Using probability bounding to improve decision making for offshore wind planning in industry

Matthias C. M. Troffaes Durham University, UK Behzad Kazemtabrizi Durham University, UK Andrew Smallbone Durham University, UK Henna BainsAndrew JenkinsKinewell Energy, UKKinewell Energy, UK

Paul McKeever Offshore Renewable Energy Catapult, UK



	Offshore substation	Offshore cable	Onshore cable	Onshore substation	
Offshore wind farm	Offshore Transmission System				Onshore Grid

Offshore wind asset and operations planning

decisions

- amount & type of components (platforms, cables, transf's, ...)
- Iocation/layout of components
- export AC or DC
- level of redundancy
- batteries, hydrogen, ...

uncertainties

- component reliability
- \blacktriangleright wind \rightarrow energy produced
- environmental conditions $\rightarrow \text{maintenance}$
- critical: subsea export cable

How to solve this planning problem?

cross discipline academic expertise engineering ↔ mathematics
industry understands key economic drivers
importance of communication academia ↔ industry industry ↔ end users
end user considerations
visualisation
simple yet accurate language
represent their uncertainty
explain uncertainty in outcome

Engineering

- develop new technologies
- engineering system design
- data processing

(1)

Mathematics

- mathematical modelling, methodology
- optimization, algorithms
- uncertainty quantification

ORE Catapult

bridge academia and industry
 insight in key industry problems
 project steering

Kinewell Energy

software and user interface design

- engineering expertise & integration
- commercialisation, sales, investment

Imprecise probability

can represent end user severe uncertainty in failure and repair rates of critical

Model

D represents full set of planning designs
 O represents out of model persenters

- $\triangleright \Theta$ represents set of model parameters
- ▶ uncertainty described via expectation given $d \in D$ and $\theta \in \Theta$
- typically aim to maximize net present value (or similar) [2, 3]:

$$\mathsf{NPV}(d, \theta) = \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \frac{\mathsf{INCOME}_t - \mathsf{CAPEX}_t - \mathsf{OPEX}_t}{(1+r)^t} \middle| d, d
ight)$$

► *T* is lifetime, *r* is discount rate



- components such as subsea cables [3]
- \blacktriangleright performed by sensitivity analysis on model parameters θ
- use interval dominance on NPV (net present value) [1]

 $\underline{\mathsf{NPV}}(d) = \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathsf{NPV}(d, \theta) \quad \overline{\mathsf{NPV}}(d) = \max_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathsf{NPV}(d, \theta)$ $D^* = \left\{ d \colon \overline{\mathsf{NPV}}(d) \ge \max_{d' \in D} \underline{\mathsf{NPV}}(d') \right\}$

- why interval dominance and not maximality or E-admissibility?
- fast computation
- handles act-state dependence [1]
- can visualize lower and upper expectations
- intuitive: 'optimal choice depends on risk appetite'
- challenges in user interface design
- how to elicit ranges for sensitivity analysis?
- visualization of outcome of analysis of a potentially large numbers of designs

Decision support tool: KDOTS

- developed by Kinewell Energy with support of Durham & ORE Catapult, funded by TIGGOR (NTCA)
- integrated into offshore infrastructure optimisation software (SaaS)



 importance of documentation and clear consistent language HVAC 1 HVAC 2 HVDC 1 HVDC 2 Hydrogen

(2)

(3)

Configuration of export system technology

[1] Henna Bains, Offshore transmission systems planning under severe uncertainty, Ph.D. thesis, Durham University, 2021.

[2] Henna Bains, Ander Madariaga, Behzad Kazemtabrizi, and Matthias C. M. Troffaes, *The impact of offshore transmission regulatory regimes on technology choices*, CIGRE Symposium, 2019.

[3] Henna Bains, Ander Madariaga, Matthias C. M. Troffaes, and Behzad Kazemtabrizi, *An economic model for offshore transmission asset planning under severe uncertainty*, Renewable Energy **160** (2020), 1174–1184.



