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Source: CDIAC
Motivations
Motivations

- The wind industry is a business
  - strives for making money
  - no such big machines and large scale wind farm without a profitable business
How wind industry ensures it makes money

Wind resource

Power curve of wind turbines

Annual energy production

Is very uncertain

Guaranteed by manufacturer

Contractual agreements + international standards

Basis for bankable wind projects (GWh/year)
Power performance testing

• **GOAL 1:** relate turbine power to energy available in the wind

This needs measurements of:
- Turbine power
- (free stream) Wind speed

“the wind speed at the turbine position as if the wind turbine was not there”

• **GOAL 2:** assess power curve uncertainties

- how far from the true power curve (unmeasurable) is the measured one

“the wind turbine will produce that much energy at this wind speed, and we’re sure with a probability of XX %”
Power performance testing
The old way

meteorology mast far enough away (2-4 diameters)
+ cup anemometers
Power performance testing
The modern ways (1/2)

Remote sensing instruments

–

new IEC standard (2017): use of **ground-based wind lidars** (profilers) allowed

ZephIR 300 (by ZephirLidar)  WindCube (by Leosphere)
Power performance testing
The modern ways (2/2)

Remote sensing instruments

Future/Now: use of nacelle-based wind lidars

ZephIR Dual Mode (scanning) by ZephirLidar
Wind Iris (4-beam) by AventLidar
Wind Eye (4-beam) by Windar Photonics
Diabrezza (9-beam) by Mitsubishi Electric
Why nacelle lidars for power performance testing

For modern multi-megawatt turbines:

**Cost-efficiency**
- met. mast
- ground-based lidars
- nacelle-based lidars

especially offshore!

**Representativity of wind measurements**
- met. mast
- ground-based lidars
- nacelle-based lidars

especially in complex terrain!
Lidar

- **LIght Detection And Ranging**: “a radar using light”
- **Remotely measuring**: from some meters to >10 km away

**Principles of coherent Doppler wind lidars**

1. **Backscattered light** → **FFT** → **Doppler spectrum**
2. **Doppler spectrum** → **estimator** → **LOS velocity**
3. **LOS velocity** → **WFR model** → **Wind Field Characteristics**

Credit: N. Vasiljevic
Lidar

- **Light Detection And Ranging:** “a radar using light”
- **Remotely measuring:** from some meters to >10 km away

**Principles of coherent Doppler wind lidars**

1. Backscattered light
2. Doppler spectrum
3. LOS velocity
4. Wind Field Characteristics

Credit: N. Angelou
Lidar

- **Light Detection And Ranging:** “a radar using light”
- **Remotely measuring:** from some meters to >10 km away

**Principles of coherent Doppler wind lidars**

1. Backscattered light → FFT → Doppler spectrum
2. Doppler spectrum → estimator → LOS velocity
3. LOS velocity → WFR model → Wind Field Characteristics

**5B-demo**
Lidar

- LIght Detection And Ranging: “a radar using light”
- Remotely measuring: from some meters to >10 km away

**Principles of coherent Doppler wind lidars**

1. Backscattered light → FFT → Doppler spectrum
2. Doppler spectrum → estimator → LOS velocity
3. LOS velocity → WFR model → Wind Field Characteristics

---

5B-demo
Research questions

1) What are the uncertainties inherent to the measurements performed using a nacelle-mounted lidar?

- Calibration procedures required
  see article in Remote Sensing journal:
  "Generic Methodology for Field Calibration of Nacelle-Based" (2016)
  A. Borraccino, M. Courtney, R. Wagner

2) How can nacelle-mounted lidars provide free-field wind characteristics for power curve measurement?

- New wind field reconstruction methodologies
  see article in Wind Energy Science journal:
  "Wind field reconstruction from nacelle-mounted lidar short-range measurements" (2017), A. Borraccino, D. Schlipf, F. Haizmann, R. Wagner

- Application to power performance testing
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Calibration of measuring systems

• **Metrology** (= science of measurements)
  
  international standards: JCGM (BIPM, IEC, ISO, etc)
  
  • VIM: international vocabulary of metrology
  
  • GUM: guide to uncertainty in measurements

• **Calibration** =
  
  operation providing as an end-result
  
  • a relation between measured values and reference ones
    (mathematical model, curve, table, etc)
  
  • associated measurement uncertainties
  
  • a correction of the indicated quantity value

• **Why?**

  Traceability to SI

  Uncertainty quantification

  “measurement values are meaningless without their associated uncertainty. The true value is unknowable”
Calibration of wind lidars: white vs. black-box methodology (1/2)

• **Black-box**
  – Direct comparison of reconstructed wind parameters

**PROS:** simple, limited knowledge required

**CONS:** lidar-specific, practical setup unrealistic, and ...

→ It simply does not work for nacelle lidars!
Calibration of wind lidars: white vs. black-box methodology (1/2)

- **White-box**
  - calibration of all the inputs of the Wind Field Reconstruction

**PROS**
- Low sensitivity to WFR assumptions
- Genericity
- Uncertainties on any wind characteristics (WFC)

**CONS**
- Longer process
- Need expert knowledge

**Inputs:**
- backscattered light, lidar scanning geometry, ...

**LIDAR**
- = white box

**Outputs:**
- reconstructed wind characteristic e.g. WS, WD, shear, ...
Generic calibration methodology

• Based on the original procedures for 2-beam nacelle lidars

• Further developed and tested with two different nacelle lidar systems

Avent 5-beam Demonstrator (5B-Demo): pulsed, step-staring

ZephIR Dual Mode (ZDM)
continuous wave, conically scanning

• Published in journal article + 2 detailed calibration reports
Generic calibration methodology
1) beam positioning quantities

- Step 1: calibration of beam positioning quantities
  - inclinometers (tilt, roll)
  - lidar geometry: cone or opening angles

➤ Procedures are lidar-specific
➤ We used hard target methods to detect beam position
Generic calibration methodology
2) calibration of LOS velocity

• Measurement setup, in Høvsøre (DK)
Generic calibration methodology
2) calibration of LOS velocity

Measurement setup, in Høvsøre (DK) - zoom

one beam of the Avent Demonstrator

ZephIR DM beam passage

cup

sonic

5m

8.9m

260m

5B-demo

ZDM
2) Calibration of LOS velocity
Method and data analysis

• **Main data**
  - **Cup**: horizontal wind speed $V_{hor}$
  - **Sonic**: wind direction $\theta$
  - **Lidar**: LOS velocity $V_{los}$; tilt angle $\varphi$

  \[
  \text{Reference quantity } \quad V_{ref} = V_{hor} \cos \varphi \cos (\theta - LOS_{dir})
  \]

• **LOS direction evaluation**
  - fit of wind direction response (part 1)
  - Residual sum of squares process (part 2)

• **Comparison between**
  - Lidar-measured LOS velocity $V_{los}$
  - Reference quantity: pseudo-LOS velocity $V_{ref}$
    \(\Rightarrow\) derived from calibrated ref. instruments
2) Calibration of LOS velocity

Results (1/2)

Linear regressions on 10-min data

- **LOS 0**
  - N = 742
  - $y = 1.0069x$, $R^2 = 0.9991$

- **Bottom LOS**
  - N = 2140
  - $y = 1.0022x$, $R^2 = 0.9978$
2) Calibration of LOS velocity

Results (2/2)

Linear regressions on binned data

the calibration relation is obtained!
Uncertainty of LOS velocity

Method

- **GUM methodology:**
  - based on law of propagation of uncertainties
  - analytical method

- **Measurement model**

\[ a \cdot V_{\text{ref}} = y = a \cdot V_{\text{hor}} \cdot \cos \phi \cdot \cos (\theta - \text{LOS}_{\text{dir}}) \]

- "Tree of uncertainties": GUM method applied to the \( V_{\text{los}} \) calibration

\[ u_c, \gamma \]

\[ u_a \]

\[ u_{c, \theta_r} \]

\[ u_{\theta_{los}} \]

\[ u_{c, \theta_r} \]

\[ u_{c, V_{\text{ref}}} \]

\[ u_{\theta} \]

\[ u_{c, V_{\text{hor}}} \]

\[ u_{\text{cal}} \]

\[ u_{\text{ope}} \]

\[ u_{\text{mast}} \]

\[ u_{\text{pos}} \]

\[ u_{\text{inc}} \]
Uncertainty of LOS velocity

Results

• Expanded uncertainties \((k=2)\) vs. \(V_{\text{los}}\): in m/s and in %

\[ U_{\text{exp}} \text{ increases linearly (m/s)} \]

\[ \sim 3\% \text{ at } 4 \text{ m/s} \]

\[ \sim 2\% \text{ at } 10 \text{ m/s} \]
Uncertainty of LOS velocity

Prevailing sources

\[ a \cdot V_{\text{ref}} = y = a \cdot V_{\text{hor}} \cdot \cos \varphi \cdot \cos \left( \theta - \text{LOS}_{\text{dir}} \right) \]

\[ u_{a} \]

\[ u_{c,y} \]

\[ u_{c,V_{\text{ref}}} \]

\[ u_{c,\theta r} \]

\[ u_{\theta_{los}} \]

\[ u_{\theta} \]

\[ u_{\varphi} \]

\[ u_{c,V_{\text{hor}}} \]

\[ u_{\text{cal}} \]

\[ u_{\text{ope}} \]

\[ u_{\text{mast}} \]

\[ u_{\text{pos}} \]

\[ u_{\text{inc}} \]

• Conclusions:
  ➔ the lidar \( V_{\text{los}} \) uncertainty is almost entirely inherited from the cup
  ➔ need to improve uncertainty assessment of cup anemometers
  OR
  ➔ need for new reference sensors
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Wind Field Reconstruction ...

- Combines LOS velocities measured in multiple locations

  - Needed to retrieve useful info: wind speed, direction, shear, ...
  - **Assumptions on the flow field** must be made

- **Simplest example**
  - two-beam nacelle lidar
  - horizontal homogeneity hyp.
  - analytical solution for wind speed and relative direction

- Not a good enough method for profiling nacelle lidars
And... searching for free stream wind speed

Modern turbines: $2.5D \sim 200-400m$

- Decorrelation WSpeed / power
- Hub height speed insufficient?
- $V_{2.5D}$ not really free wind ...

$$\infty \quad ??$$
Does this make it any easier?

Flow disturbed by turbine wakes!

(very) complex terrain

Perdigão. 
credit: N. Vasiljevic
Model-fitting Wind Field Reconstruction

• Method is (not new...)

• need new “wind models” for profiling nacelle lidars, suitable for power performance testing
Wind model accounting for shear

- Use lidar measurements at 2.5 rotor diameters
- "static" model: stationarity assumed
- Assumes horizontal homogeneity and power law shear profile

Fits three wind characteristics

- wind speed $V_0$ (@$H_{hub}$)
- relative wind dir. $\theta_r$ (yaw misalignment)
- shear exponent $\alpha_{exp}$
Combined wind-induction model

- Use lidar measurements at multiple distances close to rotor
- Additionally assumes simple induction model:

(from actuator disk and vortex sheet theory)

\[
\frac{U(x)}{U_\infty} = 1 - a_{ind} \left( 1 + \frac{\xi}{\sqrt{1 + \xi^2}} \right)
\]

- Fits four wind characteristics
  - Free stream wind speed \( V_\infty \) (@\( H_{hub} \))
  - Relative wind dir. \( \theta_r \)
  - Shear exponent \( \alpha_{exp} \)
  - Induction factor \( a_{ind} \)
Full-scale campaign: Nørrekræør Enge

- in Jutland, Denmark
- owner: Vattenfall
- 13 Siemens turbines of 2.3MW
Nørrekær Enge
nacelle lidars measurement trajectories

- Considered lines-of-sight:
  - 5B-Demo: all 5 LOS
  - ZDM: 6 LOS / azimuth sectors, ie. 3 pairs (in green)
**Wind speed results**  
Mast comparison, WFR using the wind model

- horizontal speed estimated @hub height
- IEC “free sector”: $[110°, 219°]$

---

5B-demo  
use the 5 LOS, @2 D_rot

\[
y = 1.0097x - 0.0345 \quad R^2 = 0.9848
\]

N_{pts} = 2815

---

ZDM  
use 6 LOS, @2.5 D_rot

\[
y = 1.0192x - 0.1481 \quad R^2 = 0.9844
\]

N_{pts} = 2815
Wind speed results
Mast comparison, WFR using the wind-induction model

- horizontal speed estimated @ hub height and 2.5D_rot
- IEC “free sector”: [110°, 219°]

5B-demo: use the 5 LOS
4 dist., from 0.5 to @1.2D_rot

\[ y = 0.9952x + 0.0408 \quad R^2 = 0.9877 \]

ZDM: use 6 LOS
3 dist., from 0.3 to 1.2D_rot

\[ y = 0.9987x - 0.0582 \quad R^2 = 0.9885 \]
Wind speed evolution in induction zone

The simple induction model seems adequate! (enough)
The white-box methodology: where are we?

• Propagation of input uncertainties ($V_{los}$, inclination, etc)
  - Not possible with GUM
  - Use numerical methods instead: Monte Carlo simulations

• Get model uncertainties of all (fitted) wind characteristics
Monte Carlo methods for Uncertainty Quantification

- **Monte Carlo methods (MCM):**
  - Statistical techniques used to computationally solve physical or mathematical problems
  - Applications: numerical integration, optimisation, sensitivity or reliability analysis, uncertainty quantification (UQ)
  - References: [GUM supplement 1](#), [Cox (2006)](#)

- **Principles:**
  - Propagation of random inputs
  - By evaluation of a model for a large number of samples
  - Outputs characterized through their distribution
**Uncertainties of WFC using Monte Carlo on free wind speed** $V_\infty$

- **Conclusions**
  - Linear variation vs speed
  - No variability with input yaw misalignment and shear
  - No significant difference with two-beam lidar results (using GUM)

$\theta_r = 4^\circ; \alpha_{exp} = 0.2; a_{ind} = nom.$

$V_\infty = 10\; ms^{-1}; \alpha_{exp} = 0.2; a_{ind} = nom.$

$V_\infty = 10\; ms^{-1}; \theta_r = 4^\circ; a_{ind} = nom.$

$\Rightarrow$ essentially, the wind speed model uncertainty is the one of the cup anemometer used during the calibration in Høvsøre!
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Power performance testing
Method – NKE campaign

• Based on international standards IEC 61400-12-1 (2017 ed)
  – for the mast measurements

• Adapted to nacelle-based wind lidars:
  ➔ 5B-Demo and ZDM
  ➔ Wind field reconstruction with:
    1) wind model
    2) combined wind-induction model

• Considering hub height wind speed only
  – No rotor equivalent wind speed

• Derived results
  – Measured power curves
  – Power curve uncertainties
  – Annual Energy Production (AEP)
Measured Power curves (scatter)
WFR using wind-induction model

5B-demo

ZDM

Mast
Measured Power curves (binned)
WFR using wind-induction model
Power curve uncertainties: power, type A
WFR using wind-induction model

- Clear reduction of scatter in power curve
  ➞ nacelle lidars yield smaller type A (statistical) power uncertainty
Power curve uncertainties: combined WFR using wind-induction model

• Results are mostly dependent on type B wind speed uncertainty
  ➔ very sensitive to the “terrain uncertainty”
  ➔ lidar uncertainties are smaller only due to this component...

![Graph showing combined uncertainty versus normalised hub height wind speed. The graph includes three datasets: cup, A5B, and ZDM.]
Annual Energy production

- Derived as percentage of AEP using "mast power curve"
- 3 methods:
  - Wind model
  - Combined wind-induction
    - Wind speed estimated at 2.5D
    - Fitted free stream wind speed ($V_\infty$)
Overall conclusions

- **Calibration of wind lidars** ✓
  - the white-box methodology successfully applied
  - is now the preferred technique by wind industry!
  - Lidar LOS velocity uncertainty $\approx$ ref. anemometer speed

- **V infinity is found ! ✓**
  - solution: combined wind-induction WFR model and lidar measurements close to rotor
  - allows to estimate free stream wind speed

- **For power curve measurements:** nacelle-based lidars are
  - at least as accurate as meteorology masts
  - (offshore) likely to replace them systematically ✓
  - to be included in next generation IEC standards?
Future work

• Testing similar methods in complex terrain
  – Hill of Towie
  – Ogorje

• Standardisation work on nacelle lidars for power perfo.

  IEC 61400-50-3 ED1
  Wind energy generation systems - Part 50-3: Use of nacelle mounted lidars for wind measurements (proposed project number 61400-50-3)

• Optimisation of nacelle lidar trajectory
  – Needs a fully implemented lidar simulator
  – Needs validated CFD tools

• Development of model-fitting wind field reconstruction for:
  – Nacelle lidar measurements in wakes
  – Ground-based, scanning and floating lidars

UniTe campaigns, ongoing analysis
Thanks for your attention!

And many many others!!
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Preparing for questions

Calibration of wind lidars
Publications

- **Publications:**

- **DTU E-0086 report** → generic methodology
- **DTU E-0087 report** → detailed procedure 5B-demo
- **DTU E-0088 report** → detailed procedure ZDM
- **Journal paper**
  - *Remote Sensing of Wind Energy* (special issue)
  - methodology, results, discussions, 2-beam example
  - doi: 10.3390/rs8110907
Lidar

**Light Detection And Ranging:** “a radar using light”

**Remotely measuring:** from some meters to >10 km away

**Principles of coherent Doppler wind lidars**

1. **Processing of raw signal** → **Doppler spectrum**
2. **Estimate wind velocity along beam path** → **Line-Of-Sight (LOS) velocity** $V_{los}$
3. **Combine $V_{los}$ measurement in multiple locations** → **reconstructed wind field characteristics (WFC): speed, direction, shear, etc**
2) Calibration of LOS velocity

Data analysis (1/2)

- **LOS direction evaluation (part 1)**
  - Cosine / rectified cosine fitting to wind direction response
  - The lidar LOS is normalised by the horizontal speed
  - Gives a first good estimation of LOS direction in sonic CS

![Graphs showing LOS direction analysis for 5B-demo and Bottom LOS](image-url)
2) Calibration of LOS velocity
Data analysis (1/2) – RSS process

- **LOS direction evaluation (part 2)**
  - Projection angle range: $\pm 1^\circ$ to cosine fitted LOS_dir
  - Linear reg. each $0.1^\circ$
  - $\text{LOS dir} = \text{min parabola}$

![Graph showing LOS 0 and Bottom LOS](image-url)
Calibration results

• Summary:
  – lidar-measured LOS velocity: error of $\sim 0.5 - 0.9\%$
  – excellent agreement with the reference quantity $V_{ref}$: $R^2 > 0.9998$
  – LOS direction method provides robust results $(\pm 0.05^\circ)$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lidar</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>$\theta_{los}$</th>
<th>$a$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>N pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>LOS 0</td>
<td>286.03°</td>
<td>1.0058</td>
<td>0.9999</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS 1</td>
<td>285.99°</td>
<td>1.0072</td>
<td>0.9999</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS 2</td>
<td>285.99°</td>
<td>1.0084</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS 3</td>
<td>286.06°</td>
<td>1.0090</td>
<td>0.9999</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS 4</td>
<td>285.99°</td>
<td>1.0059</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZDM</td>
<td>179° – 181° azimuth</td>
<td>287.44°</td>
<td>1.0050</td>
<td>0.9998</td>
<td>2140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Uncertainty assessment: how to combine components?

• **GUM methodology**: analytic method
  1) Define measurement model: \( y_m = f(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \)
  2) Law of propagation of uncertainties:

\[
U_c = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{\partial y_m}{\partial x_i} \cdot u_{x_i} \right)^2}
\]

for uncorrelated inputs \( x_i \)

3) Expanded uncertainty with coverage factor \( k \)

\[
U_{exp} = k \cdot U_c
\]

typically, \( k=2 \) corresponds to 95% confidence interval
What are the uncertainty sources?

- **Reference instruments uncertainties**
  - HWS (IEC 61400-12 procedure for cups)
  - Wind tunnel calibration uncertainty
    \[
    u_{cal} = u_{cal} 1 + \frac{0.01}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot \langle HWS \rangle
    \]
  - Operational uncertainty
    \[
    u_{ope} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot \text{cup class number} \cdot (0.05 + 0.005 \cdot \langle HWS \rangle)
    \]
  - Mounting uncertainty
    \[
    u_{mast} = 0.5\% \cdot \langle HWS \rangle
    \]
- Wind direction, from calibration certificate of sonic anemometer:
  \[
  u_{WD} \approx 0.4^\circ
  \]
What are the uncertainty sources?

- **Calibration process uncertainties**
  - LOS direction uncertainty
    \[ u_{LOS \, dir} = 0.1^\circ \]
  - Uncertainty of tilt inclination angle
    \[ u_\varphi = 0.05^\circ \]
  - Beam positioning uncertainty: \( u_H = 10 \, cm \), shear \( \alpha_{exp} = 0.2 \)
    \[ u_{pos} = \alpha_{exp} \cdot \frac{u_H}{H} \cdot \langle HWS \rangle \approx 0.23\% \cdot \langle HWS \rangle \]
  - Inclined beam and range uncertainty
    \[ u_{inc} = 0.052\% \cdot \langle HWS \rangle \]

"how the probe volume affects the RWS estimation when the beam is inclined" (see model in DTU report E-0086, Annex A)
Preparing for questions

- Wind Field Reconstruction
Publications

- Publications:

**Research articles**

*Wind Field Reconstruction from Nacelle-Mounted Lidars Short Range Measurements*

Antoine Borraccino¹, David Schlipf², Florian Haizmann², and Rozenn Wagner¹

¹DTU Wind Energy, Roskilde, Denmark
²Stuttgart Wind Energy, University of Stuttgart, Germany

Scientific article: wes-2017-10/
Full-scale campaign: Nørrekrær Enge

- in Jutland, Denmark
- owner: Vattenfall
- 13 Siemens turbines of 2.3MW
Wind speed results: summary table

- Overestimation of 1-1.5% with the wind model
- Better performance of wind-induction model using the lidars’ short-range measurements
- Lidar-to-lidar: 5B-Demo about 0.5-1% higher than ZDM
## Wind speed results: summary table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data filtering</th>
<th>Reconstruction case</th>
<th>Forced linear regressions results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Case</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Disjoint datasets: similar observations
- Increased number of valid data points (2-3x more)
- $R^2$ enhanced slightly
Wind speed results: summary table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data filtering</th>
<th>Reconstruction case</th>
<th>Forced linear regressions results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Direction sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$[93°, 123°]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$[93°, 123°]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$[110°, 219°]$ (IEC free sector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Better agreement between lidar and mast
- Much larger scatter (“signal decorrelation”)
- Still 5B-Demo above ZDM (about 0.5%)
# Wind speed results: summary table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data filtering</th>
<th>Reconstruction case</th>
<th>Forced linear regressions results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Input measurement ranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case</strong></td>
<td><strong>Direction sector</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dataset</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>([93^\circ, 123^\circ])</td>
<td>Joint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>([93^\circ, 123^\circ])</td>
<td>disjoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>([110^\circ, 219^\circ]) (IEC free sector)</td>
<td>Joint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>([110^\circ, 219^\circ]) (IEC free sector)</td>
<td>disjoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Yaw misalignment results:**
WFR using the *wind-induction model*

- Wind sector: $[110^\circ, 219^\circ]$ (joint datasets)
- "Ref." yaw misalignment from spinner anemometer

- Higher scatter with lidars than spinner
- "mean" yaw misalignment: $\approx -3^\circ$
- The two nacelle lidars seem to provide similar results

5B-demo: 4 dist, from 0.5 to @1.2D_rot

Spinner anemometer

ZDM: 3 dist. From 0.3 to 1.2D_rot
Shear exponent results:
WFR using the wind-induction model

• Wind sector: [110°, 219°] (joint datasets)
• “Ref.” shear exponent: from mast, using cups at 80 and 57m agl

→ Slight overestimation vs. mast  ➔ Similar results between the two lidars
Induction factor results:
WFR using the wind-induction model

- Wind sector: \([110^\circ, 219^\circ]\) (joint datasets)
- “Ref.” induction factor: \(C_T\) from “HAWC2” simu, \(a = 0.5 \cdot (1 - \sqrt{1 - C_T})\)

5B-demo: 4 dist, from 0.5 to @1.2D_rot

ZDM: 3 dist. From 0.3 to 1.2D_rot
LOS velocity fitting residuals

- **Definitions:**
  - $V_{los}$ and $\hat{V}_{los}$ are column vectors of length = N meas. points (e.g. 5B-Demo = 4 dist*5 los = 20; ZDM = 3 dist*6 los = 18)
  - “bias” = $V_{los} - \hat{V}_{los}$ ; “error”: = $abs(V_{los} - \hat{V}_{los})$
LOS velocity fitting residuals

- **Computed stats:**
  - M: mean, N: normalised; F: fractional;
  - S: squared; R: root; SS: sum of squares
  - **MB, ME, NMB, NME, MFB, MFE, SSE, MSE, RMSE, NMSE**
V_los fitting residuals: mean bias

WFR using the wind-induction model

- Wind sector: [110°, 219°] (joint datasets)

- MB show very low values;
- Histogram centered on zero: the used model is “unbiased”
V_los fitting residuals: mean bias
WFR using the wind-induction model

- Wind sector: [110°, 219°] (joint datasets)

- RMSE values between 0 and 0.25 m/s
- Similar distributions for both lidars, with a slightly larger mean for ZDM

5B-demo
4 dist. from 0.5 to @1.2D_rot

ZDM
3 dist. from 0.3 to 1.2D_rot

RMSE values between 0 and 0.25 m/s
Similar distributions for both lidars, with a slightly larger mean for ZDM
A simple induction model

- Derived from the Biot-Savart law
  - see *The upstream flow of a wind turbine: blockage effect*
  - two parameters: induction factor $a$, free wind speed $U_\infty$

$$\frac{U}{U_\infty} = 1 - a \left( 1 + \frac{\xi}{\sqrt{1 + \xi^2}} \right), \text{ with } \xi = \frac{x_W}{R_{rot}}$$

[Graphs showing non-dimensional wind speed $V_H/V_\infty$ vs. distance from rotor plane $[\text{in } D_{rot}]$.]

5B-demo

ZDM
Simple induction models

- One- or two-dimensional?
Preparing for questions
-
propagation of uncertainties with Monte Carlo methods
\[ \bar{y}_i = y_t + \epsilon_e = g(x_i + \epsilon_x, \bar{\theta}) + \epsilon_g + \epsilon_a \]

\( \bar{y}_i \) is a measured value of \( g \);
\( \epsilon_x \) represents the error related to the inputs;
\( \epsilon_g \) is the random error due to the model uncertainty;
\( \epsilon_a \) characterises the error due to the model inadequacy
\( \epsilon_e \) is the error between observations \( \bar{y}_i \) (measured) and the true value \( y_t \);

Reproduced from:
Huard, D., and A. Mailhot (2006),
A Bayesian perspective on input uncertainty in model calibration: Application to hydrological model “abc”,
Uncertainties of WFC yaw misalignment $\theta_r$

- Decreasing vs speed: consistent with NKE campaign results!
- Values are very (too ??) low: due to assumed high correlation between $V_{\text{los}}$
- No variability with input yaw misalignment and shear

$\theta_r = 4^o; \alpha_{\text{exp}} = 0.2; a_{\text{ind}} = \text{nom.}$

$V_\infty = 10 \text{ ms}^{-1}; \alpha_{\text{exp}} = 0.2; a_{\text{ind}} = \text{nom.}$

$V_\infty = 10 \text{ ms}^{-1}; \theta_r = 4^o; a_{\text{ind}} = \text{nom.}$
Uncertainties of WFC shear exponent $\alpha_{exp}$

- Decreasing vs speed
- No variability with input yaw misalignment
- Increasing with shear
- Order of magnitude: 5-10%

$\theta_r = 4^\circ$; $\alpha_{exp} = 0.2$; $a_{ind} = nom.$

$V_\infty = 10\, ms^{-1}$; $\alpha_{exp} = 0.2$; $a_{ind} = nom.$

$V_\infty = 10\, ms^{-1}$; $\theta_r = 4^\circ$; $a_{ind} = nom.$
Uncertainties of WFC induction factor $a_{ind}$

- Decreasing vs speed
- No variability with input yaw misalignment and shear
- Much higher for 5B-Demo than ZDM: why??
- Order of magnitude:
  - $5\%$ at high CT (low spd), up to $20\%$ at low CT (high spd)

$\theta_r = 4^\circ; \alpha_{exp} = 0.2; a_{ind} = \text{nom.}$

$V_\infty = 10 \text{ ms}^{-1}; \alpha_{exp} = 0.2; a_{ind} = \text{nom.}$

$V_\infty = 10 \text{ ms}^{-1}; \theta_r = 4^\circ; a_{ind} = \text{nom.}$
MCM convergence
Wind speed uncertainties (k=2)
MCM convergence

Yaw misalignment uncertainties (k=2)
Shear exponent uncertainties \((k=2)\)
Induction factor uncertainties (k=2)
Preparing for questions
-
power performance testing
Measured Power curves (scatter)

WFR using wind model

5B-demo

ZDM

Mast
Measured Power curves (scatter)

WFR using **wind model**

![Graph showing measured power curves with different markers and lines for normalized hub height wind speed]

- ref
- cup
- A5B
- ZDM
Power curve uncertainties: power, type A
WFR using wind model
Power curve uncertainties: combined WFR using wind model