



Case study: Offshore wind in the North Sea

Kitzing, Lena; Klinge Jacobsen, Henrik

Publication date:
2014

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)


Citation (APA):
Kitzing, L. (Author), & Klinge Jacobsen, H. (Author). (2014). Case study: Offshore wind in the North Sea. Sound/Visual production (digital)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



MEMBER STATE COOPERATION ON RENEWABLE ENERGY


Member State meeting
5 November 2014, Brussels

Case study: Offshore wind in the North Sea

Lena Kitzing, Henrik Klinge Jacobsen
5/11/2014

- General introduction to the case study on renewables cooperation
 - Belgium is main driver and Netherlands host
 - How to share costs and benefits between BE, NL and UK
 - Support financing, compensation and market access
- Design characteristics
 - Support guaranty and contract setup
 - Involvement of NL and UK predetermined by optional participation in the 1000 MW offshore capacity
- Conclusions
 - What did we learn from the case study?
 - Further development of cooperation

Set-up of the joint project in the North Sea




Why a joint project here?

- ▶ ▶ **Site most attractive when benefits for several countries are exploited**
- > Technical set-up aligned with the case study by NorthSeaGrid project (www.northseagrid.info)
- > Joint project wind park of 1000 MW, located in NL, the Borssele area
- > Offshore hub in BE, connecting the wind park to BE
- > Interconnectors to UK and NL

Set-up of the joint project in the North Sea


Simplified illustration



- > Belgium is the driving force
- > The Netherlands would have to make the site available. There is a natural reluctance, as the site might be needed for own future developments.
- > The UK is interested if electricity can be generated at a competitive price as compared to domestic sources.
- > Other, not physically connected countries, could be interested to participate based on statistical transfers.

Principles of the case study

- > Maximum level of integration into existing system and regulations – only this can ensure a success in such short time frame (before 2020)
- > Limited level of required coordination between countries (no joint funds etc.)
- > Thus, each country will consider part of the wind park as just another RES installation within their territory



Sharing costs and benefits



	BE	NL	UK	LUX
Shares of RES				
<i>Electricity from the wind park</i>	40%	30%	30%	-
<i>RES benefits for targets</i>	30%	30%	30%	10%
Direct Effect				
Support cost to wind park	40%	30%	30%	-
Payment from statistical transfers	-10%			10%
Infrastructure cost	40%	20%	40%	-
Indirect Side Effects				
System integration costs Grid related costs Ancillary service costs Impact on conv. capacity	40%	30%	30%	-
Displaced alternative utilisation of area		100%		
Biodiversity and landscape costs	-	100%	-	-
Avoided local air pollution	40%	30%	30%	-
Greenhouse gas savings	40%	30%	30%	-
Security of supply	40%	30%	30%	-
Employment effects	<i>Allocation uncertain, depending on contracts</i>			
Innovation effects	<i>Allocation uncertain</i>			


1. Agreement for a Joint Project between Belgium and the Netherlands including statistical transfer to Belgium

2. Agreement for a statistical transfer between Belgium and the UK


3. Agreement for a statistical transfer between Belgium and Luxembourg

Responsibilities of Belgium	Responsibilities of the Netherlands	Responsibilities of both
Provision of financial support to the project operator.	Transfer of RES benefits to Belgium.	Permitting and licensing (through 'Responsible Body')
Grid access for project, off-taking of all electricity, whenever technically possible.		
In case of non-compliance, Belgium will lose all rights under the agreement and the area will again be at disposal for the Netherlands.	In case of non-compliance, either a financial compensation or a statistical transfer of alternative RES benefits is possible.	

Potential timing & process



Special Issue: Market Access Phase II



- > There currently exists no regulation regarding offshore hubs and to which market area and pricing zone they would belong
- > Issue: UK currently requires physical import of the power. How else can production enter the UK in a simple way?
- > Issue: Can you extend the market area to reach outside the countries' borders?

Conclusions

- The case study outlines possible design of the basic contractual characteristics necessary for the implementation of cooperation
 - > Simplicity of first stage development of the project is vital
 - > Belgium act as primary driver of cooperation project
 - > No changes in support schemes needed
 - > Option for Netherlands to take 300MW serve as part of compensation for land use (forgone development)
 - > Physical feed-in for each market must be accepted at hub point if phase II participation of NL and UK

Please contact us for more information

**Technical University of Denmark, DTU Management
Engineering**

Henrik Klinge Jacobsen

E: jhja@dtu.dk

Lena Kitzing

E: lkit@dtu.dk