

Comments in response to Ørsted's presentation to the Wind Europe Tech Workshop (June 2023) assessing commercial lidar performance

> John Medley Head of Data & Insights

## **ZX Continual Development**



- At WindEurope's Technology Workshop, June 2023, Ørsted presented trial results from both a ZX 300 (2019) and a ZephIR 300 (2016) lidar system, which feature different firmware versions
- ZX Lidars' strategy is one of continual product development, with updates available throughout a lidar system's lifetime
- Firmware development has looked to balance the high availability that can be achieved by a CW Lidar, which uniquely features constant sensitivity, with the data accuracy requirements of financegrade wind data
- ZephIR 300 / Firmware v1.0x delivered almost 100% data availability at all heights. Whilst
  regression slope fell within best practice, the correlation coefficient exceeded minimum
  acceptable criteria at the very highest height in the Ørsted trial
- ZX 300 / Firmware v2.2x improved measurement accuracy, with regression slope and correlation coefficient within best practice. Availability observed during this trial was slightly reduced, but within best practice up to 250m
- Many other independent trials have been performed, both offshore and onshore, showing all acceptance criteria being met. Here are just some examples, results with thanks to KNMI, EOLOS, IDS/Green Rebel:

### 2-year comparison of ZX300 with KNMI's 200m Cabauw onshore mast



Koninklijk Nederlands Meteorologisch Instituut Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Waterstaat



Figure from: Steven Knoop, et al, Intercomparison of CW focusing wind lidar and tall mast at Cabauw: Journal of Atmospheric Measurement Techniques, 14, 2219-2235, 2021

# 3-month EOL-FLS200 verification campaign



Summary of wind speed comparison between a floating ZX 300 on EOL-FLS200 buoy and adjacent platform-mounted Windcube:

| WS comparison |       | slope R <sup>2</sup> coeff. |                               | WS CUP avg | WS LID avg | WS diff. | relative<br>WS diff. |
|---------------|-------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|------------|----------|----------------------|
|               |       | к                           | Pls                           |            |            |          |                      |
| Level / [m]   | #     | Xmws                        | R <sup>2</sup> <sub>mws</sub> | m/s        | m/s        | m/s      |                      |
| 63            | 12680 | 1,003                       | 0,996                         | 10,96      | 10,99      | 0,03     | 0,3%                 |
| 91            | 12585 | 1,000                       | 0,997                         | 11,48      | 11,47      | -0,01    | -0,1%                |
| 116           | 12560 | 0,998                       | 0,997                         | 11,79      | 11,76      | -0,03    | -0,3%                |
| 141           | 12532 | 0,997                       | 0,997                         | 12,05      | 12,00      | -0,05    | -0,4%                |
| 166           | 12484 | 0,995                       | 0,995                         | 12,29      | 12,22      | -0,07    | -0,6%                |

Wind Speed accuracy levels comfortably achieve best practice

#### **Overall data availability:**

| EOLOS FLS-200 E02 |       |       |       |       |       |
|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Level [m]         | 63    | 91    | 116   | 141   | 166   |
| Overall           | 99.1% | 99.1% | 99.0% | 98.8% | 98.6% |

Data availability figures exceeds required threshold



## 6-month Green Rebel FLS validation campaign



Summary of wind speed comparison between a floating ZX 300 on Green Rebel FLS buoy and adjacent platform mounted Windcube:

| WS comparison |       | slope            | R <sup>2</sup> coeff. | WS CUP avg | WS LID avg | WS diff. | relative<br>WS diff. |
|---------------|-------|------------------|-----------------------|------------|------------|----------|----------------------|
|               |       | К                | Pls                   |            |            |          |                      |
| Level / [m]   | #     | X <sub>mws</sub> | $R^2_{mws}$           | m/s        | m/s        | m/s      |                      |
| 62            | 25935 | 0,994            | 0,995                 | 9,37       | 9,31       | -0,06    | -0,7%                |
| 90            | 25498 | 0,992            | 0,996                 | 9,89       | 9,79       | -0,09    | -1,0%                |
| 115           | 25120 | 0,991            | 0,997                 | 10,18      | 10,08      | -0,10    | -1,0%                |
| 140           | 24965 | 0,992            | 0,997                 | 10,39      | 10,29      | -0,10    | -0,9%                |
| 165           | 24862 | 0,992            | 0,996                 | 10,54      | 10,44      | -0,10    | -0,9%                |
| 190           | 24483 | 0,993            | 0,994                 | 10,65      | 10,55      | -0,10    | -0,9%                |
| 215           | 23584 | 0,994            | 0,993                 | 10,68      | 10,60      | -0,08    | -0,8%                |
| 240           | 22251 | 0,994            | 0,991                 | 10,72      | 10,64      | -0,08    | -0,7%                |
| 265           | 20239 | 0,995            | 0,991                 | 10,73      | 10,67      | -0,06    | -0,6%                |
| 290           | 18526 | 1,003            | 0,988                 | 10,66      | 10,67      | 0,01     | 0,1%                 |

Wind Speed accuracy levels comfortably achieve best practice

#### Monthly and overall data availability:

| IFLB01-LEG | Data Availability Percentage |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|------------|------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Level [m]  | 62                           | 90    | 103   | 115   | 140   | 165   | 190   | 215   | 240   | 265   | 290   |
| Overall    | 98,3%                        | 97,3% | 97,1% | 96,3% | 95,6% | 95,2% | 94,8% | 94,4% | 94,0% | 93,3% | 93,1% |

Data availability figures exceed all stage 2 acceptance criteria thresholds

## 6-month Green Rebel FLS validation campaign



| КРІ                | Definition / Rationale   | Stage-2 Acceptance Criteria across total campaign duration    |
|--------------------|--|---|
| OSA <sub>CA</sub>  | Overall System Availability – Campaign Average.                | ≥ 95%   |
|                    |  | 99.6% - PASSED  |
| $MSA_{1M}$         | Monthly System Availability – 1-Month Average.                 | $\geq 90\%$   |
|                    |  | 99.0 % to 99.8 % - PASSED for all 6-months                    |
| OPD <sub>CA</sub>  | Overall (post-processed) Data Availability – Campaign Average. | ≥ 85%   |
|                    |  | 93.1 % to 98.3 % - PASSED for all compared heights            |
| MPDA <sub>1M</sub> | Monthly Post-processed Data Availability – 1-Month Average.    | $\geq 80\%$   |
|                    |  | 82.1 % to 99.6 % - PASSED for all months and compared heights |



|                               | Definition ( Detionals  | Acceptance Criteria across total campaign duration |             |  |  |  |
|-------------------------------|---|--|-------------|--|--|--|
| крі                           | Definition / Rationale  | Best Practice (Stage 3*)                           | Minimum     |  |  |  |
| X <sub>MWS</sub>              | Mean Wind Speed – Slope.  | 0.98 – 1.02  | 0.97 – 1.03 |  |  |  |
|                               | Assessed for wind speed range: [all above 2 m/s]  | ZX: 0.991 to 1.003 - PASSED at all levels          |             |  |  |  |
| R <sup>2</sup> <sub>MWS</sub> | Mean Wind Speed – Coefficient of Determination.   | > 0.98   | > 0.97      |  |  |  |
|                               | Assessed for wind speed range: [all above 2 m/s]  | ZX: 0.988 to 0.997 - PASSED for all 6-months       |             |  |  |  |
| M <sub>MWD</sub>              | Mean Wind Direction – Slope.  | 0.97 - 1.03  | 0.95 - 1.05 |  |  |  |
|                               | Assessed for wind speed range: [all above 2 m/s] regardless of wind direction, i.e. no WD filtering applied | ZX: 0.990 to 0.994 - PASSED at all levels          |             |  |  |  |
| OFF <sub>MWS</sub>            | Mean Wind Direction – Offset, in terms of the mean absolute WD  | < 5°   | < 10°       |  |  |  |
|                               | difference over the total campaign duration.  | ZX: 1.56° to 2.67°-PASSED at all levels            |             |  |  |  |
|                               | (same as for M <sub>MSD</sub> )   |  |             |  |  |  |
| R <sup>2</sup> <sub>MWD</sub> | Mean Wind Direction – Coefficient of Determination.   | > 0.97   | > 0.95      |  |  |  |
|                               | (same as for M <sub>MWD</sub> )   | ZX: 0.968 to 0.995 - PASSED at all levels          |             |  |  |  |

### Summary

- Ørsted's presentation at WindEurope's Technology Workshop (June 2023) reported a difference in performance between the ZephIR 300 and the ZX 300

   it should be noted that the firmware versions are different and span several years of development
- ZX Lidars continually works on enhancements to retain very high data availability whilst maintaining accuracy within the best practice class. All major firmware changes are delivered in consultation with Independent Engineer DNV
- It has been suggested that ZX customers would benefit from a better understanding of the impact of software changes. Agreed!



**ZX**Lidars