Nick Clark · Published April 25, 2026 · PDF

ESS Inc, maker of long-duration iron flow batteries vs a sealed solid-state cell: comparing the flow architecture to the Hydrogen-Aluminum Energy Cell

ESS Inc builds long-duration stationary storage on an iron flow chemistry, pumping an iron-based aqueous electrolyte between external tanks and a reaction stack to serve multi-hour grid duty. The domain problem is the same one every long-duration operator faces: hold energy cheaply and safely for many hours, cycle it for decades, and do it with earth-abundant materials. This application positions that flow architecture against the Hydrogen-Aluminum Energy Cell, disclosed in U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/055,649, which stores the same class of energy inside a single sealed cell with no flowing electrolyte and no external tanks. The comparison is architectural, and it is honest about a real asymmetry: ESS ships product today, while the disclosed cell is an early-stage architecture disclosure.

What ESS Inc, maker of long-duration iron flow batteries Does

ESS Inc is a manufacturer of long-duration stationary energy storage systems built on iron flow chemistry. In broad architectural terms, an iron flow battery stores energy in a liquid electrolyte based on iron salts dissolved in water. That electrolyte is held in external tanks and pumped through a reaction stack, where the electrochemical reactions of charge and discharge take place across electrodes and a membrane. Because the energy-bearing electrolyte lives in the tanks and the power-converting reactions happen in the stack, a flow system decouples how much energy it stores (tank size) from how much power it delivers (stack size). ESS packages this into deployable products aimed at multi-hour grid, commercial, and industrial storage.

There is a great deal to credit here, and it should be stated plainly. The iron flow approach uses earth-abundant, low-cost, water-based materials rather than lithium, cobalt, or nickel, which is a genuine supply-chain and cost advantage. The aqueous iron electrolyte is not flammable and is chemically benign relative to organic-solvent lithium-ion cells, which is a real safety benefit for large stationary installations. The decoupling of energy from power is well suited to long-duration duty, where many hours of storage are wanted from a modest power rating. And, most importantly for a fair comparison, ESS is a real company shipping real, manufactured, field-deployed systems. That is the honest baseline against which everything below must be read.

The Architectural Axis

The axis this comparison addresses is cell architecture: where the energy lives, how charge is retained, and what moving parts and internal boundaries the design requires. It is not a claim that flow chemistry is deficient. A flow battery is, by design, a system of tanks, pumps, plumbing, a membrane-separated stack, and flowing liquid electrolyte. Those elements are what deliver its strengths, above all the independent scaling of energy and power. They also define its architectural character: the electrolyte is a circulating fluid, the reaction happens at a membrane-separated interface in the stack, and the system includes active fluid-handling components that move electrolyte during operation.

The Hydrogen-Aluminum Energy Cell, disclosed in U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/055,649, sits at a structurally different point on this axis. It is described as a sealed, unitary cell with no flowing electrolyte, no external tanks, and, distinctively, no internal separator or membrane at all between its two current collectors. Framing this as a difference rather than a defect matters: these are two different answers to the long-duration question, and the comparison is about what each structure inherently provides.

How the Disclosed Approach Differs

The disclosed cell stores energy as electron-stabilized metal-hydrogen surface bonds on a population of metal nanoflakes, preferably aluminum, dispersed throughout a single continuous volume of dual-domain proton-conducting carbon gel. Charging drives protons, under applied bias, into a high-energy transit state that reaches the flake surfaces and bonds atomic hydrogen there; discharging withdraws the bonding electrons through the external load and releases the hydrogen back into the gel as protons. The energy-bearing chemistry lives on solid surfaces inside one sealed volume, not in a circulating liquid.

Three structural differences follow directly from the disclosure. First, there is no internal separator or membrane. The disclosure describes bulk-equipotential charge retention: in the charged state with no load connected, every nanoflake is held at the same electrochemical potential, so there is no internal driving force for charge to redistribute. Charge is retained by saturation of the conductive medium rather than by an insulating barrier that separates two electrodes of different potential. A flow battery, by contrast, retains charge across a membrane-separated stack interface. Second, there are no pumps, tanks, or flowing electrolyte in the operational cell. The disclosed enclosure is hermetic, admitting no gas exchange during operation, and the storage medium is a solid gel rather than a fluid that must be circulated. Third, the disclosure describes a self-healing and use-positive aging regime in which mobile carbon migrates to mechanically strained sites during cycling and repairs fatigue damage, so cumulative cycling is described as not producing monotonic capacity loss until the auxiliary carbon reservoir nears exhaustion.

Every one of these is a mechanism recited in the disclosure. The disclosure is candid that its cell-level performance figures, including energy density and calendar self-discharge below one percent per year, are projections from the disclosed operating mechanisms and published materials data, not measurements on a built cell. That candor is exactly the point of an honest comparison.

Where They Fit Together

These are not strictly rivals for every socket, and the honest reading is compose-or-choose rather than winner-take-all. ESS iron flow systems are a mature answer where a site wants many hours of non-flammable, water-based storage from a modest power rating and can accommodate a system of tanks, pumps, and plumbing, and where the buyer needs product that exists and ships now. The independent scaling of energy and power is a real architectural fit for very long duration, tank-dominated duty.

The disclosed cell is aimed at a different structural profile: a sealed, static, separator-free cell with no fluid handling, whose projected value is in holding charge for long idle periods with very low self-discharge and in cycling without monotonic degradation. Where a deployment is constrained on moving parts, on maintenance access to pumps and plumbing, or on siting a fluid system, a sealed solid-state cell is the architecturally complementary answer. In a mixed portfolio one could imagine flow systems carrying the longest-duration, most cost-per-kilowatt-hour-sensitive tanks and sealed cells carrying duty that rewards zero fluid handling and long idle retention. The choice turns on the deployment's constraints, not on either technology being wrong.

Boundary Conditions

The honest limits run both ways, and the asymmetry between the two must be stated clearly. On the disclosed side, the underlying science is entirely pre-existing: hydrogen chemisorption on metal surfaces, proton-conducting carbon gels, boron-doped turbostratic graphene, and electrochemically driven nanoparticle restructuring are all drawn from published research. The novelty claimed is the combination and architecture, the specific integration of a separator-free bulk-equipotential cell with surface-bonded hydrogen storage in a dual-domain gel, not any newly discovered basic science. Just as importantly, the disclosed cell is an architecture disclosed in a provisional application. It has not been built, validated, benchmarked, or measured. Its energy-density, self-discharge, cycle-life, and efficiency figures are explicitly projected ranges subject to refinement upon prototype construction and testing.

ESS, by contrast, ships manufactured systems with field data behind them. That is a decisive present-day asymmetry: one side has product and operating history, the other has an architecture on paper. Nothing here should be read as asserting a defect in the iron flow approach. Flow batteries do exactly what their architecture is built to do, and the components that make them a flow system, tanks, pumps, membrane-separated stack, are the source of their strengths, not evidence of a flaw. Any statement here about the flow architecture is a neutral, structural description; any comparative advantage claimed for the disclosed cell is a projection from disclosed mechanisms, not a measured result and not an assertion that the competitor underperforms.

Disclosure Scope

The inventive subject matter described here is disclosed in U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/055,649, and is defined by the operating mechanisms and architectural elements recited there: bulk-equipotential charge retention without an internal separator, surface-bonded hydrogen storage on metal nanoflakes in a dual-domain proton-conducting carbon gel, and the associated self-healing and field-service architecture. All references in this article to ESS Inc, to iron flow batteries, and to the long-duration storage market are external context provided to orient the reader; they are not part of the disclosure, are not claims of the filing, and are offered as accurate architecture-level description of a real company and its product category. This article does not assert any defect, failure, or deficiency in ESS Inc or in iron flow technology; the flow architecture's components are described neutrally as the intended design of that category. All performance characteristics attributed to the disclosed cell are projections from the disclosed mechanisms and from published data on the underlying pre-existing materials science, not empirical measurements, and the disclosed cell is an early-stage architecture that has not been built or validated.

Hydrogen-Aluminum Energy Cell (/h-al-battery)

All 40 steps → (/inventive-steps)

Sealed electrochemical cell storing energy as reversible covalent hydrogen bonds on carbon electrodes.

Provisional application

PRIMARY TECHNICAL DISCLOSURE

- A Hydrogen-Aluminum Surface-Bond Storage Cell with Bulk-Equipotential Charge Retention (/articles/a-hydrogen-aluminum-surface-bond-storage-cell-with-bulk-equipotential-charge-retention)

SECONDARY TECHNICAL

- Charge Retention by Bulk-Equipotential Saturation Without an Internal Separator (/articles/h-al-battery/bulk-equipotential-charge-retention)
- Storing Energy as Electron-Stabilized Metal-Hydrogen Surface Bonds Formed by Proton-Coupled Electron Transfer (/articles/h-al-battery/hydrogen-metal-surface-bond-storage)
- Electron-Mediated Bond Stability: The Kinetically Trapped Idle State Behind Indefinite Calendar Life (/articles/h-al-battery/electron-mediated-bond-stability)
- Hot-Proton Charging Versus Cold-Proton Discharge: The Bias-Gated Asymmetry That Blocks Self-Charge and Self-Discharge (/articles/h-al-battery/hot-cold-proton-asymmetry)
- Asymmetric Dual-Domain Proton Paths: Separate Ingress and Egress Routes in a Hydrogen-Aluminum Storage Gel (/articles/h-al-battery/asymmetric-dual-domain-paths)
- Hydrophobic Gating: Rejecting Neutral and Molecular Hydrogen While Admitting Only Biased Protons (/articles/h-al-battery/hydrophobic-gating)
- The Storage Gel as a Polarized Electrochemical Switch: Coherent Alignment, Equipotential Locking, and Load-Proportional Discharge (/articles/h-al-battery/gel-polarized-switch)
- Flake-Flake Electrostatic Isolation: DLVO Repulsion as a Self-Discharge Barrier in a Separator-Free Hydrogen-Aluminum Cell (/articles/h-al-battery/flake-electrostatic-isolation)

APPLICATIONS · GENERAL

APPLICATIONS · SPECIFIC

- **ESS Inc, maker of long-duration iron flow batteries vs a sealed solid-state cell: comparing the flow architecture to the Hydrogen-Aluminum Energy Cell (/articles/h-al-battery/ess-inc)**
- Ambri liquid-metal battery vs a solid-state hydrogen-aluminum energy cell: architectural comparison for stationary storage (/articles/h-al-battery/ambri)
- QuantumScape solid-state lithium-metal battery vs a bulk-equipotential hydrogen-aluminum surface-bond cell: an architecture comparison (/articles/h-al-battery/quantumscape)
- Natron Energy sodium-ion (Prussian-blue-electrode) batteries vs a hydrogen-aluminum surface-bond cell: an abundant-materials architecture comparison (/articles/h-al-battery/natron-energy)
- Eos Energy Enterprises Znyth zinc long-duration storage vs a hydrogen-aluminum equipotential cell: an abundant-materials architecture comparison (/articles/h-al-battery/eos-energy)

Hydrogen-Aluminum Energy Cell overview → (/h-al-battery)