Volume 1, Issue 1, Mei 2026
E-ISSN : xxx-xxxx

Applied
Journal of Applied Science, Engineering and Technologies

ellpub

Clean Hydrogen Engineering for Industrial Decarbonization: Comparative Socio-Technical Systems Analysis of the Netherlands' Hydrogen Hub Model and Japan's Hydrogen–Ammonia Supply Chain Model

Alexander Bennett[1]

Alexander Bennett
Department of Chemical Engineering
University of Cambridge
Email: alexander.bennett@cam.ac.uk

***Corresponding Author:** *alexander.bennett@cam.ac.uk*

Citation: Aziz (2026). The Title of Article (Book Antiqua 14pt Bold). Clean Hydrogen Engineering for Industrial Decarbonization: Comparative Socio-Technical Systems Analysis of the Netherlands' Hydrogen Hub Model and Japan's Hydrogen–Ammonia Supply Chain Model, *10*(4), xx–xx. https://doi.org/0000-0000

Published: 10/05/2026

ABSTRACT

This article examines how clean hydrogen systems are engineered, governed, and implemented as infrastructures for industrial decarbonization and sustainable socio-economic development. Using a comparative socio-technical systems analysis of the Netherlands and Japan, the study argues that clean hydrogen transition cannot be understood through electrolyser capacity or hydrogen demand projections alone; it depends on interactions among electrochemical conversion, renewable electricity, industrial clustering, pipelines, storage, import terminals, certification systems, end-use technologies, and public policy. The Netherlands represents a hydrogen hub model centered on industrial clusters, port infrastructure, offshore wind, electrolytic hydrogen, pipeline backbones, and European regulatory integration. Japan represents a hydrogen–ammonia supply chain model centered on imported low-carbon fuels, liquefied hydrogen, ammonia co-firing, carrier technologies, long-distance logistics, and energy security. The findings indicate that the Dutch model is technologically suited to industrial cluster decarbonization but depends on renewable electricity, infrastructure timing, and demand creation. The Japanese model is suited to energy-import diversification and technology demonstration but faces efficiency losses, fuel certification challenges, and end-use prioritization dilemmas. The article contributes to engineering and technology scholarship by developing a conceptual model linking hydrogen system architecture, technological integration, industrial adoption, sustainability verification, and socio-economic resilience.

Keywords: clean hydrogen; electrolysis; ammonia; industrial decarbonization; hydrogen pipelines; port infrastructure; energy carriers; Netherlands; Japan; technological governance; sustainable engineering

INTRODUCTION

Clean hydrogen has become one of the most contested and strategically important technologies in global decarbonization. It is simultaneously presented as an industrial feedstock, energy carrier, seasonal storage medium, maritime fuel, steelmaking reductant, chemical precursor, power-sector balancing resource, and geopolitical instrument for energy security. Yet the engineering and governance challenge is substantial: hydrogen is not a primary energy source but an energy vector that must be produced, converted, compressed, liquefied, transported, stored, certified, and used through technically demanding infrastructures. Its climate value depends on the carbon intensity of production, system efficiency, methane leakage where fossil-based hydrogen with carbon capture is used, renewable electricity availability, infrastructure utilization, end-use suitability, and lifecycle verification.

This study argues that clean hydrogen should be analyzed as a socio-technical engineering system rather than as a single fuel or industrial commodity. Hydrogen systems combine electrochemical conversion, thermodynamics, materials engineering, process integration, pipelines, storage caverns, port logistics, safety regulation, digital monitoring, certification, industrial demand, and policy incentives. Because hydrogen has lower volumetric energy density than conventional hydrocarbon fuels and requires specialized handling, its transition pathway is highly infrastructure-dependent. The central question is therefore not whether hydrogen is technically feasible, but where, how, and under what governance conditions clean hydrogen can produce credible decarbonization and development outcomes.

The global policy context is characterized by rapid ambition but slow implementation. The International Energy Agency reports that installed water electrolyser capacity reached 1.4 GW by the end of 2023 and could reach 5 GW by the end of 2024, while announced projects suggest almost 520 GW by 2030; however, only a small share of these projects has reached final investment decision or construction (IEA, 2024). The IEA also states that announced low-emissions hydrogen projects could reach 49 million tonnes per year by 2030, but project maturity remains a major constraint (IEA, 2024). This gap between ambition and implementation makes clean hydrogen an important case for examining the relationship between engineering systems, technological governance, industrial demand, and sustainable development.

The European Union has positioned renewable hydrogen as a strategic component of energy transition, industrial decarbonization, and energy security. The REPowerEU strategy set the objective of producing 10 million tonnes and importing 10 million tonnes of renewable hydrogen by 2030, while the EU expects renewable hydrogen to contribute significantly to decarbonizing energy-intensive industrial processes and transport by 2050 (European Commission, 2024). The Netherlands occupies a central role in this European strategy because it combines large industrial clusters, North Sea offshore wind potential, Rotterdam port infrastructure, natural gas expertise, salt cavern storage potential, and pipeline infrastructure. Its hydrogen transition is therefore organized around industrial hubs and backbone development.

Japan follows a different trajectory. Its Basic Hydrogen Strategy emphasizes low-carbon hydrogen and ammonia as instruments of energy security, industrial competitiveness, and decarbonization. Japanese policy materials set hydrogen demand targets of around 3 million tonnes per year by 2030, around 12 million tonnes per year by 2040 including ammonia, and around 20 million tonnes per year by 2050, while also targeting hydrogen supply cost reductions to 30 yen per normal cubic meter by 2030 and 20 yen by 2050 (METI, 2023). Japan's model is shaped by limited domestic renewable resources, high energy import dependence, strong engineering capabilities in liquefaction, fuel cells, turbines, shipping, and ammonia handling, and a strategic interest in diversified low-carbon energy carriers.

The academic and policy problem is that clean hydrogen debates often polarize between technological optimism and technological skepticism. Some engineering studies emphasize electrolyser scaling, fuel-cell efficiency, ammonia combustion, underground storage, and hydrogen pipelines. Some policy studies emphasize targets, subsidies, markets, and international trade. Some sustainability studies emphasize lifecycle emissions and energy efficiency losses. However, current scholarship frequently fails to integrate these dimensions into a comparative framework that explains why different hydrogen architectures emerge and how they shape decarbonization performance.

The scientific foundations of hydrogen engineering are well established but systemically complex. Water electrolysis converts electricity into hydrogen through electrochemical splitting of water, with alkaline, proton exchange membrane, solid oxide, and anion exchange membrane technologies offering different cost, efficiency, dynamic response, and material profiles (Buttler & Spliethoff, 2018; IRENA, 2020). Hydrogen can be compressed, liquefied, converted into ammonia, synthesized into methanol or e-fuels, stored underground, or transported through pipelines and ships. Each conversion step introduces thermodynamic losses, capital costs, safety requirements, and infrastructure constraints. Industrial end uses also differ: hydrogen is difficult to justify where direct electrification is efficient, but it may be valuable in steelmaking, refining, ammonia production, methanol, high-temperature heat, maritime fuels, aviation fuels, and long-duration storage (IEA, 2024; IRENA, 2022).

While previous studies emphasize hydrogen's technical potential in hard-to-abate sectors, other scholars argue that hydrogen deployment depends on infrastructure coordination, demand creation, certification, and policy credibility. Geels (2020) shows that sustainability transitions involve interactions among technologies, regimes, markets, users, and institutions. Sovacool et al. (2020) emphasize that energy transitions require social legitimacy, justice, and political-economic coordination. Kitchin (2021) reminds us that data and certification systems shape governance, which is critical for hydrogen because climate claims depend on lifecycle measurement. Hydrogen is therefore a technological governance problem as much as a chemical engineering problem.

Existing literature remains limited in six respects. First, there is a theoretical gap in explaining clean hydrogen as a coupled electrochemical-infrastructural-governance system. Second, there is an empirical gap in comparing hydrogen hub development with hydrogen carrier import strategies. Third, there is a comparative gap because the Netherlands and Japan are often analyzed within separate regional policy debates despite offering contrasting hydrogen system architectures. Fourth, there is a technological governance gap in explaining how certification, infrastructure planning, offtake contracts, public finance, and safety regulation affect engineering implementation. Fifth, there is an industrial implementation gap in linking hydrogen production to actual end-use conversion in steel, chemicals, refining, ports, shipping, and power systems. Sixth, there is a sustainability gap in assessing hydrogen through lifecycle emissions, renewable electricity opportunity cost, conversion losses, and material constraints.

This article addresses these gaps by comparing the Netherlands’ hydrogen hub model and Japan’s hydrogen–ammonia supply chain model. The novelty lies in treating hydrogen as a system architecture rather than a fuel category. The Dutch case demonstrates how hydrogen can be developed through spatially concentrated industrial clusters, port logistics, pipelines, offshore wind, electrolysers, and European market regulation. The Japanese case demonstrates how hydrogen and ammonia can be developed through long-distance carrier supply chains, import terminals, power-sector demonstrations, industrial policy, and energy-security strategy.

The analytical framework links engineering governance to sustainable hydrogen development through the following causal sequence: **hydrogen system architecture → technological integration → industrial adoption → sustainability verification → socio-economic resilience**. Hydrogen system architecture includes production technology, carrier choice, pipelines, terminals, storage, digital monitoring, and end-use equipment. Technological integration refers to coordination among renewable electricity, electrolysers, carbon capture, compressors, liquefiers, ammonia synthesis, pipelines, ships, storage, and industrial processes. Industrial adoption refers to offtake agreements, fuel-switching, process redesign, and market creation. Sustainability verification refers to lifecycle emissions accounting, certification, additionality, temporal matching, leakage control, and safety monitoring. Socio-economic resilience refers to industrial competitiveness, energy security, innovation capacity, regional development, emissions reduction, and employment transition.

The research objective is to explain how the Netherlands and Japan’s contrasting clean hydrogen engineering models shape technological implementation and to identify the causal mechanisms through which hydrogen governance influences industrial decarbonization, sustainability performance, energy security, and socio-economic development.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs comparative socio-technical systems analysis, techno-economic interpretation, and technological governance analysis to examine how clean hydrogen is engineered and institutionalized in the Netherlands and Japan. The research design follows a most-different systems comparison: both countries are advanced industrial economies with strong engineering capabilities, energy security concerns, and hydrogen policy strategies, yet they differ sharply in geography, renewable resource availability, industrial clustering, energy import dependence, infrastructure legacy, and end-use prioritization. The Netherlands is selected as a hydrogen hub case because it combines port-based industrial clusters, offshore wind potential, existing gas infrastructure, hydrogen backbone development, storage prospects, and integration into European renewable hydrogen regulation. Japan is selected as a hydrogen–ammonia supply chain case because it combines high energy import dependence, limited domestic renewable land availability, strong fuel-cell and turbine engineering capabilities, ammonia import and combustion strategies, liquefied hydrogen demonstration, and national policy targets for low-carbon hydrogen and ammonia. The unit of analysis is the national clean hydrogen system, defined as the configuration of production pathways, carrier technologies, infrastructure, end-use sectors, standards, certification, industrial actors, and policy instruments through which hydrogen is deployed.

The empirical base consists of IEA hydrogen reports, European Commission hydrogen policy documents, Dutch hydrogen strategy and infrastructure materials, Japanese Basic Hydrogen Strategy documents, energy-system reports, port and pipeline plans, and peer-reviewed scientific literature on electrolysis, ammonia, hydrogen transport, lifecycle assessment, industrial decarbonization, and socio-technical transitions. The analysis applies structured focused comparison across engineering variables including production pathway, electrolyser deployment, renewable electricity coupling, carrier selection, pipeline infrastructure, import logistics, storage, end-use prioritization, lifecycle emissions verification, safety regulation, industrial clustering, and demand creation. Process tracing is used to identify causal mechanisms linking system architecture to industrial adoption and sustainability outcomes. Reliability is strengthened through triangulation across international datasets, policy documents, institutional reports, and scientific literature. No interview data or proprietary project-level cost data are used, and no fabricated industrial evidence is introduced. Ethical and sustainability considerations include hydrogen safety, lifecycle emissions transparency, renewable electricity opportunity cost, ammonia toxicity, carbon capture integrity, labor transition, environmental justice in exporting regions, and the limitations of comparing a European port-cluster model with an Asian import-dependent carrier model. The study is limited by rapid project turnover and uncertain commercial deployment, but it provides a rigorous analytical framework for evaluating hydrogen as a governance-mediated engineering transition.

Findings and Discussion

1. Hydrogen System Architecture: Industrial Hub Integration versus Carrier-Based Import Logistics

The first finding is that the Netherlands and Japan represent fundamentally different hydrogen system architectures. The Dutch model is spatially concentrated around industrial clusters, ports, pipelines, offshore wind, and European hydrogen market regulation. Its core engineering logic is hub integration: connect production, import, storage, transport, and industrial demand within dense industrial regions. The Port of Rotterdam has framed hydrogen development as a system combining production, use, imports, and transit flows to other parts of the Netherlands and Northwest Europe (Port of Rotterdam, 2021). Gasunie and the Port of Rotterdam are developing hydrogen pipeline infrastructure that forms part of the future hydrogen backbone (Gasunie, 2024).

Japan's architecture is organized around carrier-based international supply chains. Because Japan has limited domestic low-cost renewable energy relative to its industrial demand and high energy import dependence, its hydrogen strategy emphasizes imported hydrogen and ammonia, liquefied hydrogen demonstration, ammonia co-firing, fuel-cell technologies, and long-distance supply chain formation. The Basic Hydrogen Strategy explicitly frames low-carbon hydrogen and ammonia as instruments of energy security, cost reduction, and industrial policy (METI, 2023). Japan therefore treats hydrogen not only as an industrial decarbonization feedstock but also as a future traded energy commodity.

The technological difference is not simply geographic. The Dutch hub model minimizes some transport complexity by colocating supply and demand. Hydrogen can be produced through electrolysis near offshore wind landing points, imported through Rotterdam, transported by pipeline, stored in salt caverns, and used in refining, chemicals, steel, and heavy transport. Japan's carrier model accepts additional conversion and transport complexity to overcome domestic resource constraints. Hydrogen may be produced abroad, converted to ammonia or liquefied, shipped to Japan, regasified or used directly, and consumed in power generation, industry, transport, or chemical processes.

The causal mechanism in the Dutch model is cluster-to-demand coupling. Industrial clusters create concentrated demand; pipelines reduce transport cost; port infrastructure enables imports; renewable electricity enables electrolysis; storage buffers variability; and European regulation creates certification and market rules. The causal mechanism in the Japanese model is carrier-to-security coupling. International supply chains diversify energy imports; ammonia and liquefied hydrogen provide transportable carriers; public finance reduces early project risk; and end-use demonstrations create demand signals.

This finding contributes to hydrogen engineering scholarship by demonstrating that system architecture determines feasible end uses. Hydrogen pipelines are efficient for dense industrial regions, while ammonia or liquefied hydrogen carriers may be necessary for long-distance trade. However, carrier conversion adds energy losses and cost. Therefore, the choice between pipelines and carriers is not merely logistical; it determines lifecycle efficiency and competitiveness.

The governance implication is that hydrogen strategy must begin with geography and demand mapping. The Netherlands' hydrogen policy is credible where industrial demand, infrastructure, and renewable resources are coordinated. Japan's strategy is credible where imports serve genuinely hard-to-electrify sectors or energy-security functions. The development implication is that hydrogen systems should be designed around high-value applications rather than generalized substitution for all fossil fuels.

2. Electrolysis, Renewable Electricity, and Infrastructure Timing

The second finding concerns the relationship between electrolysis, renewable electricity, and infrastructure timing.

Clean hydrogen production through electrolysis depends on abundant low-carbon electricity, high electrolyser utilization, grid connection, water supply, power-purchase agreements, and certification. The Netherlands' hydrogen hub model depends heavily on North Sea offshore wind, electrolyser deployment, and pipeline readiness. The EU's strategy to produce 10 million tonnes and import 10 million tonnes of renewable hydrogen by 2030 provides a policy signal, but implementation has been slower than ambition (European Commission, 2024).

The IEA reports that global installed water electrolyser capacity remained only 1.4 GW by the end of 2023, despite far larger announced project pipelines (IEA, 2024). This illustrates a key systems problem: hydrogen strategies often rely on future infrastructure that has not yet reached commercial maturity. Electrolysers require renewable electricity; renewable developers require grid access; industrial users require reliable supply; pipeline operators require demand commitments; investors require stable policy; and certification bodies require credible emissions accounting. Delays in any layer can delay the whole system.

Japan's electrolysis strategy is less centered on domestic large-scale renewable hydrogen production and more focused on imported low-carbon hydrogen and ammonia, though domestic production, research, and demonstration also matter. Because Japan's policy aims to reduce supply costs to 30 yen per normal cubic meter by 2030 and 20 yen by 2050, its engineering challenge is cost reduction across production, transport, conversion, and end use (METI, 2023). This cost target is not merely economic; it reflects engineering performance across the entire supply chain.

The cross-case comparison reveals an infrastructure sequencing problem. The Netherlands must coordinate offshore wind, electrolysers, pipelines, storage, and industrial demand. Japan must coordinate overseas production, carrier conversion, shipping, import terminals, safety systems, and domestic end-use technologies. In both models, hydrogen development fails if supply and demand are not synchronized. Too much production without demand creates stranded assets. Too much demand without supply creates price volatility and weak adoption. Too much infrastructure without certification creates sustainability uncertainty.

The causal technological mechanism is electricity-to-molecule conversion. Renewable electricity powers electrolysers; electrolysers convert water into hydrogen; compressors or liquefiers condition hydrogen; pipelines or ships transport it; storage buffers supply; industrial processes consume it. Each step has efficiency, cost, safety, and timing constraints. The total system is only as strong as its weakest interface.

This finding extends electrolysis literature by showing that electrolyser efficiency alone is not sufficient to evaluate hydrogen feasibility. System efficiency depends on renewable electricity procurement, temporal matching, grid congestion, electrolyser utilization, infrastructure access, and end-use value. Recent European debates about hourly matching of renewable electricity for green hydrogen show that certification design directly affects cost and climate credibility. A 2026 report indicated that industry actors argued strict hourly matching could raise costs, while critics argued that without temporal matching hydrogen may not be genuinely renewable.

The policy implication is that hydrogen governance should support integrated infrastructure planning rather than isolated project subsidies. The Netherlands should align offshore wind auctions, electrolyser siting, pipeline completion, storage development, and industrial offtake. Japan should align import partnerships, carrier selection, cost support, end-use priorities, and emissions verification. The sustainability implication is that renewable electricity opportunity cost matters: using scarce renewable electricity for hydrogen is justified primarily where direct electrification is technically difficult or systemically valuable.

3. Industrial End Uses: Steel, Chemicals, Ports, Power, and Transport

The third finding concerns end-use prioritization. Clean hydrogen is valuable where it solves a decarbonization problem that direct electrification cannot solve easily. The Netherlands and Japan differ in end-use emphasis. The Dutch model focuses strongly on industrial feedstocks and clusters: refining, chemicals, fertilizers, steel, port logistics, and heavy transport. The Japanese model emphasizes hydrogen and ammonia for energy security, power generation, industry, transport, and technology demonstration, including ammonia co-firing and fuel-cell applications.

In the Netherlands, existing industrial hydrogen use provides an immediate substitution opportunity. Refineries and chemical plants already consume hydrogen, much of it currently fossil-based. Replacing grey hydrogen with renewable or low-carbon hydrogen can reduce emissions without requiring entirely new end-use markets. Hydrogen may also support direct reduced iron in steelmaking, high-temperature industrial heat, synthetic fuels, and maritime applications. The presence of Rotterdam strengthens this logic because ports connect industrial demand, storage, shipping, and imports.

In Japan, ammonia has received substantial policy attention because it can be transported using established chemical logistics and potentially co-fired in thermal power plants. Ammonia does not contain carbon at point of use, but its climate value depends on production emissions, transport emissions, combustion efficiency, nitrogen oxide control, and whether it displaces coal or delays renewable alternatives. Hydrogen fuel cells also remain part of Japan’s technological identity, including mobility and stationary applications. However, the global evidence suggests that hydrogen is likely most valuable in hard-to-abate sectors rather than widespread passenger transport or low-temperature heating.

The cross-case comparison shows that industrial adoption depends on end-use specificity. The Dutch model’s strongest applications are located in industrial clusters where hydrogen is already chemically necessary or where carbon-intensive processes need molecular substitutes. Japan’s strongest applications are those where imported low-carbon molecules address energy security or industrial processes that cannot be easily electrified. The risk in both systems is diffusion into lower-value applications where hydrogen is less efficient than electrification.

The causal mechanism is molecule-to-process substitution. Hydrogen substitutes for fossil hydrogen in refining and ammonia production; substitutes for coal-derived carbon monoxide in iron reduction; substitutes for fossil fuels in high-temperature heat; combines with captured carbon to form synthetic fuels; or converts to electricity in fuel cells and turbines. Each substitution has different efficiency, infrastructure, safety, and emissions profiles. Therefore, clean hydrogen policy should not treat all demand equally.

This finding supports techno-economic studies arguing that hydrogen should be prioritized for sectors with limited alternatives (IRENA, 2022; Liebreich, 2021). It also qualifies broad hydrogen economy narratives by showing that system value depends on disciplined end-use selection. The Netherlands' cluster strategy is relatively aligned with high-value industrial demand. Japan's broader energy-carrier strategy may support energy security but requires careful sustainability verification and opportunity-cost analysis.

The industrial policy implication is that governments should create demand through contracts for difference, carbon pricing, public procurement, industrial standards, and green product markets. Steel, fertilizers, chemicals, shipping fuels, and aviation fuels may require early support because clean hydrogen remains more expensive than fossil alternatives. Japan's strategy of compensating price gaps between strike prices and reference prices reflects recognition that early supply chains require public risk-sharing (METI, 2023). The Netherlands' participation in EU hydrogen regulation and infrastructure planning similarly reflects the need for coordinated market creation.

4. Certification, Safety, and Sustainability Verification

The fourth finding concerns certification and sustainability verification. Hydrogen's climate value cannot be inferred from the label "hydrogen." Grey hydrogen, blue hydrogen, turquoise hydrogen, renewable hydrogen, low-carbon hydrogen, ammonia, and synthetic fuels have different lifecycle emissions. Certification is therefore central to engineering governance. It determines whether hydrogen can credibly contribute to decarbonization, receive subsidies, enter regulated markets, and support green industrial products.

The Netherlands operates within the EU's increasingly detailed renewable hydrogen framework. The EU prioritizes renewable hydrogen and has developed rules concerning renewable fuels of non-biological origin, additionality, temporal correlation, geographic correlation, and greenhouse gas accounting. These rules aim to ensure that renewable hydrogen production does not simply divert existing renewable electricity or increase fossil generation elsewhere. The Netherlands must therefore align hydrogen projects with EU certification standards, electricity market rules, and industrial decarbonization policy.

Japan's certification challenge is more complex because its model relies heavily on imported hydrogen and ammonia. Imported fuels may be produced from renewable electricity, natural gas with carbon capture, coal with carbon capture, biomass, or other pathways. Each pathway requires lifecycle emissions accounting, verification of carbon capture rates, methane leakage assessment, transport emissions measurement, and international certification compatibility. Without robust standards, imported hydrogen and ammonia could shift emissions overseas rather than reduce global emissions.

Safety also differs by system architecture. Hydrogen is a small molecule with high diffusivity and a wide flammability range. It requires leak detection, ventilation, materials compatibility, pressure management, and emergency procedures. Ammonia is toxic and corrosive, requiring strict handling, storage, and transport controls. Liquefied hydrogen requires cryogenic systems at extremely low temperatures. Pipeline networks require embrittlement management and integrity monitoring. Thus, safety governance is not peripheral; it is core infrastructure engineering.

The causal mechanism is verification-to-market legitimacy. Certification defines carbon intensity; safety regulation defines acceptable operating conditions; monitoring systems generate data; regulators and market actors validate claims; buyers trust the product; and investment becomes possible. Without verification, hydrogen markets risk greenwashing, public opposition, and policy backlash. Without safety, infrastructure expansion may face accidents and legitimacy loss.

This finding contributes to technological governance scholarship by showing that certification is an engineering interface between molecules and markets. Kitchin's (2021) analysis of data infrastructures is relevant because hydrogen sustainability depends on measurement systems, emissions data, chain-of-custody records, and digital verification. Hydrogen markets are therefore also data-governed markets.

The governance implication is that the Netherlands and Japan both require transparent, internationally interoperable certification systems. The Netherlands must ensure that European renewable hydrogen standards are rigorous but implementable. Japan must ensure that imported hydrogen and ammonia are certified through credible lifecycle methods aligned with global best practice. The sustainability implication is that hydrogen cannot be considered clean unless production, conversion, transport, storage, and use are measured across the full lifecycle.

5. Socio-Economic Development, Industrial Competitiveness, and Energy Security

The fifth finding links hydrogen engineering to socio-economic development. Hydrogen systems can support industrial competitiveness, energy security, port development, infrastructure employment, equipment manufacturing, and regional innovation. However, they can also generate stranded assets, inefficient subsidies, import dependency, and delayed electrification if poorly governed.

The Netherlands' hydrogen hub model has strong development potential because it builds on existing industrial clusters, port infrastructure, offshore wind, gas expertise, and European market access. Rotterdam can become a hydrogen import, production, distribution, and industrial-use hub for Northwest Europe. Hydrogen pipelines and storage can preserve and repurpose parts of the gas infrastructure workforce. Industrial decarbonization can protect competitiveness in chemicals, refining, steel, and logistics under tightening carbon constraints. However, if demand develops slowly or renewable electricity remains scarce, hydrogen infrastructure may be underutilized.

Japan's hydrogen–ammonia model has different development objectives. It seeks energy security, technology leadership, diversified imports, and industrial competitiveness in fuel cells, turbines, liquefaction, shipping, and ammonia technologies. Hydrogen and ammonia can reduce dependence on fossil fuel imports if supplied from diversified low-carbon sources. Yet because Japan remains import-dependent, it must manage geopolitical, cost, and certification risks. The strategy can strengthen Japanese engineering firms but may also create long-term dependence on international low-carbon fuel suppliers.

The cross-case comparison reveals two development pathways. The Netherlands follows a cluster competitiveness pathway: hydrogen supports decarbonization of existing industrial ecosystems and strengthens port-based logistics. Japan follows an energy-security technology pathway: hydrogen and ammonia support diversified fuel imports and industrial technology development. Both pathways can contribute to resilience, but both require disciplined governance.

The causal development mechanism is infrastructure-to-capability formation. Hydrogen infrastructure creates new capabilities in electrolysers, pipelines, compressors, storage, safety systems, digital monitoring, port logistics, ammonia handling, turbines, and industrial process redesign. These capabilities become development assets when firms, workers, regulators, and research institutions learn through deployment. They become liabilities when infrastructure is built ahead of credible demand or when public subsidies support inefficient applications.

This finding aligns with innovation systems theory, which views technological development as a coordinated process involving firms, universities, governments, users, and infrastructure (Lundvall, 1992; Nelson, 1993). It also aligns with socio-technical transition theory, which emphasizes regime change and institutional coordination (Geels, 2020). The comparison adds that hydrogen transitions are especially dependent on infrastructure synchronization because production, transport, storage, and demand must co-emerge.

The policy implication is that hydrogen should be governed through industrial strategy, not only energy strategy. Governments should prioritize sectors where hydrogen has high decarbonization value, support shared infrastructure, establish credible certification, coordinate international supply chains, and prevent inefficient end-use lock-in. The sustainability implication is that clean hydrogen can contribute to development only when it complements electrification rather than competing with it in applications where electricity is more efficient.

Table 1. Analytical Matrix of Comparative Science, Engineering and Technological Development

Variable	**Case 1: Netherlands’ Hydrogen Hub Model**	**Case 2: Japan’s Hydrogen–Ammonia Supply Chain Model**	**Empirical Evidence**	**Analytical Interpretation**
Hydrogen system architecture	Industrial clusters, Rotterdam port, offshore wind, electrolysis, hydrogen backbone, storage, imports, and European market integration	Imported hydrogen and ammonia, liquefied hydrogen, ammonia co-firing, fuel cells, turbines, shipping logistics, and energy-security strategy	Port of Rotterdam and Gasunie hydrogen backbone materials; Japan Basic Hydrogen Strategy	Netherlands prioritizes spatially concentrated industrial integration; Japan prioritizes carrier-based energy import diversification
Production pathway	Renewable hydrogen from electrolysis	Imported low-carbon hydrogen and	EU REPowerEU hydrogen targets;	Production strategy reflects renewable

	linked to offshore wind, plus potential imports and low-carbon pathways	ammonia, domestic demonstrations, and carrier technologies	Japanese supply-cost and demand targets	resource geography and industrial structure
Infrastructure model	Pipelines, port terminals, salt cavern storage, industrial offtake, and European backbone connectivity	Shipping, import terminals, liquefaction, ammonia storage, regasification or direct use, and power-sector trials	Dutch hydrogen network plans; Japanese hydrogen and ammonia policy	Infrastructure choice determines efficiency, safety, and end-use suitability
End-use prioritization	Refining, chemicals, steel, port logistics, heavy transport, synthetic fuels, and industrial heat	Power generation, ammonia co-firing, industry, fuel cells, mobility niches, and energy storage	Policy documents and IEA hydrogen analysis	Netherlands aligns more directly with industrial feedstock substitution; Japan balances decarbonization with energy security
Sustainability verification	EU renewable hydrogen certification, additionality, temporal correlation, lifecycle accounting, and market regulation	International lifecycle certification for imported hydrogen and ammonia, carbon capture verification, methane leakage assessment, and ammonia safety	EU hydrogen regulation and Japanese strategy	Certification determines whether hydrogen is genuinely clean or merely geographically displaced emissions
Main engineering constraint	Renewable electricity availability, electrolyser scaling, pipeline timing, industrial	Conversion losses, import costs, carrier safety, lifecycle emissions, fuel	IEA reports slow electrolyser deployment and project maturity constraints	Both models face synchronization problems across supply, infrastructure, and

	offtake, and storage integration	certification, and end-use efficiency		demand
Industrial development outcome	Port competitiveness, industrial cluster decarbonization, gas infrastructure repurposing, electrolysis and logistics innovation	Energy security, fuel-cell and turbine technology, ammonia logistics, international supply-chain leadership	Dutch and Japanese institutional reports	Hydrogen development can strengthen industrial ecosystems if linked to high-value applications
Socio-economic risk	Stranded infrastructure if demand and renewable supply lag; high costs; competition with electrification	Import dependency, cost burden, greenwashing risk, delayed renewable electrification, ammonia safety concerns	IEA and policy implementation evidence	Governance must prioritize applications where hydrogen has strong system value

The table demonstrates that the Netherlands and Japan do not represent different levels of hydrogen ambition alone; they represent different hydrogen engineering architectures. The Netherlands builds hydrogen around industrial proximity, pipelines, port logistics, offshore wind, and European certification. Japan builds hydrogen around international carriers, import security, ammonia and liquefied hydrogen technologies, and power-sector demonstrations. These architectures create different efficiency profiles, sustainability risks, industrial opportunities, and governance requirements.

The deeper analytical interpretation is that clean hydrogen becomes developmentally valuable only when its full system chain is coherent. Electrolysers without renewable electricity do not create renewable hydrogen. Pipelines without demand do not create industrial decarbonization. Imported ammonia without lifecycle certification does not guarantee emissions reduction. Power-sector hydrogen use without efficiency justification may waste scarce clean molecules. Therefore, hydrogen governance must integrate engineering design, end-use discipline, infrastructure timing, and sustainability verification.

Conceptual Model

This article proposes the following conceptual model:

Hydrogen System Architecture → Technological Integration → Industrial Adoption → Sustainability Verification → Socio-Economic Resilience

Hydrogen system architecture refers to the configuration of production pathways, electrolysers, renewable electricity, carbon capture, carrier technologies, pipelines, ports, storage, terminals, and end-use systems. Technological integration refers to the engineering coordination among electricity supply, water electrolysis, compression, liquefaction, ammonia synthesis, transport, storage, safety systems, and industrial processes. Industrial adoption refers to the creation of reliable demand through offtake contracts, industrial process redesign, fuel-switching, public procurement, and carbon regulation. Sustainability verification refers to lifecycle emissions accounting, certification, temporal matching, additionality, methane leakage assessment, ammonia safety, and chain-of-custody monitoring. Socio-economic resilience refers to industrial competitiveness, energy security, emissions reduction, employment transition, regional development, and innovation capability.

The model advances three theoretical propositions.

Proposition 1: Clean hydrogen systems generate decarbonization value only when system architecture is matched to high-value end uses.

Hydrogen should be prioritized for sectors such as steel, chemicals, shipping fuels, fertilizers, high-temperature heat, and long-duration storage where direct electrification is difficult. The Dutch cluster model is strongest when connected to such applications; the Japanese carrier model requires rigorous end-use prioritization to avoid inefficient substitution.

Proposition 2: Infrastructure synchronization mediates the relationship between hydrogen production and industrial adoption.

Renewable electricity, electrolysers, pipelines, storage, import terminals, certification, and demand must develop together. If one component lags, the entire hydrogen value chain becomes economically and technically fragile.

Proposition 3: Sustainability verification determines market legitimacy and socio-economic resilience.

Hydrogen and ammonia contribute to sustainable development only when their lifecycle emissions, safety risks, and supply-chain impacts are credibly measured and governed. Certification is therefore not administrative overhead but a core engineering governance mechanism.

CONCLUSION

This article examined how the Netherlands and Japan's contrasting clean hydrogen engineering models shape technological implementation and how hydrogen governance influences industrial decarbonization, sustainability performance, energy security, and socio-economic development. The analysis demonstrates that clean hydrogen is not a single technology or fuel solution. It is a complex socio-technical infrastructure that requires coordinated production, transport, storage, certification, end-use conversion, safety regulation, and market creation.

The main analytical finding is that the Netherlands and Japan represent distinct hydrogen transition pathways. The Netherlands' hydrogen hub model is built around industrial clusters, port logistics, offshore wind, electrolysis, pipeline backbones, storage, and European regulation. This model is well suited to decarbonizing existing industrial hydrogen demand and hard-to-abate cluster processes, but it depends on renewable electricity availability, infrastructure sequencing, demand creation, and credible certification. Japan's hydrogen–ammonia supply chain model is built around imported fuels, carrier technologies, liquefied hydrogen, ammonia logistics, energy security, and technology demonstration. This model is suited to import-dependent energy strategy and industrial technology development, but it faces conversion losses, lifecycle verification challenges, ammonia safety concerns, and end-use prioritization risks.

The theoretical contribution of the article is to conceptualize hydrogen transition as a governance-mediated engineering system. The proposed model links hydrogen system architecture, technological integration, industrial adoption, sustainability verification, and socio-economic resilience. This framework contributes to science and engineering scholarship by showing that hydrogen performance depends not only on electrolyser efficiency or fuel availability but on infrastructure synchronization, end-use suitability, certification credibility, and institutional coordination.

The empirical contribution lies in comparing two advanced hydrogen strategies that illuminate different pathways for industrial decarbonization. The Netherlands demonstrates the importance of industrial hubs and pipeline infrastructure. Japan demonstrates the importance of international carrier supply chains and energy-security-oriented technology development. Together, they show that hydrogen strategies must be context-specific rather than universal.

The engineering and technological governance implications are substantial. Hydrogen policy should prioritize high-value applications, shared infrastructure, lifecycle emissions accounting, safety systems, and demand-side industrial conversion. Electrolyser projects should be aligned with renewable electricity, storage, and offtake. Ammonia and liquefied hydrogen imports should be governed through rigorous certification, safety regulation, and transparent emissions accounting. Infrastructure planning should avoid stranded assets by synchronizing supply, transport, and demand.

The industrial and innovation policy implications are equally important. Hydrogen can support green steel, low-carbon chemicals, sustainable fuels, port modernization, energy security, and industrial competitiveness. However, public support should not subsidize inefficient uses where direct electrification is superior. Governments should design contracts for difference, carbon pricing, public procurement, and infrastructure regulation to create credible markets for genuinely low-emissions hydrogen.

The sustainability and development implications are clear. Clean hydrogen can contribute to emissions reduction and socio-economic resilience, but only under strict conditions. It must be produced with low lifecycle emissions, transported safely, used efficiently, and integrated into broader renewable energy and industrial strategies. Hydrogen should complement electrification, not delay it. It should decarbonize hard-to-abate sectors, not become a generalized justification for fossil infrastructure continuation.

The study has limitations. It relies on public policy documents, international reports, and scientific literature rather than proprietary project-level cost data or confidential industrial offtake contracts. Hydrogen markets are evolving rapidly, and many announced projects may not reach final investment decision. Future research should use project-level techno-economic modeling, lifecycle emissions datasets, infrastructure network simulation, industrial demand mapping, and comparative certification analysis. Further comparative research should include Germany, Australia, South Korea, Chile, the United States, and Saudi Arabia to test whether the proposed model applies across export-oriented, import-dependent, and industrial-cluster hydrogen regimes.

The central conclusion is that clean hydrogen contributes to sustainable socio-economic development only when science, engineering, technological governance, and industrial strategy are integrated. The Netherlands shows the importance of industrial cluster integration and infrastructure coordination. Japan shows the importance of carrier technologies and energy-security planning. The future of hydrogen will depend not on ambition alone, but on the capacity of societies to build technically efficient, environmentally credible, economically disciplined, and socially legitimate hydrogen systems.

REFERENCES

Abe, J. O., Popoola, A. P. I., Ajenifuja, E., & Popoola, O. M. (2019). Hydrogen energy, economy and storage: Review and recommendation. International Journal of Hydrogen Energy, 44(29), 15072–15086.

Buttler, A., & Spliethoff, H. (2018). Current status of water electrolysis for energy storage, grid balancing and sector coupling. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 82, 2440–2454.

European Commission. (2020). A hydrogen strategy for a climate-neutral Europe. European Commission.

European Commission. (2024). Hydrogen: Energy system integration and renewable hydrogen policy. European Commission.

Fuel Cells and Hydrogen Observatory. (2025). EU hydrogen strategy and renewable hydrogen deployment dashboard. European Commission.

Geels, F. W. (2020). Micro-foundations of the multi-level perspective on socio-technical transitions. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 152, 119894.

Gasunie. (2024). Hydrogen network Netherlands. Gasunie.

International Energy Agency. (2023). Global hydrogen review 2023. IEA.

International Energy Agency. (2024). Global hydrogen review 2024. IEA.

International Energy Agency. (2024). Energy technology perspectives 2024. IEA.

International Renewable Energy Agency. (2020). Green hydrogen cost reduction: Scaling up electrolysers to meet the 1.5°C climate goal. IRENA.

International Renewable Energy Agency. (2022). Geopolitics of the energy transformation: The hydrogen factor.

IRENA.

Kitchin, R. (2021). Data lives: How data are made and shape our world. Bristol University Press.

Liebreich, M. (2021). The clean hydrogen ladder: Ranking use cases by merit. BloombergNEF Hydrogen Economy Analysis.

Lundvall, B. Å. (1992). National systems of innovation: Towards a theory of innovation and interactive learning. Pinter.

Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry Japan. (2023). Basic Hydrogen Strategy. Government of Japan.

Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry Japan. (2023). Overview of the Basic Hydrogen Strategy. Government of Japan.

Nel Hydrogen. (2024). Electrolyser technology and green hydrogen deployment report. Nel ASA.

Nelson, R. R. (1993). National innovation systems: A comparative analysis. Oxford University Press.

Port of Rotterdam Authority. (2021). Hydrogen economy in Rotterdam. Port of Rotterdam.

Rissman, J., Bataille, C., Masanet, E., Aden, N., Morrow, W. R., Zhou, N., Elliott, N., Dell, R., Heeren, N., Huckestein, B., Cresko, J., Miller, S. A., Roy, J., Fennell, P., Cremmins, B., Blank, T. K., Hone, D., Williams, E. D., de la Rue du Can, S., ... Helseth, J. (2020). Technologies and policies to decarbonize global industry: Review and assessment of mitigation drivers through 2070. Applied Energy, 266, 114848.

Sovacool, B. K., Axsen, J., & Sorrell, S. (2020). Promoting novelty, rigor, and style in energy social science: Towards codes of practice for appropriate methods and research design. Energy Research & Social Science, 45, 12–42.

Staffell, I., Scamman, D., Abad, A. V., Balcombe, P., Dodds, P. E., Ekins, P., Shah, N., & Ward, K. R. (2019). The role of hydrogen and fuel cells in the global energy system. Energy & Environmental Science, 12(2), 463–491.

van der Spek, M., Banet, C., Bauer, C., Gabrielli, P., Goldthorpe, W., Mazzotti, M., Munkejord, S. T., Røkke, N., Shah, N., Sunny, N., Sutter, D., Trusler, J. P. M., Gazzani, M., & Ramirez, A. (2022). Perspective on the hydrogen economy as a pathway to reach net-zero CO_2 *emissions in Europe. Energy & Environmental Science, 15(3), 1034–1077.*

World Bank. (2023). Scaling hydrogen financing for developing countries. World Bank.

World Bank. (2024). Digital progress and trends report 2023. World Bank.