



Critical Review of Floating Support Structures for Offshore Wind Farm Deployment

Mareike Leimeister^{1,2}, Athanasios Kolios¹, Maurizio Collu¹

¹ Cranfield University, Energy and Power, United Kingdom

² Fraunhofer Institute for Wind Energy Systems IWES, Germany

Abstract

Current situation: - numerous deep water sites with promising wind potential → floating structures possible, bottom-fixed systems not;
 - large diversity in floater concepts → fast achievement of high technology readiness levels (TRLs) inhibited.

Thus, different floating support structures are assessed with respect to their suitability for offshore wind farm deployment. Based on a survey, a multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) is conducted, using the technique for order preference by similarity to ideal solution (TOPSIS). With the individual scores of ten floater categories, considering the weighting of ten specified criteria, suitable concepts are identified and potential hybrid designs, combining advantages of different solutions, are suggested.

Methodology

Set of alternatives		Set of criteria	
I. spar - standard	common spar floater type	1. (-) LCOE	rate of return, power density, mooring footprint, dimensions, turbine spacing
II. spar - advanced	improved spar (horizontal transport, short draft, vacillation fins, delta configuration)	2. (+) volume production	ease to manufacture, fabrication time, onshore fabrication, modular structure
III. semi-sub - standard	common semi-sub floater type	3. (+) ease of handling	weight, assembly, transport, installation, decommissioning, equipment, dimensions
IV. semi-sub - advanced	improved semi-sub (braceless, active ballast, wave-cancelling, inclined columns)	4. (+) durability	redundancy, corrosion resistance, fatigue resistance, aging
V. barge floater	common barge floater type	5. (+) flexibility	site, water depth, soil, environment
VI. TLP - standard	common TLP floater type	6. (+) certification	time & ease to achieve, TRL
VII. TLP - advanced	improved TLP (redundant mooring lines, gravity anchors)	7. (+) performance	deflections, displacements, nacelle acceleration, dynamic response
VIII. hybrid floater	mixed spar, semi-sub, TLP floater types	8. (-) maintenance	frequency, redundancy, costs, downtime
IX. multi-turbine floater	floater supporting more than one wind turbine	9. (+) time-efficiency	assembly, transport, installation, maintenance, decommissioning
X. mixed-energy floater	floater for wind & wave/tidal/current/photovoltaic utilisation	10. (-) mooring requirements	number & length of lines, need of flexible cables (motions), anchor system costs

Results

Survey: - scores (1: least applicable - 5: most applicable) assigned for each criterion to each alternative;
 - weights (1: not important - 5: important) represent importance of each criterion with respect to offshore wind farm deployment.
 Analysis using TOPSIS: - scores yield a decision matrix, which is - after normalisation - multiplied with the weight vector;
 - final ranking of alternatives based on their closeness/distance to the positive/negative ideal solution (table 1);
 - comparison of TRL wrt to potential to scale up to mass production for multi-MW wind farm deployment (figure 1).

Table 1: Weights, scores, ranks				Figure 1: TRLs wrt potential to scale up to mass production for multi-MW wind farm deployment			
Weight	Score	Rank	TRL	Description (based on Horizon 2020 https://ec.europa.eu/)	Figure 1: TRLs wrt potential to scale up to mass production for multi-MW wind farm deployment		
1. 4.26	I. 0.651	2	(0)	idea for an unproven concept	9		
2. 3.43	II. 0.763	1	1	basic principles observed	8		
3. 2.91	III. 0.532	5	2	technology concept formulated	7		
4. 3.24	IV. 0.600	3	3	experimental proof of concept	6		
5. 2.33	V. 0.549	4	4	validation in lab	5		
6. 3.40	VI. 0.319	10	5	validation in relevant environment	4		
7. 3.38	VII. 0.335	9	6	demonstration in relevant environment	3		
8. 3.59	VIII. 0.425	7	7	demonstration in operational environment	2		
9. 3.02	IX. 0.436	6	8	system complete and qualified	1		
10. 3.10	X. 0.390	8	9	proven in operational environment	0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9		

Conclusions

- Assessment of ten floating wind turbine support structures wrt ten criteria focusing on wind farm deployment;
 - MCDA based on survey results and TOPSIS method;
 - Costs are still most important and advanced spars have the highest potential to develop for multi-MW wind farm deployment.