# Lithium Battery Combustion Hazard Analysis and Packaging Testing

Presented to: International Aircraft Materials Fire Test and Systems Fire Protection Forums

Matthew Karp, Joseph Sica

June 12, 2023



By:

Date:

Federal Aviation Administration

### Purpose

- The goal of aircraft fire protection research is to prevent fatal accidents caused by in-flight fires and improve survivability during post-crash fires.
- The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Technical Center conducted experiments to
  - assess the combustion hazard of lithium batteries that undergo thermal runaway through gas analysis.
  - assist in the development of the SAE G27 standard.



# Background

- Large format cells becoming more prevalent. Governments banning production of internal combustion engine (ICE) cars plus tax incentives for electric vehicles (Evs).
- Approximately 1/3 of Ev fires start while the car is parked and not charging<sup>1</sup>.
- Projected 465% increase in battery sales over 10 years from 230 GWh in 2020 to 1300 GWh in 2030<sup>2</sup>.
- Three catastrophic in-flight aircraft cargo fires between 2006 and 2011 where lithium ion batteries were suspected cause of factor.
- 30% state of charge (SOC) limitation for lithium ion cells
- The SAE G27 committee was established to develop a package performance standard for lithium cells and batteries for cargo in air transportation.



# **Combustion analysis**



Combustion energy versus cell energy at % SOC

Forty-nine cells composed of ten different types were individually tested. Within this study, five cell chemistries, five SOCs, and five heating rates



#### Vent gas volume and combustion energy

- The volume of vent gas is a good indicator of the combustion energy
- Non cobalt cell chemistries such as lithium iron phosphate (LFP) might produce less flammable gases and decrease the combustion energy





# State of charge comparison

• Positive correlation between cell energy and combustion energy but no correlation between SOC and combustion energy.





# **Heating Rate Comparison**

 Cells of similar energy at SOCs heated between 15 and 20 °C/min typically have greater combustion energy than cells heated between 5 and 10 °C/min.





# G27 test with large format cells

- 122 Wh lithium iron phosphate (LFP) at 33% SOC (40.2 Wh)
- 27 Wh nickel cobalt aluminum (NCA) at 33% SOC (8.9 Wh)
- 18650 sized cell for size reference only





### **G27 test chamber configuration**

- 0.3 m<sup>3</sup> free space volume
- Fan at corner facing vertically
- Spark ignitor halfway between the top of the package and chamber ceiling

Top view

Side view





# Test configuration 27 Wh cell

• 10" X 10" X 10" cardboard box

- One 735 W cartridge heater
- Thermocouples located at center of cell
- High density foam packaging
- Proportional-integral-derivative (PID) controller set at 20 °C/min





#### Visual results 27 Wh cell

#### **Top layer**



Middle layer



**Bottom layer** 





Federal Aviation Administration

#### Visual results 27 Wh cell cont.

**Charred interior** 





Federal Aviation Administration

#### Visual results 27 Wh cell











# Visual observation for exiting flame



- Four second difference and visual observation is gone.
- Smoke is quickly mixed with fan.



# Test configuration 122 Wh cell

- 10" X 10" X 10" cardboard box
- One 735 W cartridge heater
- Insulation between
  heater and wall
- Thermocouples located at center of cell
- Low density foam packaging
- PID set at 20 °C/min

Side view

**Interior view** 







# Visual results 122 Wh cell

- Cell reached 100 °C
- Foam melted
- Box caught on fire
- Test stopped before thermal runaway





# Test configuration 122 Wh cell mod

Side view

- 10" X 10" X 10" cardboard box
- One 735 W cartridge heater
- Heater fully insulated
- Thermocouples located at center of cell
- Low density foam packaging
- PID set at 20 °C/min

ANS ANA TCD ANA TCD ANA TCD TCD Interior view

![](_page_16_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_10.jpeg)

# Visual results 122 Wh cell

- Two flashovers occurred after one cell went into thermal runaway and vented
- Fan visually mixed gases quickly
- Visual observation quickly disappears

![](_page_17_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_5.jpeg)

#### Visual results 122 Wh cell

#### **Top layer**

![](_page_18_Picture_2.jpeg)

**Bottom layer** 

![](_page_18_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_5.jpeg)

#### Visual results 122 Wh cell cont.

**Charred exterior** 

![](_page_19_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_3.jpeg)

# Findings and suggestions

- Cell energy rather than SOC may be an indicator a cell's fire hazard
  - Positive correlation between cell energy and combustion energy but no correlation between SOC and combustion energy.
- The combustion energy from a single cell can critically damage an airplane
  - A single large cell (122 Wh LFP) that undergoes thermal runaway at 33%SOC can fail the G27 test with two flashovers and could possibly dislodge a cargo compartment pressure relief panel
- Packing material is important for risk mitigation
  - Some battery packing material have a low ignition temperature and will aid in propagation
  - Possible to suppress propagation of lithium cells with packing material (ie a wet sponge<sup>3</sup> or fire retardant foam)

![](_page_20_Picture_9.jpeg)

#### **Questions and answers**

- Matthew Karp
- Matthew.Karp@faa.gov

![](_page_21_Picture_3.jpeg)

# Findings

- Positive correlation between cell energy and combustion energy but no correlation between SOC and combustion energy.
- The volume of vent gas is a good indicator of the combustion energy.
- Cells of similar energy at SOCs heated between 15 and 20 °C/min typically have greater combustion energy than cells heated between 5 and 10 °C/min.
- The vent gases consist of 18.2±7.2%vol hydrogen.

![](_page_22_Figure_5.jpeg)

■ 30% SOC × 50% SOC ▲ 70% SOC ● 100% SOC × 33% SOC

![](_page_22_Picture_7.jpeg)

#### **Test configuration 27 Wh cell**

![](_page_23_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_3.jpeg)

### **Cell case temperature**

- Heating rate 20C/min
- Onset temperature 250C
- Max temperature initiating cell 472C
- Max temperature neighboring cell 132C

![](_page_24_Figure_5.jpeg)

Temperature of cells vs time

● TC1 ● TC1 ● TC1 ● TC2 ● TC3 ● TC4 ● TC5 ● TC6

![](_page_24_Picture_8.jpeg)

### Package surface temperature

- Max package temperature 190C
- Max package temperature rise after thermal runaway 59C

![](_page_25_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_4.jpeg)

# Findings from 27 Wh testing

- It requires a powerful heater to initiate thermal runaway of large format cells
- The walls get temperatures exceed 150C before thermal runaway initiated
- Visual observation for flames exiting package is impossible
- 200C is too low of a thermal runaway initiating threshold for some cells

![](_page_26_Picture_5.jpeg)

#### Test configuration 122 Wh cell

![](_page_27_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_5.jpeg)

### **Cell case temperature**

- Heating rate 20C/min
- Onset temperature 20C
- Max temperature initiating cell 266C
- Max temperature neighboring cell 198C
- Initiating cell is slow to cool
- The neighboring cell fell onto initiating cell after packing material melted
- Maybe came close to propagating

![](_page_28_Figure_8.jpeg)

Temperature of cells vs time

• TC1 • TC2 • TC3 • TC4 • TC5

![](_page_28_Picture_11.jpeg)

### Package surface temperature

- Max package temperature 263C
- Max package temperature rise after thermal runaway – 227C (over 150C for 9 seconds)

![](_page_29_Figure_3.jpeg)

● TC6 ● TC7 ● TC8 ● TC9 ● TC10 ● TC11 ● TC12 ● TC13 ● TC14

![](_page_29_Picture_5.jpeg)

# Findings from 122 Wh testing

- The tested low density foam material melts and ignites at a low temperature
- Low hanging fruit for improving shipping safety is to specify packing materials
- More insulation is needed

![](_page_30_Picture_4.jpeg)