#### The Importance of Adding the Temporal Component to Wake Losses – a Verification Study

Wiebke Langreder, Henrik S. Pedersen, Adit N. Kishore

EMD International A/S





### Motivation

- We have seen umpteen validation of wake models and umpteen interpretation of the result
- Most validations concentrate on the total number and not on the temporal behaviour
- Spot market: Time is money



- Wake losses depend on stability, thus time of the day
- But how much does the park efficiency vary with time of the day?
- How can we model that?





## Setting the scene

- Ultimate truth: production data (10-minute SCADA data)
- Data filtering:
  - WTG operates flawless: no error or sub-optimal events
  - Exclude wind speeds near cut-in and rated wind speed
  - Only data where all WTGs operate
- Focus on wake sector



# The Sites (1/3)

"Onshore – single row"

- Denmark: Krogstrup Enge
- 4 WTGs
- 3D distance
- Input to model:
  - nacelle wind speed WTG1





www.emd.dk

# The Sites (2/3)

At 5 positions

"Offshore"

- > 60 WTGs, 4.5 D apart downwind
- Special aspect: 5 WTGs are equipped with an iSpin  $^{*}$
- Consequently we know:
  - Real production
  - Real wind speed
  - Real turbulence intensity
- Wind speed at WTG 1 will be used

\* Spinner anemometer, see https://www.romowind.com/

5





# The Sites (3/3)

"Onshore – multiple row"

- Egypt: El Zayt
- 100 WTGs, 3 x 14 D
- Upwind mast used as model input





# The wake model set-up

All calculations are time-varying driven by:

- Site 1: Nacelle ws
- Site 2: iSpin WTG1
- Site 3: mast

The configuration of the NO Jensen model varies:

- 1. Omni-directional fixed WDC (wake decay constant)
  - WDC 0.075 onshore / 0.04 offshore (DTU recommendation)
  - WDC adjusted to average TI (based on roughness and HH)
- 2. Time-varying WDC adjusted to TI per time-step
  - WDC = 0.4 TI
  - Site 1 (Krogstrup Enge, DK) only: Experimental WDC = 0.8 TI plus adjusting changing WDC per row



## What to look for?

#### Step 1: Do we see diurnals?

- Wind speed, turbulence
- Measured park performance: Production of downwind WTG normalized to production of free WTG - per time stamp





### Step 1: Sanity Check

Site 1: Onshore single row

Site 2: Offshore

Site 3: Onshore multiple row













## What to look for?

#### Step 1: Do we see diurnals?

- Wind speed, turbulence
- Measured park efficiency



But we do not necessarily see diurnals in park efficiency

### Step 2: Can we model?

- In terms of absolute production
- In terms of diurnals





### Modelling Diurnals: Site 3 El Zayt





18-09-2019

### What to look for?

#### Step 1: Do we see diurnals?

- Wind speed, turbulence
- Measured park efficiency

### Step 2: Can we model?

- In terms of absolute production
- In terms of diurnals



Step 3: What does that mean in terms of money?



### Financial implication

- Site 2 offshore: Nord Pool spot market
- Only production in waked sector is analyzed
- Comparing modelled to measured production

	Deviation from measured earning
Fixed WDC 0.04	7.8%
Fixed WDC 0.0354	4.1%
Time-varying WDC	0.7%



### Conclusion

- Clearly time-varying WDC best on all sites
- Clear financial impact can be shown
- Site 1 (single row) can be solved with experimental solution
- Diurnal TI pattern not necessarily a proxy for production diurnals
- Of course: More projects needed for validation! WP3 projects (with 10-minute SCADA data) will be analyzed





### **Contact Detail**

Wiebke Langreder Head of Wind Consulting EMD International A/S +45 9635 4444 wl@emd.dk



### Backup slide: Direction-dependency

- Yes, wake losses are dependent of the width of the sector
- Yes, we did (some) analysis example Site 1 (single row)

