

VOLTACERA White Paper Series

## **Chapter 1**

# **The SOFC-BTM Market Inflection:**

# **Why Behind-the-Meter (BTM) Power Is Reshaping the Energy Landscape**

Voltacera Research | April 2026



# VoltaCera

## Executive Summary

The explosive expansion of artificial intelligence (AI) infrastructure and chronic electric-grid congestion are together driving a structural shift in how large power consumers—especially data center operators—procure electricity. Solid Oxide Fuel Cells (SOFCs), once regarded as a premium clean-energy niche, have now emerged as a leading Behind-the-Meter (BTM) technology capable of supplying gigawatt-scale baseload power within weeks.

This chapter outlines the market inflection now underway, quantifies the demand signals behind it, and compares SOFC with competing BTM technologies.

Key findings include the following.

- By 2030, BTM solutions are expected to serve 20–25 GW of incremental data-center electricity demand, representing approximately \$35–70 billion in total project investment.<sup>[3]</sup>
- The global BTM market is projected to grow from roughly \$6–7 billion in 2025 to more than \$280 billion by 2034, implying a compound annual growth rate of 18–20%.<sup>[13]</sup>
- The global SOFC market was valued at approximately \$2.5 billion in 2024 and is expected to exceed \$35 billion by 2033, implying annual growth above 30%.<sup>[12]</sup>
- Bloom Energy recorded \$1.97 billion in revenue in 2025, up 37.3% year over year, driven primarily by SOFC-BTM contracts.<sup>[1]</sup>
- Between October 2025 and January 2026, binding SOFC agreements totaling approximately \$7.65 billion were executed in just 90 days.<sup>[4]</sup>
- With electrical efficiency of 50–60%, near-zero NO<sub>x</sub>/SO<sub>x</sub> emissions, strong fuel flexibility, and deployment timelines as short as 90 days, SOFC is increasingly positioned as the defining BTM technology of this decade.<sup>[3,6,11]</sup>

## 1. Introduction: A New Power Paradigm

The global energy landscape is undergoing a fundamental paradigm shift. Traditional centralized grids are finding it increasingly difficult to absorb the explosive electricity demand created by artificial intelligence, large-scale data centers, and the electrification of industrial processes.<sup>[14]</sup>

In the traditional power system, electricity flowed in one direction—from large centralized generating stations, through high-voltage transmission networks, to end users. Utilities expanded their assets

based on relatively predictable load growth, and industrial customers built their facilities on the assumption that the grid would always be available. That paradigm is no longer eroding gradually; it is breaking down abruptly.

In the United States alone, data centers are expected to add approximately 55 GW of new electricity demand between 2024 and 2030.<sup>[14]</sup> In major data-center hubs such as Northern Virginia, new interconnection requests already face multi-year delays, and in some regions the wait exceeds three to five years.<sup>[5]</sup> From a physical infrastructure standpoint, it is becoming clear that the grid cannot expand on the timetable demanded by the AI industry.

Behind-the-Meter (BTM) generation addresses this bottleneck directly. By locating generation assets behind the utility meter—on the customer side—BTM bypasses transmission congestion, avoids lengthy interconnection procedures, and gives the customer direct control over power quality, resilience, and cost.<sup>[5]</sup> In this context, BTM generation has emerged not merely as an alternative, but as a strategic necessity. Among the available BTM technology options—gas turbines, reciprocating engines, battery storage systems, and fuel cells—SOFC has emerged as the preferred choice for mission-critical baseload applications requiring continuous operation.<sup>[6,9]</sup>

This chapter analyzes the structural forces driving the SOFC-BTM market, the scale of capital already committed, and the competitive dynamics likely to determine the technology winners of the next decade.

## **2. Behind-the-Meter Power: Concept and Context**

### **2.1 Definition and Scope**

BTM generation refers to any power asset installed at a customer site that produces electricity for direct on-site consumption without passing through the utility transmission and distribution network. From the customer’s perspective, BTM electricity reduces net grid consumption rather than appearing as externally purchased electricity, and unlike traditional front-of-the-meter generation, it places power production directly next to the point of use.<sup>[5]</sup>

The BTM asset universe includes rooftop solar, on-site battery energy storage, diesel generators, and increasingly fuel-cell systems capable of delivering tens to hundreds of megawatts of output.<sup>[5,6]</sup> For this reason, BTM equipment is now viewed not merely as a “generator,” but as an integrated tool for

energy cost management, demand response, resilience, and corporate ESG strategy. Its defining feature is co-location with the load, which creates several structural advantages.

- It eliminates transmission and distribution losses, which average 5–8% in the U.S., improving overall energy economics.
- It improves power availability to 99.99% (“four nines”) by insulating sensitive computing workloads from outages and voltage fluctuations on the grid.<sup>[11]</sup>
- It avoids interconnection queues that can exceed five years in some regions, allowing projects to be implemented within months.<sup>[5]</sup>
- It can reduce demand charges and time-of-use tariffs, improving long-term total cost of ownership (TCO).
- It enhances energy security and operational independence for mission-critical facilities.
- It provides a platform for structurally lowering carbon emissions through high-efficiency generation, fuel switching, and integration with renewable energy.

## 2.2 Why Now?: The AI Demand Shock

Over the past decade, the power sector has focused heavily on expanding renewable energy deployment. As solar and wind capacity has grown rapidly, supply-side variability has increased, and peak tariffs and network congestion have risen in parallel. At the same time, the explosive growth of AI, cloud computing, and semiconductor manufacturing has driven electricity consumption at a pace far above traditional demand forecasts.<sup>[14]</sup>

AI training and inference workloads require far higher power density than conventional cloud computing. A single next-generation AI accelerator rack can consume more than 100 kW, compared with 5–15 kW for a conventional server rack, and this density continues to rise with each GPU generation.<sup>[6]</sup> Some data-center campuses now require hundreds of megawatts on a single site. This step-change in demand has fundamentally overturned the assumptions embedded in legacy grid planning.

Goldman Sachs estimates that incremental electricity demand from data centers will total roughly 730 TWh between 2024 and 2030. Even if only one-quarter to one-third of that demand is met through BTM solutions, the required new distributed generation capacity would still amount to 20–25 GW.<sup>[3]</sup> One market-research firm projects that the global BTM market will grow from roughly \$6–7 billion in 2025 to more than \$275 billion by 2034, corresponding to an 18–20% compound annual growth rate.<sup>[13]</sup>

## 2.3 Primary BTM Applications

Data centers are the most visible and fastest-growing BTM segment, but the same structural logic applies across many other high-reliability and power-sensitive industries.

- Data centers and AI compute facilities: require 24/7 baseload power, with almost zero tolerance for outages.
- Semiconductor fabs: require exceptionally stable voltage and frequency, and even a short interruption can destroy an entire production lot.
- Hospitals and healthcare facilities: depend on uninterrupted electricity for life-critical operations.
- Telecom hubs and financial data centers: cannot tolerate service interruption.
- Advanced manufacturing and industrial plants: treat energy cost as a core competitiveness factor, and often benefit substantially from process-heat integration.

## 3. SOFC Technology: The Engine Behind the BTM Market

### 3.1 Operating Principles

Solid Oxide Fuel Cells (SOFCs) generate electricity through electrochemical reactions rather than combustion. Fuel—typically natural gas, biogas, or hydrogen—is reformed at the anode, while oxygen ions supplied at the cathode pass through a solid ceramic electrolyte and react with the fuel on the anode side. This process produces electricity, heat, water, and carbon dioxide, but because it never reaches flame-combustion temperatures, it produces virtually no NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>x</sub>, or particulate matter.<sup>[15]</sup>

SOFC systems typically operate in the 600–1,000°C range. This high temperature is both a design constraint and a strategic advantage: it allows hydrocarbon fuels to be processed through internal reforming without an external reformer, enables waste-heat recovery for combined heat and power (CHP), and supports high-efficiency power generation.<sup>[7,11]</sup> Inverter-based power conversion also allows precise control of output voltage, frequency, and harmonics, helping protect sensitive loads from external grid disturbances.<sup>[10]</sup>

### 3.2 Efficiency and Emissions Profile

In electrical efficiency terms, the latest sixth-generation SOFC systems achieve approximately 60% electrical efficiency on natural gas, which is 10–30 percentage points higher than simple-cycle gas turbines.<sup>[11]</sup> When waste heat is captured and used in CHP mode, total system efficiency can exceed 90%. In data-center applications, that heat can be used to drive absorption chillers, improving facility PUE by 10–15%.<sup>[10]</sup> Research involving fuel recirculation, hybrid configurations, and thermal integration has reported electrical efficiencies above 60%.<sup>[15]</sup>

The emissions profile is equally distinctive. Because SOFC operates without flame combustion, it produces virtually no NOx or SOx.<sup>[10]</sup> Although CO<sub>2</sub> is still emitted when natural gas is used, the higher efficiency reduces CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per MWh by 20–35% relative to gas turbines. Compared with consuming the same fuel in a gas engine or gas turbine, SOFC can reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by roughly 15–30%.<sup>[7]</sup> In addition, SOFC's intrinsic fuel flexibility allows systems operating today on pipeline natural gas to transition progressively to hydrogen blends or 100% green hydrogen, offering a realistic decarbonization pathway without immediate stranded-asset risk.<sup>[6,7]</sup>

### **3.3 Deployment Characteristics and Speed**

From a project-development perspective, SOFC systems offer both modularity and speed. Leading SOFC suppliers indicate that multi-megawatt systems can be delivered and commissioned within approximately 90 days of contract signing, which is only a fraction of the 12–60 month lead times typically associated with gas turbines and combined-cycle plants.<sup>[9]</sup> In the current race to build AI infrastructure, bringing power online several months earlier translates directly into commercial advantage.<sup>[6]</sup>

SOFC systems also offer low noise, low vibration, and relatively compact footprints, making them easier to deploy in urban and suburban environments where gas turbines face permitting and siting challenges.<sup>[11]</sup> Their modular architecture allows projects to start at smaller capacity and expand incrementally as demand grows, reducing the initial capital burden.

### **3.4 Fuel Flexibility and the Hydrogen Transition**

One of the most strategically important characteristics of SOFC is its internal reforming capability. SOFC's high operating temperature allows natural gas, biogas, syngas, and ammonia to be processed directly within the stack without a separate external reformer.<sup>[7,15]</sup> This allows customers to use existing natural-gas infrastructure today while retaining the option to transition over time to hydrogen blends, 100% green hydrogen, or other low-carbon fuels.

The same ceramic cell and stack technology used in generation mode can also be operated in reverse as a Solid Oxide Electrolysis Cell (SOEC), enabling high-temperature electrolysis for hydrogen

production.<sup>[45]</sup> As a result, SOFC technology can serve as a long-term bridge between today's gas infrastructure and tomorrow's hydrogen economy, while also creating a pathway for BTM installations to evolve into integrated on-site energy hubs combining power, heat, hydrogen production, and energy management.

## **4. Market Inflection: Data and Investment Momentum**

### **4.1 The BTM Market in Numbers**

The amount of capital flowing into BTM-SOFC is unprecedented in the history of the distributed-energy industry. Goldman Sachs Sustainability Research estimates that by 2030, 25–50% of data-center electricity demand could be served through BTM solutions, corresponding to roughly 8–20 GW of SOFC installed capacity. Based on current SOFC capital-cost trajectories, that implies approximately \$35–73 billion of project investment over the next five years.<sup>[3]</sup>

Independent market researchers project that the global SOFC market will grow from about \$2.6 billion in 2024 to more than \$35 billion by 2033, implying annual growth above 30%.<sup>[12]</sup> A substantial share of this growth is expected to come from stationary power applications centered on data centers and other high-reliability industrial facilities.

### **4.2 Bloom Energy as a Leading Indicator**

As the world's largest commercial SOFC manufacturer, Bloom Energy offers the clearest quantitative indicator of BTM-SOFC market momentum. Its 2025 performance marks a clear turning point.<sup>[1,2]</sup>

- Full-year 2025 revenue reached approximately \$1.9 billion, up 37.3% year over year.<sup>[1]</sup>
- Product backlog increased by approximately 2.5x year over year to about \$5.8 billion.<sup>[1]</sup>
- Total backlog, including long-term service agreements, reached approximately \$19 billion.<sup>[2]</sup>
- The company achieved positive free cash flow for a second consecutive year and generated approximately \$108 million in cash from operations during 2025.<sup>[1]</sup>
- Bloom's Fremont facility is targeting a 2 GW annual run rate by the end of 2026, with a roadmap to expand to 5 GW.<sup>[2]</sup>

- In October 2025, Bloom announced a \$5.0 billion strategic AI infrastructure partnership with Brookfield Asset Management; in January 2026, its share price surged 75%, pushing market capitalization above \$29 billion.<sup>[4,8]</sup>

These figures reflect broad and accelerating order flow from hyperscale cloud providers, colocation operators, utilities pursuing on-site generation, and a range of industrial customers. In other words, SOFC-BTM has moved beyond the early-adopter phase and entered the early-majority stage.<sup>[2]</sup> As of 2026, Bloom Energy is supplying more than 400 MW of data-center power across 1,800 sites in nine countries.<sup>[10]</sup>

### 4.3 Landmark Transactions: The 90-Day Surge

The clearest evidence of the market inflection is the concentration of major contracts signed between October 2025 and January 2026. In just 90 days, confirmed SOFC agreements totaling approximately \$7.65 billion were executed.<sup>[4]</sup>

Timing	Counterparty	Value	Description
October 2025	Brookfield Asset Management	Approx. \$5.0 billion	Strategic Energy-as-a-Service (EaaS) partnership to deploy Bloom SOFC systems for AI data centers worldwide [8]
January 2026	American Electric Power (AEP)	Approx. \$2.65 billion	Unconditional purchase agreement for approximately 900 MW of SOFC capacity for a Wyoming AI campus [4]
Throughout 2025	Oracle / Equinix / CoreWeave	Undisclosed	Multiple projects totaling more than 100 MW; CoreWeave's 14 MW installation was commissioned within 90 days of contract signing [7][9]

Source: Bloom Energy SEC filings [1]; Introl Research, February 2026 [4].

Taken together, the Brookfield and AEP transactions alone exceeded the cumulative data-center revenue generated by the global fuel-cell industry over the prior decade, compressed into a single quarter.<sup>[4]</sup> Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley, and Evercore ISI have all issued reports recognizing SOFC as a bankable baseload power asset class for data centers.<sup>[3]</sup>

### 4.4 Domestic and International Signals

This market shift is not confined to the United States. In South Korea, Bloom Energy and SK ecoplant have demonstrated the commercial viability of the SOFC-BTM model through SOFC deployments in Southeast Asian data-center power projects.<sup>[7]</sup> In Taiwan, the Energy Taiwan 2025 forum identified AI data-center power demand as a key driver of SOFC deployment, and the local supply chain is moving aggressively to capture gigawatt-scale opportunities.<sup>[16]</sup> In Europe, strengthening carbon-pricing mechanisms and environmental regulations are improving the relative competitiveness of low-emission BTM solutions compared with gas turbines.

## 5. Competitive Landscape: SOFC and Other BTM Technologies

The BTM market is not defined by a single technology. Multiple distributed-generation technologies compete with—and in some cases complement—one another across different use cases. This section evaluates the main options against the needs of high-reliability, continuous-power applications, which currently represent the fastest-growing BTM segment.<sup>[19]</sup>

**Table 1. BTM Technology Comparison for Data-Center Applications**

Technology	Capacity (MW)	Lead Time	Start-up Time	Land Use (MW/acre)	Electrical Efficiency	LCOE (\$/MWh)
<b>SOFC (fuel cell)</b>	0.3–100+	3–4 months	Baseload	30–100	<b>50–60%</b>	100–200
Aeroderivative gas turbine	30–60	18–36 months	10 minutes	30–50	35–40%	80–130
Industrial gas turbine	5–50	12–36 months	20–30 minutes	20–40	35–40%	65–110
Small CCGT	40–100	18–36 months	30–60 minutes	20–30	40–55%	85–160
Medium-speed RICE	7–20	15–24 months	5–10 minutes	8–15	40–50%	80–150
High-speed RICE	3–5	15–24 months	2–5 minutes	5–12	40–50%	120–200
H-Class CCGT	600–1,000	36–60 months	30–60 minutes	20–30	50–60%	100–200

Technology	Capacity (MW)	Lead Time	Start-up Time	Land Use (MW/acre)	Electrical Efficiency	LCOE (\$/MWh)
PEM fuel cell	0.1–10+	6–12 months	Minutes	Compact	40–55%	150–300+
BESS (battery)	Any	6–12 months	Seconds	Variable	N/A (storage)	Not baseload-capable

Sources: Landgate BTM Report 2026 [5]; Goldman Sachs Sustain Research [3]; Bloom Energy technical materials [10][11]; Voltacera analysis [19].

## 5.1 Gas Turbines: Aero-derivative and Industrial

Gas turbines remain the most mature and widely deployed alternatives for large-scale BTM generation. Aero-derivative turbines in the 30–60 MW range offer rapid start-up and a well-established maintenance ecosystem. However, their electrical efficiency remains in the 35–40% range, meaning significantly higher fuel consumption per MWh than SOFC, with corresponding disadvantages in both operating cost and carbon emissions.<sup>[19]</sup>

Industrial gas turbines in the 5–50 MW range can offer relatively favorable estimated LCOE of \$65–110/MWh, but their 12–36 month lead times, substantial noise footprint, and air-emissions profile create major permitting challenges for urban and suburban data-center sites.<sup>[5,18]</sup>

More fundamentally, neither aero-derivative nor industrial gas turbines offer a straightforward pathway to large-scale hydrogen conversion. Hydrogen combustion requires substantial redesign of combustion hardware to manage flame temperature, NO<sub>x</sub> formation, and flashback risk, making retrofit far from trivial.<sup>[17]</sup> This limits the long-term decarbonization optionality of gas-turbine-based BTM investments.

## 5.2 Combined-Cycle Gas Turbines (CCGT)

Small and mid-sized combined-cycle gas turbines (40–100 MW) achieve higher efficiencies of 40–55% by adding a steam cycle to recover exhaust heat. However, this added complexity also lengthens lead times to 18–36 months and increases minimum economic scale, reducing deployment flexibility.<sup>[18,19]</sup>

At the utility scale, H-Class CCGTs in the 600–1,000 MW range can match SOFC efficiency at 50–60%, but their 36–60 month build times and capital costs often above \$1 billion make them fundamentally incompatible with the modular, rapid-deployment model required by data-center BTM applications.<sup>[5]</sup>

## 5.3 Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines (RICE)

Medium-speed RICE systems in the 7–20 MW range and high-speed units in the 3–5 MW range offer genuine modularity and very fast start-up times, making them useful for peaking and backup-power applications. However, their 40–50% electrical efficiency, high maintenance frequency, noise and vibration, and NOx and particulate emissions make them less attractive for continuous baseload operation.<sup>[19]</sup>

High-speed RICE units are also associated with some of the highest LCOE figures in the BTM field—around \$120–200/MWh—limiting their competitiveness where fuel cost dominates the economics of long-duration operation.<sup>[18]</sup>

## 5.4 PEM Fuel Cells

Proton Exchange Membrane Fuel Cells (PEMFCs) are often cited as a future competitor to SOFC. PEM systems operate at much lower temperatures of 60–80°C, enabling rapid start-up and shutdown, and when fueled with green hydrogen they produce zero CO<sub>2</sub> at the point of use.<sup>[6]</sup>

However, PEM fuel cells face two major near-term constraints. First, commercial-scale green hydrogen remains both limited and expensive; on an energy-equivalent basis, delivered hydrogen typically costs 3–6 times more than pipeline natural gas in most markets.<sup>[17]</sup> Second, data-center-scale PEM systems remain largely in the demonstration phase. Even Microsoft’s 2025 project with Ballard was aimed at replacing diesel backup generators, not at serving as the primary baseload source.<sup>[6]</sup> At present, the market distinction is fairly clear: SOFC is the immediate, commercially scalable solution, while PEM remains a longer-term zero-carbon frontier technology.<sup>[9]</sup>

## 5.5 Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS)

Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) are increasingly cost-competitive for short-duration use cases such as 2–4 hour balancing, grid support, and demand-charge management. But because batteries store rather than generate electricity, they cannot replace continuous baseload generation.

For example, a data center requiring 100 MW of continuous power would need 400–800 MWh of battery capacity to ride through a 4–8 hour outage, implying capital expenditure of roughly \$1.0–2.8 billion for storage alone, without energy generation.<sup>[18]</sup> BESS is therefore better understood as a complementary technology to SOFC—helping maintain stable baseload operation while also providing fast response and grid-services value.<sup>[19]</sup>

## 6. Market Structure and Competitive Dynamics

## 6.1 A Fast-Expanding Market, but Still Not Enough Supply

To understand the opportunity created by SOFC-BTM, demand and supply must be viewed separately. On the demand side, expansion is taking place at an unprecedented pace. Goldman Sachs estimates that data-center BTM demand alone could require 8–20 GW of SOFC installed capacity by 2030,<sup>[3]</sup> while the SOFC market itself is projected to grow from approximately \$2.5 billion in 2024 to more than \$34 billion by 2033.<sup>[12]</sup> That implies annual growth above 30%.

On the supply side, the situation is very different. Only a small number of manufacturers are currently capable of producing commercial-scale SOFC systems with sufficient reliability, and major customers are already securing future allocation through long-term reservation agreements. The Brookfield and AEP contracts are emblematic: both parties committed billions of dollars before the underlying systems were even manufactured.<sup>[4]</sup>

This structural imbalance between demand and supply creates a powerful incentive for new players to establish a position while the market is still taking shape.

## 6.2 What Supply Concentration Really Means: Not a Threat, but Market Validation

It is true that Bloom Energy currently occupies the leading position in stationary-power SOFC. But interpreting that as evidence of a “closed market” would be misleading. In reality, it signals two important things.

First, the technology has already been validated at scale. Bloom’s two decades of market-building—across 1,800 sites in nine countries and more than 400 MW of data-center supply—demonstrate that the SOFC-BTM model works in the real world.<sup>[10]</sup> New entrants do not have to bear the full burden of proving technical feasibility from scratch.

Second, the market has confirmed a structural shortage of supply. In March 2025, Bosch exited the SOFC business.<sup>[7]</sup> That exit reflected not a failure of the technology, but the capital intensity and time required to catch up with the cost curve and operating base of the incumbent. UK-based Ceres Power continues developing a next-generation metal-supported SOFC platform, but gigawatt-scale commercial deployment is still years away. In practical terms, demand is rising much faster than credible supply capacity, and this gap is unlikely to close quickly.

Paradoxically, the more concentrated supply becomes, the greater the strategic value and bargaining power of companies that possess enabling component technologies in cells, stacks, and materials.

Players that secure a place in the supply chain today are likely to capture outsized benefits as the market scales.

### **6.3 Financing Innovation as a Market Access Pathway**

For many years, the largest barrier to SOFC adoption was upfront capital cost. Installed costs of roughly \$2,900–4,700 per kW are higher than those of gas turbines,<sup>[18]</sup> and even when long-term TCO is favorable, customers have often been reluctant to commit substantial upfront CAPEX.

The Energy-as-a-Service (EaaS) model introduced through the Brookfield partnership changed that equation.<sup>[8]</sup> Under this structure, the financial partner retains ownership of the generation asset, while the data-center operator purchases electricity on a per-MWh basis through a long-term power purchase agreement (PPA). This allows customers to benefit from SOFC-BTM without large upfront investment, and to account for energy cost as operating expense rather than capital expenditure.

The implications go far beyond financing convenience. EaaS lowers the threshold for adoption, expands the addressable customer base, and gives suppliers access to long-term recurring revenue. Bloom's service backlog—amounting to approximately \$12.7 billion under 5–20 year O&M contracts—shows that the model is already functioning at scale.<sup>[1,2]</sup> New entrants can now structure their businesses around a financing template that has already been commercially validated.

### **6.4 Policy Environment: External Variables That Improve Profitability**

Regulation and policy provide another structural tailwind for market entrants. The U.S. Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) offers investment tax credits (ITC) of up to 30% for qualifying fuel-cell projects, with additional incentives tied to domestic content and siting in energy communities.<sup>[15]</sup> These incentives directly improve project economics and enhance financing quality. Bloom has stated that it has already secured safe-harbor qualification for tax-credit treatment through 2028.<sup>[1]</sup>

In South Korea, distributed-energy policy and the Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) structurally support demand for distributed generation, including fuel cells.<sup>[7]</sup> In Europe, strengthening carbon pricing and air-emissions regulation continue to improve the competitiveness of low-emission BTM solutions. As carbon regulation tightens globally, SOFC's structural advantages—high efficiency and low emissions—translate more directly into project profitability.

### **6.5 Economics: Already Working, and Likely to Improve Further**

It is true that SOFC systems still carry higher CAPEX and LCOE than gas engines and small gas turbines. But high-reliability BTM customers do not make decisions based only on simple electricity price per kWh. Their total cost of ownership (TCO) includes the following factors.<sup>[18,19]</sup>

- Avoided costs for interconnection and substation upgrades
- Savings on demand charges and peak tariffs
- Carbon costs and environmental compliance costs
- Production and service interruption risk from outages or poor power quality
- Regulatory and ESG-related reputation risk

For data centers, semiconductor fabs, and hospitals, one hour of unexpected downtime can translate into losses ranging from millions to tens of millions of dollars. In that context, paying a premium for infrastructure that effectively removes outage risk can be economically rational.

And the economics are improving. SOFC system costs continue to decline as manufacturing scales, processes are optimized, and supply chains mature,<sup>[12]</sup> while longer cell and stack lifetimes reduce maintenance frequency and lower LCOE further. Policy incentives, green PPA premiums, and rising carbon prices all reinforce this trend.<sup>[13,15]</sup> Entering the market now therefore means not only capturing today's revenue opportunities, but also securing an early position in a market where cost, demand, and policy are all moving in the same favorable direction.

## **7. Implications for Voltacera and the Path Forward**

The market dynamics outlined above create an opportunity that is both concrete and time-sensitive. SOFC-BTM has already entered the early-majority adoption phase in the data-center sector, and the capital-allocation decisions being made now will shape the installed base over the next 15–20 years.<sup>[5,13]</sup> The choice of which cell and stack technologies enter supply chains and accumulate reference projects during this period will effectively determine the competitiveness of future system generations.

Companies that secure manufacturing scale, supply-chain position, and customer references in the current cycle are likely to gain structural advantage through the lock-in effects created by cumulative installed base and long-term service agreements. Voltacera defines its role precisely at this point—as a specialized cell partner. Rather than attempting to execute the full stack, system, and project-

development scope alone, the platform is being designed on the assumption of collaboration with global stack and system makers.

## **7.1 Reducing Manufacturing Cost: Expanding Margin for Stack and System Makers**

As SOFC demand scales to the gigawatt level, the manufacturing cost of ceramic cells and stacks becomes one of the most sensitive levers in total system cost.<sup>[12]</sup> Voltacera's top priority is to reduce cell manufacturing cost systematically through materials innovation and process development. This creates several direct benefits for system makers.

- Higher gross margin at the same selling price
- More aggressive bidding flexibility at the same target margin
- Improved price competitiveness versus alternatives while maintaining premium performance in efficiency and durability

## **7.2 Fuel Flexibility and Hydrogen Transition Readiness: Reducing Long-Term Portfolio Risk**

Natural-gas-based SOFC-BTM is the practical solution for meeting the current needs of data centers and industrial customers. But over a 10–20 year asset life, any system that lacks a credible transition path toward low-carbon fuels such as hydrogen or ammonia is exposed to stranded-asset risk.

Voltacera's electrolyte and electrode architecture is being designed to deliver optimal efficiency on natural gas in the near term while accommodating future hydrogen blending and eventual 100% hydrogen operation. For stack and system makers, this means the ability to win projects today using existing gas infrastructure while retaining a platform that can extend into future hydrogen and low-carbon fuel projects.

## **7.3 Cell Performance: The Foundation of System Differentiation**

As the market matures, differentiation will increasingly shift toward cell and stack performance—especially electrical efficiency, durability, and degradation rate—rather than system integration alone. Even a 1–2 percentage point improvement in cell or stack performance can materially affect LCOE, fuel cost, and greenhouse-gas emissions. Developers with superior cell performance are therefore positioned to gain structural pricing power within the supply chain.

## **7.4 SOEC Integration: Expanding Toward a Power-Hydrogen-Heat Hub**

Data-center and industrial customers are increasingly looking for integrated solutions that address not only electricity demand, but also hydrogen, process heat, and cooling. Voltacera’s platform aims to support both fuel-cell mode (SOFC) and electrolysis mode (SOEC) using the same ceramic cell technology.<sup>[15]</sup> For stack and system makers, this opens a medium- to long-term pathway: entering the market first through SOFC-BTM generation projects, then expanding into on-site hydrogen production, CHP, and integrated energy-hub applications on the same technology base.

## **7.5 System Integration Capability and Partnership Model**

Data-center operators are increasingly looking for partners capable of delivering turnkey packages that integrate generation, thermal management, and energy management systems (EMS). Voltacera’s role is to focus on cells, stacks, and core module design, while completing system and project integration through collaboration with global partners. Modular stack and module design allows partner system makers to build their own packaging, controls, and service architectures with flexibility, while joint demonstration projects and reference-site development can strengthen credibility and pipeline growth for both sides.

## **8. Conclusion**

The BTM-SOFC market is no longer approaching an inflection point—it has already crossed one. The combination of AI-driven power demand, chronic grid congestion, and SOFC’s unique strengths in electrical efficiency, ultra-low local emissions, fuel flexibility, and rapid deployment has already triggered a structural reallocation of capital toward distributed on-site generation.<sup>[3,5,6]</sup>

The approximately \$7.65 billion of confirmed contracts signed in just 90 days,<sup>[4]</sup> Bloom Energy’s 2.5x backlog growth,<sup>[1]</sup> Goldman Sachs’ 8–20 GW demand outlook,<sup>[3]</sup> and independent validation from major investment banks are not hypothetical forecasts—they are already-occurred market events. The BTM market, currently valued at roughly \$6–7 billion, is projected to exceed \$280 billion by 2034,<sup>[13]</sup> while the SOFC segment itself is expected to grow from roughly \$2.5 billion today to about \$34 billion by 2033.<sup>[12]</sup> Companies that secure a position within the SOFC supply chain and project-development ecosystem today are likely to compete from a structurally advantaged position as the market expands toward 2030.

Voltacera is building its technology and capabilities for precisely this moment. The chapters that follow will show in detail how Voltacera intends to convert this opportunity into durable technological and commercial advantage.

## **References**

**[1]** Bloom Energy Corporation. (February 2026). Form 8-K: Q4 and Full-Year 2025 Financial Results. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC).

<https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1664703/000162828026005798/be-20260205.htm>

**[2]** Bloom Energy Corporation. (2026). 2026 Proxy Statement (DEF 14A). U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC).

<https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1664703/000162828026024237/0001628280-26-024237-index.html>

**[3]** Goldman Sachs Sustain Research. (2026). *Fuel Cells: Powering the Next Era of Data Center Infrastructure*. [Referenced via ZeroHedge summary, February 2, 2026.]

<https://www.zerohedge.com/news/2026-02-02/fuel-cells-poised-capture-13-data-center-power-demand-2030>

**[4]** Introl Research. (February 24, 2026). *Fuel Cells: AI Data Center Power's \$7.65B Dark Horse*.

<https://introl.com/ko/blog/fuel-cells-data-center-power-dark-horse-7-billion>

**[5]** Landgate. (April 2026). *Behind-the-Meter Report: 2026 Outlook*.

<https://www.landgate.com/news/behind-the-meter-report-2026-outlook>

**[6]** EnkiAI. (January 24, 2026). *Fuel Cells Power Data Centers in 2025: The AI Boom*.

<https://enki.ai/data-center/fuel-cells-power-data-centers-in-2025-the-ai-boom>

**[7]** EnkiAI. (November 5, 2025). *Bloom Energy SOFC 2025: Analysis of AI & Partnerships*.

<https://enki.ai/solid-oxide-fuel-cells/bloom-energys-2025-sofc-tech-for-ai-data-centers>

**[8]** EnkiAI. (April 2026). *Bloom Energy 2026: AI Data Center & SOFC Deals*.

<https://enki.ai/solid-oxide-fuel-cells/bloom-energy-2026-ai-data-center-sofc-deals/>

**[9]** EnkiAI. (January 24, 2026). *Top 10 2025 Fuel Cell Projects for AI Data Centers*.

<https://enki.ai/data-center/top-10-2025-fuel-cell-projects-for-ai-data-centers>

**[10]** Bloom Energy. (December 2, 2025). *The AI Revolution: How Fuel Cells Are Solving the Data Center Power Challenge*. <https://www.bloomenergy.com/blog/the-ai-revolution-how-fuel-cells-are-solving-the-data-center-power-challenge/>

**[11]** Data Center Dynamics. (February 11, 2026). *Powering the Future Starts Onsite*.

<https://www.datacenterdynamics.com/en/marketwatch/powering-the-future-starts-onsite/>

**[12]** Straits Research. (2025). *Solid Oxide Fuel Cell Market Size, Share & Trends, 2025–2033*. <https://straitsresearch.com/report/solid-oxide-fuel-cell-market>

**[13]** Fortune Business Insights. (2025). *Behind the Meter (BTM) Market Size, Industry Share & Forecast*. <https://www.fortunebusinessinsights.com/behind-the-meter-btm-market-109954>

**[14]** International Energy Agency (IEA). (2024). *Electricity 2024: Analysis and Forecast to 2026*. <https://www.iea.org/reports/electricity-2024>

**[15]** U.S. Department of Energy, Fuel Cell Technologies Office. *Multi-Year Research, Development, and Demonstration Plan*. <https://www.energy.gov/cmeif/fuels/articles/hydrogen-and-fuel-cell-technologies-office-multi-year-research-development-and>

**[16]** Digitimes Research. (November 13, 2025). *AI Data Center Power Consumption Drives SOFC Deployment in Taiwan*. <https://www.digitimes.com/news/a20251106PD248/>

**[17]** McKinsey & Company. (2024). *Hydrogen and Energy Transition: Strategic Implications for Industry*. <https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/mckinsey-explainers/what-is-hydrogen-energy>

**[18]** Lazard. (2024). *Levelized Cost of Energy Analysis – Version 17.0*. [https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2024-12/34-Exh\\_FF-Lazard's.pdf](https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2024-12/34-Exh_FF-Lazard's.pdf)

**[19]** Voltacera Internal Analysis. (2026). *BTM Technology Benchmarking: SOFC vs. Competing Generation Technologies*. Voltacera Research.

Disclaimer: This white paper has been prepared by Voltacera for informational purposes only. The information contained herein is based on publicly available sources believed to be reliable as of April 2026. Voltacera makes no representations or warranties regarding the accuracy or completeness of third-party data cited herein. This document does not constitute investment advice, a solicitation, or an offer to sell securities.