



PhD defence: How to measure remotely the wind using nacelle lidars for power performance testing

Borraccino, Antoine

Publication date:
2017

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):

Borraccino, A. (Author). (2017). PhD defence: How to measure remotely the wind using nacelle lidars for power performance testing. Sound/Visual production (digital)
http://orbit.dtu.dk/admin/files/136859224/2017_08_30_Antoine_Borraccino_PhD_defence_SlideShow.mp4

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.

How to measure remotely the wind using nacelle lidars for power performance testing

A. Borraccino

Ph.D. defence, 30th August 2017



Supervisors: Michael Courtney, Rozenn Wagner
Project: UniTTe

DTU Wind Energy
Department of Wind Energy


Outline

- 1 • Introduction
- 2 • Calibration of wind lidars
- 3 • Wind field reconstruction
- 4 • Power performance testing

Outline


- 1 • Introduction
- 2 • Calibration of wind lidars
- 3 • Wind field reconstruction
- 4 • Power performance testing

Motivations



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



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 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**



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**






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**




Lidar

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

- **Principles of coherent Doppler wind lidars**



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

Outline



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




Generic calibration methodology


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

Courtney M.: "Calibrating nacelle lidars", [2013], DTU Wind Energy E-0020(EN)

- **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



2) Calibration of LOS velocity

Method and data analysis

- **Main data**

- **Cup**: horizontal wind speed V_{hor}

- **Sonic**: wind direction θ

- **Lidar**: LOS velocity V_{los} ; tilt angle φ

Reference quantity

$$V_{ref} = V_{hor} \cos \varphi \cos(\theta - LOS_{dir})$$

- **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}

- derived from calibrated ref. instruments


2) Calibration of LOS velocity

Results (1/2)

Linear regressions on 10-min data



LOS 0




Bottom LOS


2) Calibration of LOS velocity

Results (2/2)

Linear regressions on binned data



LOS 0



Bottom LOS

➔ the calibration relation is obtained!

Uncertainty of LOS velocity

Method

- GUM methodology:**


- based on law of propagation of uncertainties
- analytical method

- Measurement model**

$$a \cdot V_{\text{ref}} = y = a \cdot V_{\text{hor}} \cdot \cos \varphi \cdot \cos (\underbrace{\theta - LOS_{\text{dir}}}_{\theta_r})$$

gain of calibration relation wind speed beam tilt angle wind direction

- "Tree of uncertainties":** GUM method applied to the V_{los} calibration



Uncertainty of LOS velocity

Results


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

U_{exp} increases linearly (m/s)

~ 3% at 4m/s


~ 2% at 10 m/s

almost same as cup anemometer



5B-demo

LOS 0




ZDM

Bottom LOS

Uncertainty of LOS velocity

Prevailing sources

$$a \cdot V_{\text{ref}} = y = a \cdot V_{\text{hor}} \cdot \cos \varphi \cdot \underbrace{\cos(\theta - \text{LOS}_{\text{dir}})}_{\theta_r}$$



• Conclusions:


- the lidar V_{los} uncertainty is almost entirely inherited from the cup
- need to improve uncertainty assessment of cup anemometers
- OR
- need for new reference sensors

Outline

- 1 • Introduction
- 2 • Calibration of wind lidars
- 3 • Wind field reconstruction
- 4 • Power performance testing

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



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

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...)**


Schlipf D., Rettenmeier A., Haizmann F., Hofsäß M., Courtney M. and Cheng, P. W.:
 “Model Based Wind Vector Field Reconstruction from Lidar Data”, DEWEK, 2012.



- 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. θ_r (yaw misalignment)
 - + shear exponent α_{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_∞ (@ H_{hub})
 + relative wind dir. θ_r
 + shear exponent α_{exp}
 + induction factor a_{ind}




Full-scale campaign: Nørrekær Enge



- in Jutland, Denmark
- owner: Vattenfall
- 13 Siemens turbines of 2.3MW





- **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



ZDM
use 6 LOS, @2.5 D_rot




Wind speed results


Mast comparison, WFR using the **wind-induction model**

- horizontal speed estimated @hub height and $2.5D_{\text{rot}}$
- IEC "free sector": $[110^\circ, 219^\circ]$


5B-demo: use the 5 LOS
4 dist, from 0.5 to @ $1.2D_{\text{rot}}$




ZDM: use 6 LOS
3 dist., from 0.3 to $1.2D_{\text{rot}}$



Wind speed evolution in induction zone




5B-demo



ZDM

➔ 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_∞



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



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



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

• Conclusions

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

➔ essentially, the wind speed model uncertainty is the one of the cup anemometer used during the calibration in Høvsøre!

Outline

- 1 • Introduction
- 2 • Calibration of wind lidars
- 3 • Wind field reconstruction
- 4 • Power performance testing

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**



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...



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_∞)



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?

- **Testing similar methods in complex terrain**

- Hill of Towie
 - Ogorje
- } UniTTe campaigns, ongoing analysis

- **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

Thanks for your attention!



Ameya



Steen



Guillaume



Anders



Andrea



Niels



Nikola



Nikolas



Nikolay



Alexander



Per



Michael



Antoine



Rozenn



David



Ines



Florian



Ioannis



Matthieu



Michael



Kristoffer



And many many others!!

Acknowledgements



My Ph.D. project formed part of the UniTTe project (www.unitte.dk) which is financed by *Innovation Fund Denmark*.

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



remote sensing



Article


Generic Methodology for Field Calibration of Nacelle-Based Wind Lidars

Antoine Borraccino ^{*,†}, Michael Courtney [†] and Rozenn Wagner [†]

Lidar

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

- **Principles of coherent Doppler wind lidars**



- sense light backscattered from particles moving with the wind
- return light is frequency-shifted (Doppler effect)

(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




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°
- **LOS dir = min parabola**



LOS 0



Bottom LOS

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 ($\pm 0.05^\circ$)

Lidar	LOS	Calibration relation			
		θ_{los}	a	R^2	N_{pts}
5B	LOS 0	286.03°	1.0058	0.9999	742
	LOS 1	285.99°	1.0072	0.9999	502
	LOS 2	285.99°	1.0084	1.0000	1087
	LOS 3	286.06°	1.0090	0.9999	446
	LOS 4	285.99°	1.0059	1.0000	1508
ZDM	$179^\circ - 181^\circ$ azimuth	287.44°	1.0050	0.9998	2140

Uncertainty assessment: how to combine components?

- **GUM methodology**: analytic method

- 1) Define measurement model: $y_m = f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$

- 2) Law of propagation of uncertainties:

$$U_c = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial y_m}{\partial x_i} \cdot u_{x_i} \right)^2} \text{ for uncorrelated inputs } x_i$$

- 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:**

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: Nørrekær Enge



- in Jutland, Denmark
- owner: Vattenfall
- 13 Siemens turbines of 2.3MW

Wind speed results: summary table

Data filtering		Reconstruction case		Forced linear regressions results			
Case	Direction sector	Dataset	Lidar	Input measurement ranges	gain	R^2	Number of periods
1	[93°, 123°]	Joint	5B-Demo, 5 LOS	2.0 D_{rot}	1.0146	0.9936	885
			ZDM, 6 LOS	2.5 D_{rot}	1.0090	0.9938	
			5B-Demo, 5 LOS	from 0.5 to 1.15 D_{rot}	1.0063	0.9944	
			ZDM, 6 LOS	from 0.3 to 1.25 D_{rot}	0.9961	0.9947	

- 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

Data filtering		Reconstruction case		Forced linear regressions results			
Case	Direction sector	Dataset	Lidar	Input measurement ranges	gain	R^2	Number of periods
1	[93°, 123°]	Joint	5B-Demo, 5 LOS	2.0 D_{rot}	1.0146	0.9936	885
			ZDM, 6 LOS	2.5 D_{rot}	1.0090	0.9938	
			5B-Demo, 5 LOS	from 0.5 to 1.15 D_{rot}	1.0063	0.9944	
			ZDM, 6 LOS	from 0.3 to 1.25 D_{rot}	0.9961	0.9947	
2	[93°, 123°]	disjoint	5B-Demo, 5 LOS	2.0 D_{rot}	1.0133	0.9953	1476
			ZDM, 6 LOS	2.5 D_{rot}	1.0080	0.9942	2143
			5B-Demo, 5 LOS	from 0.5 to 1.15 D_{rot}	1.0057	0.9961	1123
			ZDM, 6 LOS	from 0.3 to 1.25 D_{rot}	0.9965	0.9962	2659

- Disjoint datasets: similar observations
- Increased number of valid data points (2-3x more)
- R^2 enhanced slightly

Wind speed results: summary table

Data filtering		Reconstruction case		Forced linear regressions results			
Case	Direction sector	Dataset	Lidar	Input measurement ranges	gain	R^2	Number of periods
1	[93°, 123°]	Joint	5B-Demo, 5 LOS	2.0 D_{rot}	1.0146	0.9936	885
			ZDM, 6 LOS	2.5 D_{rot}	1.0090	0.9938	
			5B-Demo, 5 LOS	from 0.5 to 1.15 D_{rot}	1.0063	0.9944	
			ZDM, 6 LOS	from 0.3 to 1.25 D_{rot}	0.9961	0.9947	
2	[93°, 123°]	disjoint	5B-Demo, 5 LOS	2.0 D_{rot}	1.0133	0.9953	1476
			ZDM, 6 LOS	2.5 D_{rot}	1.0080	0.9942	2143
			5B-Demo, 5 LOS	from 0.5 to 1.15 D_{rot}	1.0057	0.9961	1123
			ZDM, 6 LOS	from 0.3 to 1.25 D_{rot}	0.9965	0.9962	2659
3	[110°, 219°] (IEC free sector)	Joint	5B-Demo, 5 LOS	2.0 D_{rot}	1.0059	0.9848	2815
			ZDM, 6 LOS	2.5 D_{rot}	1.0028	0.9841	
			5B-Demo, 5 LOS	from 0.5 to 1.15 D_{rot}	0.9997	0.9877	
			ZDM, 6 LOS	from 0.3 to 1.25 D_{rot}	0.9923	0.9885	

- Better agreement between lidar and mast
- Much larger scatter ("signal decorrelation")
- Still 5B-Demo above ZDM (about 0.5%)


Wind speed results: summary table

Data filtering		Reconstruction case		Forced linear regressions results			
Case	Direction sector	Dataset	Lidar	Input measurement ranges	gain	R^2	Number of periods
1	[93°, 123°]	Joint	5B-Demo, 5 LOS	2.0 D_{rot}	1.0146	0.9936	885
			ZDM, 6 LOS	2.5 D_{rot}	1.0090	0.9938	
			5B-Demo, 5 LOS	from 0.5 to 1.15 D_{rot}	1.0063	0.9944	
			ZDM, 6 LOS	from 0.3 to 1.25 D_{rot}	0.9961	0.9947	
2	[93°, 123°]	disjoint	5B-Demo, 5 LOS	2.0 D_{rot}	1.0133	0.9953	1476
			ZDM, 6 LOS	2.5 D_{rot}	1.0080	0.9942	2143
			5B-Demo, 5 LOS	from 0.5 to 1.15 D_{rot}	1.0057	0.9961	1123
			ZDM, 6 LOS	from 0.3 to 1.25 D_{rot}	0.9965	0.9962	2659
3	[110°, 219°] (IEC free sector)	Joint	5B-Demo, 5 LOS	2.0 D_{rot}	1.0059	0.9848	2815
			ZDM, 6 LOS	2.5 D_{rot}	1.0028	0.9841	
			5B-Demo, 5 LOS	from 0.5 to 1.15 D_{rot}	0.9997	0.9877	
			ZDM, 6 LOS	from 0.3 to 1.25 D_{rot}	0.9923	0.9885	
4	[110°, 219°] (IEC free sector)	disjoint	5B-Demo, 5 LOS	2.0 D_{rot}	1.0041	0.9840	4588
			ZDM, 6 LOS	2.5 D_{rot}	1.0038	0.9860	5615
			5B-Demo, 5 LOS	from 0.5 to 1.15 D_{rot}	0.9988	0.9888	4099
			ZDM, 6 LOS	from 0.3 to 1.25 D_{rot}	0.9935	0.9897	6199


Yaw misalignment results:

WFR using the **wind-induction model**


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



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



Spinner
anemometer




ZDM: 3 dist.
From 0.3 to 1.2D_rot

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


Shear exponent results:

WFR using the **wind-induction model**

- Wind sector : $[110^\circ, 219^\circ]$ (joint datasets)
- "Ref." shear exponent: from mast, using cups at 80 and 57m agl



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




**ZDM: 3 dist.
From 0.3 to 1.2D_rot**

➔ 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” = $V_{\text{los}} - \hat{V}_{\text{los}}$; “error”: = $\text{abs}(V_{\text{los}} - \hat{V}_{\text{los}})$

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 : $[110^\circ, 219^\circ]$ (joint datasets)



5B-demo

4 dist. from 0.5 to @1.2D_{rot}

➔ MB show very low values;

➔ Histogram centered on zero: the used model is “unbiased”


ZDM

3 dist. from 0.3 to 1.2D_{rot}

V_{los} fitting residuals: mean bias

WFR using the wind-induction model

- Wind sector : $[110^\circ, 219^\circ]$ (joint datasets)




5B-demo

4 dist. from 0.5 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



ZDM


3 dist. from 0.3 to 1.2D_{rot}

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_∞

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





5B-demo



ZDM

Simple induction models


- One- or two- dimensional?



Preparing for questions - propagation of uncertainties with Monte Carlo methods

Model uncertainty framework

$$\bar{y}_i = y_t + \epsilon_e = g(x_i + \epsilon_x, \bar{\theta}) + \epsilon_g + \epsilon_a$$



Reproduced from:

Huard, D., and A. Mailhot (2006),

A Bayesian perspective on input uncertainty in model calibration: Application to hydrological model "abc",

Water Resour. Res., 42, W07416, [doi: 10.1029/2005WR004661](https://doi.org/10.1029/2005WR004661)

\bar{y}_i is a measured value of g ;

ϵ_x represents the error related to the inputs;


ϵ_g is the random error due to the model uncertainty;

ϵ_a characterises the error due to the model inadequacy


ϵ_e is the error between observations \bar{y}_i (measured) and the true value y_t ;

Uncertainties of WFC


yaw misalignment θ_r



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



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




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


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

Uncertainties of WFC


shear exponent α_{exp}



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



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




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


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

Uncertainties of WFC


induction factor a_{ind}



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



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




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

- 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)


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**




Measured Power curves (scatter)

WFR using **wind model**



Power curve uncertainties: power, type A

WFR using **wind model**



Power curve uncertainties: combined

WFR using wind model

