenic temperatures (-162°C)**, posing risks of **cold burns** and material brittleness. When vaporized, it forms methane gas, which has a **flammability range of 5–15% in air**.

A key environmental and safety concern is **methane slip**, where unburned methane escapes into the atmosphere. In confined spaces, gas accumulation can lead to explosions.

Operational Challenges:

- Management of **cryogenic storage systems**
- Handling of **boil-off gas (BOG)** during storage and transport
- Requirement for **gas detection and ventilation systems**
- Established but still complex bunkering procedures
- Compliance with existing LNG safety codes (e.g., IGF Code)

Overall: LNG has **well-developed safety frameworks**, but still requires careful handling due to flammability and cryogenic risks.

Comparative Summary of Risks and Challenges

Table 3

Aspect	Hydrogen	Ammonia	LNG
Primary Risk	Flammability & explosion	Toxicity	Flammability & cryogenic hazards

Aspect	**Hydrogen**	**Ammonia**	**LNG**
Leak Behaviour	Very high (small molecules)	Detectable (strong odor)	Moderate
Detection Difficulty	High (invisible flame)	Low (pungent smell)	Moderate
Health Hazards	Low (non-toxic)	Severe toxicity	Low toxicity
Material Impact	Embrittlement	Corrosion	Cold brittleness
Operational Complexity	Very High	High	Moderate
Technology Maturity	Low	Medium	High

- **Hydrogen** presents the highest **fire and explosion risks**, along with technical handling challenges.
- **Ammonia** introduces **significant toxicity hazards**, making safety management critical.
- **LNG**, while flammable, benefits from **mature safety standards and operational experience**, making it the most manageable in current maritime operations.

Overall, each fuel requires **tailored safety systems, crew training, and regulatory frameworks**, and no option is risk-free. The choice depends on balancing safety with environmental and operational priorities.

IX. Compare Lifecycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Including Production, Distribution and Combustion Stages

Table 4

Lifecycle Stage	Hydrogen (H_2)	Ammonia (NH_3)	LNG (Liquefied Natural Gas)
Production	- **Green hydrogen**: Near-zero emissions (renewable electrolysis) - **Blue hydrogen**: Moderate (CO_2 capture + methane leakage) - **Grey hydrogen**: High emissions (natural gas reforming)	- **Green ammonia**: Near-zero (renewable hydrogen + nitrogen) - **Conventional ammonia**: High emissions (Haber-Bosch using fossil fuels)	- High emissions from natural gas extraction and processing - Significant **methane leakage** during upstream operations
Distribution & Storage	- High energy demand for liquefaction (-253°C) or compression - Potential indirect emissions depending on electricity source - Boil-off losses possible	- Moderate energy requirement (liquefaction at -33°C or pressurization) - Existing infrastructure reduces additional emissions	- Energy-intensive liquefaction (-162°C) - Emissions during transport via LNG carriers - Methane leakage during storage and transfer
Combustion / End Use	- **Zero CO_2 emissions** - No methane emissions	- **Zero CO_2 emissions** - Produces **NOx emissions** (requires treatment systems)	- ~20–25% lower CO_2 than conventional fuels - **Methane slip** significantly increases GHG impact

Lifecycle Stage	Hydrogen (H_2)	Ammonia (NH_3)	LNG (Liquefied Natural Gas)
Methane Emissions	None	None	High (upstream leakage + engine methane slip)
Carbon Content	None	None	High (fossil fuel-based)
Overall Lifecycle GHG Emissions	- **Very low (green)** - Moderate to high (blue/grey)	- **Very low (green)** - High (conventional production)	- Moderate to high overall - Can approach or exceed conventional fuels if methane losses are high
Decarbonization Potential	Very high (with renewable production)	Very high (with green production)	Limited (transitional fuel only)

Key Takeaways from the Table

- **Production stage dominates emissions** for hydrogen and ammonia.
- **Hydrogen and ammonia can be near-zero-carbon fuels**, but only when produced using renewable energy.
- **LNG has lower combustion emissions**, but its overall lifecycle impact is significantly affected by **methane leakage**.
- From a lifecycle perspective, **green hydrogen and green ammonia outperform LNG** in long-term sustainability.

X. Evaluate The Economic Feasibility and Cost Implications of Adopting Each Fuel

The economic viability of alternative marine fuels depends on multiple cost components, including **fuel production, storage and infrastructure, vessel modification, and**

operational expenses. Hydrogen, ammonia, and LNG differ significantly in their current and projected cost structures, influencing their adoption across the maritime sector.

1. Hydrogen (H_2)

Capital Costs (CAPEX):

Hydrogen requires substantial upfront investment. Ships must be equipped with **cryogenic or high-pressure storage tanks**, fuel cells, and advanced safety systems. Port infrastructure for hydrogen production, storage, and bunkering is still limited, leading to high initial development costs.

Fuel Production Costs:

- **Green hydrogen** is currently expensive due to high electricity costs for electrolysis
- Costs depend heavily on renewable energy availability
- Prices are expected to decline with technological advancements and scaling

Operational Costs (OPEX):

- Higher fuel costs compared to conventional fuels
- Potential savings from higher efficiency (especially fuel cells)
- Maintenance costs may be high due to specialized systems

Economic Feasibility:

- Currently **low feasibility for large-scale adoption**
- More viable for **short-sea shipping or niche applications**
- Long-term potential is strong with falling renewable energy costs

2. Ammonia (NH_3)

Capital Costs (CAPEX):

- Moderate compared to hydrogen
- Existing LPG-like storage systems can be adapted
- Engine modifications and safety systems required due to toxicity

Fuel Production Costs:

- **Conventional ammonia** is relatively cheap but carbon-intensive
- **Green ammonia** is more expensive due to reliance on green hydrogen
- Costs expected to decrease with scaling and renewable integration

Operational Costs (OPEX):

- Lower storage costs than hydrogen
- Additional costs for safety systems and crew training
- Potential costs for emission control (NOx reduction systems)

Economic Feasibility:

- Considered **moderately feasible**
- Attractive for **long-distance shipping** due to easier storage than hydrogen
- Transitional phase likely before cost parity with fossil fuels

3. LNG (Liquefied Natural Gas)

Capital Costs (CAPEX):

- Lower than hydrogen and ammonia due to **mature technology**
- Ships require cryogenic tanks and dual-fuel engines, but these are already widely deployed
- Existing bunkering infrastructure reduces investment burden

Fuel Production Costs:

- Currently **cheaper than hydrogen and ammonia**
- Prices fluctuate with global natural gas markets

Operational Costs (OPEX):

- Competitive fuel pricing
- Established supply chains reduce logistics costs

- Slightly higher maintenance due to cryogenic systems

Economic Feasibility:

- **High feasibility in the short to medium term**
- Widely adopted as a **transition fuel**
- Long-term viability limited by environmental regulations

Comparative Cost Analysis

Table 5

Cost Aspect	**Hydrogen**	**Ammonia**	**LNG**
CAPEX (Ships & Infra)	Very High	Moderate	Moderate to Low
Fuel Production Cost	High (especially green)	Moderate (high if green)	Low to Moderate
Storage Cost	Very High	Moderate	Moderate
Operational Cost	High	Moderate	Low to Moderate
Infrastructure Readiness	Low	Medium	High
Fuel Price Stability	Uncertain	Moderate	Volatile (market-dependent)
Short-term Feasibility	Low	Moderate	High
Long-term Feasibility	High (with cost reduction)	High	Low (not zero-carbon)

Hydrogen has the **highest current costs**, mainly due to production and infrastructure limitations, but offers strong long-term economic potential as renewable energy becomes cheaper.

Ammonia provides a **cost-effective compromise**, with moderate infrastructure requirements and scalability potential, especially for deep-sea shipping.

LNG is the **most economically viable option today**, benefiting from established supply chains and lower fuel costs, but its long-term use may be restricted by decarbonization policies.

XI. The Current Level of Infrastructure Development and Technological Readiness

The readiness of hydrogen, ammonia, and LNG as marine fuels can be assessed using **Technology Readiness Levels (TRLs)**, infrastructure availability, and commercial deployment status. These fuels are at **different stages of maturity**, with LNG being the most developed and hydrogen the least.

1. Hydrogen (H_2)

Technological Readiness

- Typically, at **TRL 5–7 (pilot to demonstration stage)**
- Key technologies such as **electrolysis and fuel cells** are proven but not fully scaled for maritime use
- Bunkering systems and onboard storage are still under testing and demonstration

Infrastructure Development

- **Very limited global infrastructure**
- No widespread hydrogen bunkering network
- Only **local pilot bunkering operations demonstrated**
- Requires entirely new supply chains (production, liquefaction, transport)

Overall Assessment

- Hydrogen is in the **early deployment phase**
- Significant R&D and infrastructure investment still required
- Strong policy support is accelerating development globally

2. Ammonia (NH_3)

Technological Readiness

- Generally, at **TRL 6–8 (advanced prototype to early commercial stage)**
- Engine technologies and fuel systems are under active development
- Demonstration projects (e.g., ammonia engines and vessels) have been successfully tested

Infrastructure Development

- **Moderate readiness**
- Can leverage **existing global ammonia production and transport infrastructure**
- However:
    - **No fully established marine bunkering network yet**
    - Bunkering systems are still in pilot or demonstration phase

Overall Assessment

- Ammonia is **closer to commercialization than hydrogen**
- Infrastructure adaptation is easier due to existing industrial supply chains
- Key barriers remain in **bunkering, safety regulation, and scaling green production**

3. LNG (Liquefied Natural Gas)

Technological Readiness

- **TRL 9 (fully mature and commercially deployed)**
- Proven technologies:
    - Dual-fuel engines
    - Cryogenic storage systems
    - Established operational standards

Infrastructure Development

- **Highly developed global infrastructure**
- Extensive:
  - LNG bunkering facilities at major ports
  - Transportation networks (tankers, pipelines)
- Widely adopted across commercial shipping

Overall Assessment

- LNG is the **most technologically and commercially mature marine fuel**
- Infrastructure is **well-established and globally available**
- However, environmental limitations reduce its long-term viability

Comparative Readiness Table

Table 6

Criteria	**Hydrogen**	**Ammonia**	**LNG**
Technology Readiness (TRL)	5–7 (pilot stage)	6–8 (advanced development)	9 (fully mature)
Production Technology	Developing (electrolysis scaling needed)	Established (Haber-Bosch) + green transition	Fully established
Bunkering Infrastructure	Very limited (pilot only)	Limited (under development)	Widely available
Global Supply Chain	Underdeveloped	Partially established	Fully established
Onboard Technology	Experimental (fuel cells, storage)	Prototype engines emerging	Mature engines available
Commercial Deployment	Minimal	Early-stage	Widespread

Criteria	Hydrogen	Ammonia	LNG
Regulatory Framework	Developing	Developing	Well-established

Key Insights

- **LNG dominates in current readiness**, with fully developed infrastructure and proven ship technologies.
- **Ammonia is emerging as a strong mid-term solution**, benefiting from existing industrial supply chains but lacking bunkering infrastructure.
- **Hydrogen remains the least mature**, with major gaps in storage, distribution, and port infrastructure.
- Across all fuels, **regulatory frameworks and crew training standards are still evolving**, with organizations working toward global guidelines for safe adoption

XII. Identify The Most Suitable Fuel Options for Different Categories of Ships and Routes

Selecting the optimal marine fuel depends on **voyage distance, vessel size, energy demand, storage constraints, and infrastructure availability**. Hydrogen, ammonia, and LNG each fit different operational profiles rather than serving as a universal solution.

1. Short-Sea Shipping (Ferries, Inland Vessels, Coastal Ships)

Recommended Fuel: Hydrogen (H_2)

Rationale:

- Short routes reduce the impact of hydrogen's **low volumetric energy density**
- Suitable for **frequent refueling operations**
- High efficiency when used in **fuel cells**
- Zero emissions at point of use—ideal for **urban and environmentally sensitive areas**

Examples of Suitable Vessels:

- Passenger ferries
- Inland waterway vessels
- Coastal cargo ships

Limitations:

- Requires local hydrogen production and bunkering infrastructure

2. Medium-Range Shipping (Regional Cargo, Ro-Ro, Short International Routes)

Recommended Fuel: Ammonia (NH_3)

Rationale:

- Better **energy density than hydrogen**, enabling longer voyages
- Easier storage compared to hydrogen
- Carbon-free combustion supports emission regulations

Examples of Suitable Vessels:

- Roll-on/Roll-off (Ro-Ro) ships
- Feeder container vessels
- Regional bulk carriers

Limitations:

- Toxicity requires strict safety systems
- Engine technology still developing

3. Long-Distance Deep-Sea Shipping (Container Ships, Bulk Carriers, Tankers)

Recommended Fuel: Ammonia (Long-term), LNG (Short-term Transition)

Rationale:

- **Ammonia**:
  - Suitable for long voyages due to **higher volumetric density than hydrogen**

  - Carbon-free potential for future compliance

- **LNG**:
  - Currently most practical due to **established infrastructure and high energy density**
  - Acts as a **bridge fuel** during transition

Examples of Suitable Vessels:

- Ultra-large container ships
- Oil and chemical tankers
- Bulk carriers

Limitations:

- LNG is not zero-carbon (methane emissions)
- Ammonia infrastructure still developing

4. High-Speed and Energy-Intensive Vessels

Recommended Fuel: LNG (Current), Hydrogen (Future)

Rationale:

- LNG provides **high power output and reliability** with mature engines
- Hydrogen may become viable with **advanced fuel cell systems**

Examples:

- Fast ferries
- Naval vessels
- Cruise ships (partial adoption)

5. Specialized and Niche Applications

Table 7

Vessel Type	Preferred Fuel	Reason
Harbor tugs	Hydrogen	Short operation cycles, zero emissions in ports
Offshore support vessels	Ammonia / LNG	Balance between range and storage feasibility
Arctic shipping	LNG	Proven cold-environment performance
Cruise ships	LNG (current), Hydrogen (future)	Emission control in sensitive zones

Comparative Suitability Table

Table 8

Ship Category	Hydrogen	Ammonia	LNG
Short-sea / Inland	★★★ (Best)	★★	★★
Medium-range	★★	★★★ (Best)	★★★
Long-distance deep-sea	★	★★★ (Future Best)	★★★ (Current Best)
High-speed vessels	★★ (Future)	★	★★★ (Best)
Port/Harbor operations	★★★ (Best)	★★	★★

(★ = suitability level)

Key Insights

- **Hydrogen is best suited for short routes and port operations** due to storage limitations but offers maximum environmental benefits.

- **Ammonia is the most promising fuel for long-distance decarbonization**, balancing storage and zero-carbon potential.
- **LNG is currently the most practical option**, especially for large vessels and long routes, but is only a transitional solution.
- No single fuel is universally optimal; a **multi-fuel strategy** is necessary for the maritime sector

XIII. Recommendations For Policymakers and Industry Stakeholders for Sustainable Fuel Adoption

A successful transition to low- and zero-carbon marine fuels—hydrogen, ammonia, and LNG (as a transitional fuel)—requires coordinated action between governments, shipping companies, fuel producers, and port authorities. The following recommendations are structured to support **technical feasibility, economic viability, safety, and environmental sustainability**.

1. Policy and Regulatory Framework Development

- Establish a **clear global regulatory roadmap** under IMO guidelines for zero-carbon fuels.
- Introduce **mandatory lifecycle emission accounting (well-to-wake approach)** to avoid “carbon shifting” between stages.
- Implement **carbon pricing mechanisms** (e.g., carbon taxes or emissions trading systems) to make green fuels economically competitive.
- Standardize **fuel safety codes for hydrogen and ammonia bunkering operations**, similar to LNG’s IGF Code.

2. Infrastructure Development and Investment

- Develop **dedicated green fuel corridors** in major shipping routes with hydrogen and ammonia bunkering hubs.
- Expand **port readiness programs** to upgrade storage, handling, and refueling systems.
- Encourage **public–private partnerships (PPP)** to reduce capital burden on ports and governments.

- Prioritize investment in **renewable energy integration** to support green hydrogen and ammonia production.

3. Financial Incentives and Market Support

- Provide **subsidies and tax incentives** for early adopters of zero-carbon vessels.
- Establish **green shipping funds** to support R&D and fleet conversion.
- Offer **low-interest financing or green bonds** for shipowners transitioning to alternative fuels.
- Implement **fuel price stabilization mechanisms** to reduce uncertainty in hydrogen and ammonia markets.

4. Technology Development and Innovation

- Increase funding for **fuel cell and ammonia combustion engine R&D**.
- Support development of **safe onboard storage systems** for hydrogen and ammonia.
- Promote **pilot projects and demonstration vessels** to accelerate real-world validation.
- Encourage innovation in **carbon capture technologies for LNG as a transitional solution**.

5. Safety Standards and Risk Management

- Develop **international safety protocols for toxic (ammonia) and highly flammable (hydrogen) fuels**.
- Mandate **advanced gas detection, ventilation, and emergency response systems** onboard vessels.
- Require **specialized crew training and certification programs** for alternative fuel handling.
- Strengthen **port emergency preparedness systems** for fuel leakage or fire incidents.

6. Industry Collaboration and Supply Chain Integration

- Promote **collaboration between fuel producers, shipbuilders, and shipping companies** for integrated fuel ecosystems.

- Encourage **standardized fuel infrastructure design** to ensure compatibility across ports.
- Develop **global supply chains for green hydrogen and ammonia production and transport**.
- Support **digital tracking systems** for fuel lifecycle emissions monitoring.

7. Phased Transition Strategy

- **Short-term (0–10 years):**
    - Expand LNG as a transitional fuel
    - Begin pilot projects for hydrogen and ammonia
- **Medium-term (10–20 years):**
    - Scale ammonia adoption for deep-sea shipping
    - Develop hydrogen hubs for short-sea and port operations
- **Long-term (20+ years):**
    - Transition toward **green hydrogen dominance** as technology matures
    - Phase out LNG due to methane-related emissions

8. Research, Data Transparency, and Monitoring

- Create a **global maritime emissions database** for transparent lifecycle tracking.
- Standardize **fuel performance metrics across countries and shipping companies**.
- Encourage academic–industry collaboration for continuous improvement in fuel efficiency studies.

Key Strategic Insight

A **single-fuel strategy is not viable** for global shipping. Instead, a **multi-fuel transition pathway** is required:

- LNG → Ammonia → Hydrogen (long-term decarbonization trajectory)
- Each fuel serves a **specific transitional role** depending on maturity, infrastructure, and vessel type.

For sustainable marine fuel adoption, policymakers must focus on **regulation, infrastructure, and financial incentives**, while industry stakeholders must prioritize **technology adoption, safety compliance, and operational adaptation**. Coordinated global action is essential to ensure that the maritime sector achieves its **2050 decarbonization targets** while maintaining economic efficiency and operational reliability.

XIV. Threats to Research Validity

Data Limitations

- Inconsistencies in emission data due to varying assumptions
- Limited real-world operational data for hydrogen and ammonia

Technological Uncertainty

- Rapidly evolving fuel technologies may render findings outdated

Bias in Secondary Sources

- Industry-funded reports may favor specific fuels

Generalization Issues

- Findings may not apply uniformly across all ship types and routes

Measurement Errors

- Variability in lifecycle analysis methodologies

Data Analysis

Physical and Chemical Properties

- Hydrogen: Low density, high energy per mass
- Ammonia: Carbon-free, toxic, moderate energy density
- LNG: Fossil-based, high-energy density, cleaner than conventional fuels

Energy Efficiency

- Hydrogen: High efficiency in fuel cells
- Ammonia: Lower combustion efficiency

- LNG: Mature and efficient combustion systems

Storage and Handling

- Hydrogen: Requires cryogenic or high-pressure storage
- Ammonia: Easier to liquefy but toxic
- LNG: Established cryogenic storage systems

Safety Analysis

- Hydrogen: Highly flammable
- Ammonia: Toxic and corrosive
- LNG: Risk of methane leakage

Lifecycle Emissions

- Hydrogen: Zero emissions if produced via renewable energy
- Ammonia: Zero carbon but depends on production method
- LNG: Lower CO_2 but methane slip is a concern

Economic Analysis

- Hydrogen: High production and infrastructure cost
- Ammonia: Moderate cost but requires adaptation
- LNG: Most economically viable currently

XV. Key Findings

- Hydrogen offers **maximum decarbonization potential** but faces storage challenges
- Ammonia is a **promising carbon-free fuel** with easier storage than hydrogen
- LNG is a **transitional fuel**, not fully zero-carbon due to methane emissions
- Infrastructure readiness is **highest for LNG**, lowest for hydrogen
- No single fuel fits all applications; **fuel choice depends on vessel type and route**

XVI. Merits

Hydrogen

- Zero carbon emissions at point of use
- High energy efficiency in fuel cells
- Renewable production potential

Ammonia

- Carbon-free combustion
- Easier storage compared to hydrogen
- Existing global production infrastructure

LNG

- Mature technology and infrastructure
- Lower emissions than conventional fuels
- Immediate implementation feasibility

XVII. Demerits

Hydrogen

- Low volumetric energy density
- High storage and transport costs
- Limited infrastructure

Ammonia

- Toxicity risks
- Lower energy efficiency
- Engine technology still developing

LNG

- Methane slip reduces environmental benefits

- Fossil fuel dependency
- Not a long-term zero-carbon solution

XVIII. Comparison of Fuels

Table 9

Criteria	**Hydrogen**	**Ammonia**	**LNG**
Carbon Emissions	Zero	Zero	Low (not zero)
Energy Density (Mass)	High	Moderate	High
Energy Density (Volume)	Very Low	Moderate	High
Storage Complexity	Very High	Moderate	Moderate
Safety Risks	Flammable	Toxic	Flammable
Infrastructure	Limited	Developing	Well-established
Cost	High	Moderate	Low
Technology Readiness	Emerging	Emerging	Mature

XIX. Recommendations

- Short-term: Adopt LNG as a transition fuel
- Medium-term: Invest in ammonia infrastructure and engine development
- Long-term: Transition to green hydrogen for full decarbonization
- Policymakers should:
    - Provide subsidies for green fuel development
    - Implement stricter emission regulations
    - Support R&D in fuel technologies

XX. Conclusion

This study provides a comprehensive comparative analysis of hydrogen, ammonia, and liquefied natural gas (LNG) as alternative marine fuels in the context of decarbonizing the maritime sector. The findings highlight that no single fuel currently offers a complete solution, as each presents unique advantages and limitations across technical, environmental, economic, and operational dimensions. Hydrogen demonstrates strong potential as a zero-carbon fuel with high energy efficiency, but its low volumetric energy density and complex storage requirements pose significant challenges. Ammonia, with relatively higher energy density and easier storage compared to hydrogen, emerges as a promising option; however, concerns regarding toxicity, safety, and combustion efficiency must be addressed. LNG, while not entirely carbon-free, provides an immediate and practical transition pathway due to its established infrastructure and relatively lower emissions. The comparative evaluation of lifecycle emissions reveals that the environmental benefits of hydrogen and ammonia are highly dependent on sustainable production methods. In terms of economic feasibility and technological readiness, LNG currently holds an advantage, whereas hydrogen and ammonia require further investment, innovation, and policy support. Additionally, the suitability of each fuel varies depending on vessel type, route, and operational requirements, emphasizing the need for a diversified fuel strategy rather than a one-size-fits-all approach. Overall, the transition to sustainable marine fuels will require coordinated efforts from policymakers, industry stakeholders, and researchers. Strategic investments in infrastructure, advancements in technology, and the development of clear regulatory frameworks are essential to enable the large-scale adoption of zero- and low-carbon fuels in the maritime industry.

XXI. References

1. International Maritime Organization (IMO), *Fourth IMO GHG Study*
2. International Energy Agency (IEA), *The Future of Hydrogen*
3. DNV, *Maritime Forecast to 2050*
4. Lloyd’s Register, *Zero-Emission Fuel Pathways*
5. MAN Energy Solutions, *Alternative Marine Fuels Report*
6. Journal of Cleaner Production (various articles on marine fuels)
7. Energy & Environmental Science Journal

8. ABS (American Bureau of Shipping), *Fuel Technology Reports*