



Flywheel Calibration of Coherent Doppler Wind Lidar - Anno 2019

Pedersen, Anders Tegtmeier; Courtney, Michael

Publication date:
2019

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):
Pedersen, A. T., & Courtney, M. (2019). *Flywheel Calibration of Coherent Doppler Wind Lidar - Anno 2019*. Poster session presented at IEA Wind Task 32 Workshop 2019 DTU Wind Energy.

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.



Flywheel Calibration of Coherent Doppler Wind Lidar

Anno 2019

Anders Tegtmeier Pedersen* and Michael Courtney
DTU Wind Energy





Motivation

"Lidars are absolute instruments" is a sentence often heard, and by that is meant, that given the laser wavelength and the sampling frequency, we are able to calculate the measured radial speed through the well-known equation: $V_r = \frac{1}{2} \lambda \cdot \Delta f$. There are no empirical constants that have to be found through a calibration as is the case for e.g. cups or even LDAs.

Why then do we claim that lidar calibration is necessary anyhow? Probably the most direct answer is that without a calibration we cannot know that the lidar is getting it right. There could be wrong constants or some subtle errors in the algorithm. Only by comparing to a known 'truth' can we be completely sure that the lidar gives the correct speed.

Calibration rig



- Stainless steel wheel: $R = 286.76$ mm
- Aluminium frame: $L = 1.58$ m
- Telescope: 1" aperture, $f = 0.10$ m
- Angular velocity measured by high resolution tachometer

Model

A simple model relating the error in measured speed due to non-tangential skimming angle, ϕ_s , to the inclination angle, θ , has been developed.

By assuming the laser beam is infinitely narrow and that θ and ϕ_s are both small, the relation between θ and ϕ_s can be found from simple geometrical considerations:

$$\phi_s \approx \sin \phi_s \approx \frac{d}{R} = \sqrt{\frac{2L\theta}{R}}$$

Now, the lidar only measures the speed component along the line-of-sight, thus

$$V_{Lidar} = V_{Wheel} \cdot \cos(\phi_s + \theta) \approx V_{Wheel} \cdot \cos(\phi_s),$$

and by Taylor expansion of the cosine term a simple expression for the speed ratio is reached

$$\frac{V_{Lidar}}{V_{Wheel}} \approx 1 - \frac{\phi_s^2}{2} = 1 - \frac{L\theta}{R}$$

Model – Thick beam

In reality the laser beam has a finite width and the lidar response must be found through

$$V_{Lidar} = \frac{1}{\phi_{s1} - \phi_{s0}} \int_{\phi_{s0}}^{\phi_{s1}} V_{Wheel} \cos(\phi + \theta) d\phi \Leftrightarrow$$

$$\frac{V_{Lidar}}{V_{Wheel}} = \frac{1}{\phi_{s1} - \phi_{s0}} [\cos \theta (\sin \phi_{s1} - \sin \phi_{s0}) + \sin \theta (\cos \phi_{s1} - \cos \phi_{s0})],$$

which approaches the above approximation as the beam becomes narrower.

In the special case when part of the beam is skimming above the wheel and thus $\phi_{s0} = 0$


$$\frac{V_{Lidar}}{V_{Wheel}} \approx 1 - \frac{\phi_s^2}{6} = 1 - \frac{L\theta}{3R}$$

In this region the sensitivity to the tilt angle is thus reduced by a third.

Main uncertainty components

- Wheel diameter: 0.1 mm
 - Relative uncertainty $u_r = \frac{0.1 \text{ mm}}{287 \text{ mm}} = 3.5 \cdot 10^{-4}$
- Frequency from tachometer to speed conversion: 10 ppm
 - Relative uncertainty $u_\omega = 1 \cdot 10^{-5}$
- Tilt angle resolution: 0.01°
 - Relative uncertainty $u_{\Delta\theta} = \frac{L}{R} \cdot \frac{\Delta\theta}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} = 2.8 \cdot 10^{-4}$
- Combined relative uncertainty $u_{ref} = \sqrt{u_r^2 + u_\omega^2 + u_{\Delta\theta}^2} = 4.5 \cdot 10^{-4}$


Simulations






Simulated measured lidar speed over reference wheel speed as function of tilt angle for an infinitely narrow beam and a beam of finite width. The reduced sensitivity to tilt is clearly seen and also that this leads to a shift towards larger angles in the region of higher sensitivity. Extrapolating from the high sensitivity region to $\theta = 0$ without compensating for the beam width will therefore lead to errors in the calibration.

Results

Function of speed



Function of focus distance



Top: Example of calibration measurement at 5.44 m/s reference speed together with affine fit (red). The beam is focused at the top of the wheel. Oscillations in the residual plots are due to the very narrow Doppler peak moving through the spectral bins alternately over- and underestimating the speed.

Bottom: Fit parameters (slope and intercept) as function of reference wheel speed

Top: Example of calibration measurement with laser beam focused at 1.03 m. The wheel speed is kept constant at 10.93 m/s.

Bottom: Fit intercept as function of focus distance together with the calculated beam width at the wheel. Best fit is found when the beam is focused close to the wheel and it is clear that the fit is influenced by the beam width emphasising the need to compensate for this.

Conclusions & Future work

- Calibration rig built and running
- Model for measurement error as function of inclination angle made
- Measurements agree well with model
- Method stable over wide range of speeds
- The main uncertainties have been identified but further work needed including wheel eccentricity
- The line-of-sight speed can be calibrated to an uncertainty of approximately 1.0%
- Beam width compensation necessary

