

# Improvement of ILM calculation by pre-processing of the acquired data



○Wakana IGARASHI Kanagawa Institute of Technology, Japan Reina MUTO Kanagawa Institute of Technology, Japan Daiki KURIHARA The University of Notre Dame, USA Masafumi YAMAZAKI The University of Notre Dame, USA Ken'ichi IWAI KOMAIHALTEC Inc., Japan Hirotaka SAKAUE The University of Notre Dame, USA Muhammad S. Virk The Arctic University of Norway Shigeo KIMURA Kanagawa Institute of Technology, Japan

### Introduction



 $\rightarrow$ IceLossMethod

#### About Tiksi

- A city facing the Arctic Sea of the Russian Federation
- Average temperatures are below freezing and cold regions

Climate of Tiksi

	Wind speed [m/s]	Average	5.4
		Maximum	37.2
	Ambient temperature [°C]	Average	-8.7
		Maximum	27.4
		Minimum	-35.6

Nacelle

Tower

Participated in a wind turbine operation project at Tiksi

Necessary to evaluate the effects of icing on production losses

- An open source code
- Need only standard data
- Applicable in any wind turbines

# Specifications of the Tiksi wind turbine & the ice detector

#### Wind turbine type 3-bladed upwind type Blade 300 kW Rated power Cut-in wind velocity 3 m/s Hub 25 m/s Cut-out wind velocity Hub height 41.5 m Blade length 16.5 m Nacelle - On the nacelle -Ultrasonic Anemometer Cup Anemometer Wind direction Ice Detector Sensors Tower Precipitation Sensor(Only No.2) Vibrometer - Base -Thermometer Hydrometer

Specification of the wind turbine



Normalize the natural frequency of the aluminum stretched around it

Calculated the effect of icing by IceLossMethod and ice detector

#### The result of IceLossMethod and the analysis with the ice detector



- Icing duration of Ice detector is taken as reference because the ice detector detects actual ice
- The results of IceLossMethod is greatly lower than Ice detector

#### IceLossMethod underestimate the effect of icing

# Result of IceLossMethod



•	Standard production
×	Lost production due to icing
×	Stops due to icing
×	Over production due to icing
	Power curve by warm season data
	10 percenttile value (icing judgment value)
	90 percentile value

#### <u>IceLossMethod</u> <u>underestimates</u>

- Applicable for icing loss in any wind turbines as long as sufficient data
- The only standardized way to investigate the impact of icing on wind turbines

Objective

Aim to improve the accuracy of IceLossMethod by processing the data

### **Causes of underestimation**



#### Calculate non-iced output curve with warm season data

 $\rightarrow$  The accuracy of IceLossMethod depends on the degree of scattering of the data acquired in the warm season data

Warm season data : temperature is higher than 3°C



Perform pre-processing to remove deviated data

#### How to remove the deviated data



- Some data cannot generate power as usual
- Data is removed in order from the data with the largest gap
- Remove deviated data until all data is within 5-20% above and below the approximation formula

### How to remove the deviated data



+10% of output curve

Change this line to  $\pm 5$ ,  $\pm 10$ ,  $\pm 15$ , and  $\pm 20\%$ 

- Some data cannot generate power as usual
- Data is deleted in order from the data with the largest gap
- Remove deviated data until all data is within 5, 10, 15, and 20% above and below the approximation formula

### The feature of deviated data

<u> </u>	<b>.</b>							
	Ultrasonic relative wind direction 3 seconds average[°]			Ultrasonic relative wind direction				
				30 seconds average				
	average	minimum	maximum	deviation	average	minimum	maximum	deviation
2019/6/11 12:35	12.271	-18.9	49	14.756	11.867	-12.9	34	12.199
2019/6/16 11:40	3.875	-22.9	63	19.352	4.697	-17.9	47	17.862

Because of the turbulency of wind

(1)Relative wind direction deviation is big

#### 2 The change in the generator speed is large in 5 minutes

		Control	Control zone[-]		Power [kW]			
	average	minimum	maximum	deviation	average	minimum	maximum	deviation
2019/7/20 10:55	2.517	1	3	0.51	135.674	58.146	165.534	24.866
2019/7/23 8:05	2.489	1	3	0.597	127.306	45.208	163.486	36.814

#### The reason is not yet clear

The output may be low for a reason other than the wind speed



# The result of Icing duration and production losses after pre-processing



 $\pm$  5, 10, 15 and 20% of output curve

# The result of Icing duration and production losses after pre-processing



- Icing duration and production losses were increased at any percentage compared to original data
- 5 and 10% were close to the value of the icing detector, which is considered to be reliable

Underestimate is solved by pre-processing

2019.4~2020.3

# Production losses and warm season data as % of original data



12

# The results of pre-processing



# Conclusion

Incorporating new ideas into the ILM approach has improved the accuracy of icing duration calculations. Some findings and ideas are as follows.

- The duration of the icing events calculated by the ILM approach was evaluated by the comparison with the analytical results of the ice sensor outputs. As a result, it turned out that the ILM approach would tend to underestimate the duration.
- Since the criterion of the icing events in the cold season are determined by the power data in the warm period in the ILM approach, the accuracy of analysis for the icing duration and the energy loss depends strongly on the degree of scattering of the data acquired in the warm period.
- The process of removing data with a large deviation from the expected power at the respective wind speeds in the warm season prior to conducting the ILM analysis contributed greatly to improved calculation of the icing duration.



