

Kattegat

Site Wind Conditions Assessment

TITHAN

2 3 S E P T E M B E R 2 0 2 4

 T

Kattegat, Site Wind Conditions Assessment

R E C I P I E N T

Energinet Tonne Kjærsvej 65 DK-7000 Fredericia

Attn. Guillaume Mougin

D A T E 23 September 2024

P R E P A R E D B Y

EMD International A/S Niels Jernes Vej 10 DK- 9220 Aalborg T: + 45 69 16 48 50 E: emd@emd.dk

PRINCIPAL CONSULTANTS

Karina Bredelle Thomas Sørensen Lasse Svenningsen Stefan Condurache EMD-DK

A P P R O V E D B Y

Wiebke Langreder Troels Pedersen EMD-DK

D O C U M E N T

[240821_23406_B_KB_4](#page-2-0)

C L A S S I F I C A T I O N

Commercial in confidence

DOCUMENT REVISIONS

KEY TO DOCUMENT CLASSIFICATION

L I A B I L I T I E S

According to contract.

Objective

The objective of this technical report is to present the findings of the Site Wind Conditions Assessment conducted by EMD International A/S for Energinet in relation to the Kattegat offshore wind farm project in the Kattegat Sea.

Background

The Danish Energy Agency has tasked Energinet with undertaking site wind conditions assessments for the development of five Offshore Wind Farm (OWF) areas within the Danish Exclusive Economic Zone. The site wind conditions assessments are a part of the technical basis for future public tenders on the development of the projects. The OWF areas are divided into three lots, respectively in the Kattegat, Baltic and North Sea. In the Kattegat Sea, two OWF projects are considered, Hesselø South and Kattegat, the later being the subject of this report.

Methodology

The site wind condition assessment is an early assessment after 8 months of onsite measurements using floating LiDAR systems (FLS) in the Kattegat OWF areas and delivers the early site wind condition parameters according to IEC 61400-1 [1], IEC 61400-3-1 [2] and in addition refers to Eurocode EN1991- 1-4 [3] including the Danish annex [4], DS 472 ed.2 [5] and IEC 61400-15-1 [6].

The site wind conditions assessment is intended to serve as basis for:

- Preliminary site-suitability analysis of the Wind Turbine Generator (WTG) and Rotor Nacelle Assembly (RNA)
- Front-End Engineering and Design (FEED) of offshore support structures for WTGs and other structures.

The report includes a presentation and analysis of onsite data from one floating LiDAR buoy (WS199) deployed on site as well as secondary measurements surrounding the site and sourced for this purpose. A wind model has been created for the site through long-term correction of 8 months of onsite LiDAR data with 22 years of EMD-WRF mesoscale data (labelled "Primary Wind Model").

The Primary Wind Model has been backed up by three alternative models, based on data from the Hesselø South floating LiDAR (HS-1), Hesselø floating LiDAR (H1) and Læsø meteorological mast (M1). The three alternative models are in good agreement with the Primary Model on mean wind speed for the site, given the distance from the Kattegat Wind Farm and the data quality.

Due to seasonal bias, the short measurement period and the nature of the LiDAR measurements, the site condition parameters are supported by data from secondary sources.

Calculations are done in windPRO 4.0, developed by EMD International A/S.

Results

The site condition parameters are summarized i[n Table 1.](#page-4-0)

Table 1. Summary table of site wind condition parameters at the three selected positions for the Kattegat OWF area. All values refer to 150 m height above sea level (ASL).

*Turbulence values at other wind speeds can be found in [Appendix G](#page-231-0)

The datasets produced by this study are available in a data package prepared for Energinet.

Climate change effects on the wind conditions assessed above has been investigated. From this investigation it appears that wind speed is likely unaffected, the models are inconclusive concerning extreme wind speed while there is clear indication of an up to 2˚C increase in temperature for the medium term (2041-2060), resulting in an 0.7% decrease in air density. An increase in precipitation is expected for both near and medium term.

EMD recommends updating this site wind conditions parameter assessment once the measurement campaign has been concluded.

EMD recommends supporting the turbulence assessment with additional local turbulence measurements from suitable sources, preferably cup anemometer measurements, in the Kattegat Sea.

Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

1 Introduction

EMD International A/S has been tasked by Energinet to provide a site wind condition assessment for the Kattegat offshore wind farm.

The objectives of the site wind condition assessment are outlined in the Scope of Services Site Wind Conditions Assessment [7] provided by Energinet and aims for a site wind condition assessment adequate for a preliminary site-suitability analysis for the Wind Turbine Generator (WTG) and Rotor Nacelle Assembly as well as input for Front-End Engineering and Design (FEED) of offshore support structures for WTGs and other structures.

The parameters for the wind condition assessment are listed in [Table 2](#page-17-1) and are defined according to IEC61400-1 [1], IEC 61400-3-1 [2] and IEC 61400-15-1 [6].

Table 2. List of Site Wind Conditions Parameters.

The site wind condition parameter list is populated through a wind condition and resource assessment based on onsite floating LiDAR data from one location and mesoscale WRF data. This model is supported by a selection of secondary stations located within meaningful distance of the Kattegat wind farm area.

Beside the present report, measurement data as well as mesoscale WRF and long-term corrected datasets are provided in the form of time series text files.

All elevations throughout are referred to as Above Sea Level (ASL) with the reference sea level being the mean sea level.

A naming convention is used for turbulence conditioned on wind speed where 'mean turbulence' is the mean of 10 min wind speed standard deviations (σ) within a wind speed bin. The 'standard deviation of turbulence' is the standard deviation across 10 min wind speed standard deviations (σ*σ*) in a wind speed bin. Both these quantities (mean and standard deviation of turbulence) may be normalized to the wind speed of the wind speed bin in question, in this case the normalized turbulence is referred to as Turbulence Intensity (TI), either mean or standard deviation.

2 Site Description

Kattegat project area is located 20 km east of the Djursland peninsular, Denmark, protruding into Kattegat Sea [\(Figure 1\)](#page-19-1).

The Kattegat OWF area is defined through a shape file provided by Energinet. The shape file is provided as a deliverable.

Closest distance to land from the OWF area is 15 km to the west (Grenå Port).

The neighbouring wind farm, Anholt, is located adjacent to the Northen part of the Kattegat II OWF project. Additional wind farms are planned in this part of the Kattegat Sea, such as the Hesselø South OWF, planned about 15 km to the east.

Figure 1. Regional map with location of the Kattegat OWF area together with Hesselø South OWF area and the existing Anholt OWF (in blue).

The wind farm area is located in open water with sufficient distance to any shoreline (minimum 15 km). The effect of the shorelines on the wind speed gradient across the site will therefore be better represented by mesoscale effects. For this reason, no further terrain assessment has been conducted. The water depth within the OWF area is between 17 and 38 m.

Figure 2. Bathymetric map of Kattegat OWF area (source: EMODnet – 115 m grid resolution)

3 Overview of Available Wind Data

A host of wind data measurements was considered for the wind condition and resource analysis. Each source is listed in [Table 3](#page-22-0) and [Table 4](#page-23-0) and considered in the following.

The onsite Floating LiDAR System (FLS), commissioned by Energinet, is the primary source of information and is used for the primary wind model. The data are described in section [4.](#page-26-0)

For the validation of the primary wind model, data from Hesselø South (HS-1), Hesselø (H1), and Læsø met mast (M1) are used.

For the turbulence model, data from FINO2 and FINO3 offshore met masts are used.

Meteorological stations data from the Danish Meteorological Institute (DMI) [8] and the Swedish Meteorological and Hydrological Institute (SMHI) [9] are primarily used to verify the long-term variation in wind climate or the temperature profile for the site. Some of the stations included are done so with only limited contribution to the study as far as data quality permits.

A number of other meteorological stations were considered, but not used in this study as it was found that their data were of insufficient quality, not representative for the site or redundant.

[Table 3](#page-22-0) lists all the meteorological stations suggested by Energinet.

The measurement locations are plotted on a map in [Figure 3.](#page-24-0)

All secondary data used in this study are presented in Appendix A.

Table 3.List of considered measurement stations, with measured heights and period. In bold are the used measurements stations.

Table 4. Coordinates and data provider of the considered measurement stations (geographic coordinates, datum WGS84).

Figure 3. Location of considered measurement stations in Kattegat Sea, with used stations in green and discarded ones in red (black line: Kattegat wind farm area).

Figure 4. Location of measurement stations finally used for siting parameters (black line: Kattegat wind farm area).

4 On-Site Floating LiDAR Measurements

Energinet has commissioned one floating LiDAR measurements on site, operated by Fugro Norway AS. The deployment location is labelled KG-1-LB and the only buoy deployed on this location is WS199. The campaign was commenced on 21/07/2023 and it is still ongoing.

EMD has received documentation as listed i[n Table 5.](#page-27-1)

EMD has received measurement data as monthly batches covering the period 21/07/2023 to 21/03/2024, hence covering consecutive 8 months.

No motion correction is applied. Averaging over 10 minutes is considered sufficient to remove motion effects on mean wind speed data. This was verified during pre-deployment verification. The detrimental effects of motion on the turbulence measurements remain.

EMD has received documentation and measurements beyond those mentioned here, but those are not used directly in this study.

Table 5. List of documentation received on the Floating LiDAR Systems (FLS).

4.1 Buoy Positions

The buoy deployment positions are reported by Fugro as listed i[n Table 6.](#page-28-0)

The buoys positions are recorded in the logged data series. EMD has plotted a section of these and can confirm that the drift of the buoys is within 100 m [\(Figure 5\)](#page-28-1). For all practical purposes the buoys can be considered stationary.

During the period 18/02/2024 to 22/02/2024, the buoy was recovered, repaired and redeployed. [Figure](#page-29-1) [6](#page-29-1) presents the logged positions after redeployment and confirms that the general locations of measurement are unchanged.

Figure 5. Position logs before recovering (18 February 2024) confirm a drift within 100 m (black circle) of stated location (black "X").

Figure 6. Position logs after redeployment (22 February 2024) confirm that the locations are unchanged (black "X").

4.2 Instrumentation

The SEAWATCH Wind LiDAR buoy (SWLB) and instrumentation is described in the measurement plan [11]. In the following, only instruments relevant for the analysis of the site wind conditions are described.

4.2.1 LiDAR

The LiDAR mounted on the buoy is a ZX300M LIDAR from ZX Lidars Ltd. This LiDAR model is classified by DNV [16] and has reached Stage 3 maturity [17].

The LiDAR (ZX1741) was verified at the Pershore, UK, an onshore test site operated by DNV-GL [14].

Once mounted on the buoy, the LiDARs was verified again by DNV at Frøya Norway against a groundmounted onshore LiDAR of the brand ZephIR ZX300 [18].

The information from the classification and the verification is used to assess the measurement uncertainty of the LiDAR.

The LiDAR window is located at the top of the buoy and is as such elevated above sea level. This difference is compensated for in the provided data files, so that the stated height is height above sea level, not height above buoy.

4.2.2 Wind Direction

The Fugro buoys are equipped with three different wind direction sensors:

- A magnetic compass that indicates the wind direction relative to magnetic north.
- The Differential GPS (DGPS) system that provides wind direction relative to true north.
- A wind direction signal from the LiDAR meteorological station.

The DGPS is the primary source for wind direction data. If the DGPS is unavailable, the magnetic compass is used as a backup. The LiDAR met station's signal serves as the third option for measuring wind direction. To ensure accuracy and resolve any potential 180-degree direction ambiguities, the data are compared with readings from the Gill wind sensor. Consequently, the wind direction data from the buoys should be interpreted as relative to true north.

4.2.3 Additional Instrumentation

The Fugro buoys are equipped with additional meteorological instruments, including the Gill WindSonic ultrasonic wind sensor package, a Vaisala PTB330A air pressure sensor, and a Vaisala HMP155 sensor for measuring air temperature and humidity. Details of these specifications are outlined in reference [10].

Air pressure readings are taken at actual sea level. Measurements of temperature, humidity, wind speed, and direction are conducted at a height of 4.1 meters above sea level. However, as they are not used for shear or wind model analysis, they are assigned a standard height of 4.0 m by EMD.

The air temperature data is used for the assessment of site temperature and air density.

4.3 Operation History

The measurement campaign started on 21/07/2023. Fugro has submitted event logs tracking faults and flaws of the buoy [12]. Of these, only two events have had impact on the LiDAR data:

- The LIDAR stopped data collection for two days starting on 24/01/2024 due to abrupt input power outage.
- The buoy had been recovered for repairs on 18/02/2024 and redeployed on 22/02/2024. Therefore, the dataset has a 2-day gap due to service. EMD has verified and confirmed that the buoy was redeployed to the same location.

Figure 7. Timeline chart of buoy deployment on Kattegat site (KG-1-LB). Buoy ID (WS199) is indicated, green color marks provided data, orange color marks data gaps.

4.4 Post-Processing of Data

4.4.1 Quality Control and Filtering Performed by Fugro

Fugro has provided some information on the post-processing of the LIDAR data [11]. ZX LiDARs typically equip their instruments with a standard data filter, known as industry filter, designed to ensure the acquisition of high-quality data by eliminating data points that have a low signal-to-noise ratio. Fugro has disabled the industry data filter on the LiDAR data and has implemented a simpler filtering algorithm [10]. The processing of the LiDAR data by Fugro involves the following steps:

- Removing values outside of those times where the system is deployed at the target position.
- Check that data was saved for all 10-min intervals. Out of the 36-37 data packages produced every 10 minutes, a minimum of 9 packages (25%) are required to qualify as a valid measurement.
- Check for duplicates measurements.
- Removing out of range values (e.g. speed below 0.001 m/s and above 58 m/s, wind direction above 360˚)
- Apply 180˚ ambiguity fix on LiDAR wind directions using Gill directions.

Beyond the 9-data-package filter already provided by Fugro, EMD has determined that increasing the threshold for the number of data packets does not enhance the quality of the data. Therefore, no additional filtering based on packet count has been conducted.

The data from Fugro were organized into monthly files:

- Wind speed, wind direction and turbulence data were supplied in files named "KG-1- LB_M0x_WindSpeedDirectionTI.csv".
- The package counter information was supplied in files named "KG-1-LB-LB_M0x_Status.csv".
- Temperature, humidity and pressure data was supplied in files named "KG-1- LB_M05_MetOceanData.csv".

It is understood that this setup is identical to the verification setup and that the verification is therefore valid with these filter settings.

4.4.2 Quality Control and Filtering Performed by EMD

EMD has conducted a qualitative, manual filtering process by comparing the LiDAR data with several mesoscale-derived datasets (EMD-WRF and NORA3). Data points where wind speed and direction substantially differ from these datasets have been excluded. Although the industry-standard filter was disabled, which may have allowed some faulty data points to pass through Fugro's simpler filtering, EMD has found that the overall quality of the dataset is good, with only a few such discrepancies identified.

Typical anomalies identified in the dataset include instances of peak wind speeds at great heights (over 130 meters) that occur for very brief periods and are not consistent with the wind speed and shear observed at lower altitudes. These discrepancies were specifically targeted during the manual filtering process to ensure the reliability of the dataset.

Figure 8. Example of short bursts of high wind speed at tall height disconnected from wind speed at lower height. Buoy WS199.

According to Fugro reports [11], the primary sensor for wind direction is measuring relative to true north. EMD has compared the wind direction signal against mesoscale derived dataset (EMD WRF) and finds the average difference within 1° at equivalent heights. EMD therefore finds the wind direction data correct with no need for adjustment.

However, at very low wind speeds, some remnants of the 180-degree ambiguity in wind direction measurements persist. Given the high uncertainty of wind direction at these low speeds, EMD has decided not to make any corrections to these data.

4.4.3 Recovery Rate and Data Substitution

With the industry filter disabled, the data recovery rate for the LiDAR measurements is substantially higher than is sometimes seen with ZX LiDAR instruments. Notably, the data recovery rates decrease with increasing height above sea level (ASL), and these rates are detailed i[n Table 9.](#page-35-1) Additionally, a small data recovery loss is still experienced due to the applied filtering.

To address some of the data loss, data substitution procedures were implemented: one based on measured shear on the Kattegat LIDAR (KG-1-LB), referred to as "shear repair" and another using data from Hesselø South LIDAR (HS-1), referred to as "horizontal repair". The shear repair procedure is prioritized over the horizontal repair due to its expected lower uncertainty.

The shear data substitution is based on a shear matrix created from the surrounding heights. Which height are used to create the shear matrix for each repair are listed i[n Table 9.](#page-35-1) The shear matrix is applied to the source height, also listed in below tables, to produce a synthesized dataset. An example of a shear matrix is presented i[n Table 7.](#page-34-0)

The synthesized data fills in gaps and replaces disabled data for wind speed and direction in the recorded dataset. However, the Turbulence Intensity (TI) signal is not reconstructed; instead, it is simply copied from data at a lower height.

The horizontal repair involves transferring data between the two LiDAR datasets (at KG-1 and HS-1) at the same measurement heights using a sectorial linear regression function based solely on original data (data generated through the shear repair procedure are not used in these transfers). High correlation between datasets from the two buoy datasets increase confidence in the transferred data [\(Table 8\)](#page-34-1). To prevent distortions due to thermal stability, data transfers occur only between the same heights.

For each data transfer, 360 transfer functions are created for each 1˚ direction bin, using data from a 30˚ sector window. The functions for wind speed are first-order, while those for direction are zero-order functions (constants). The process avoids residual resampling to prevent random scatter. Only wind speed and direction data are repaired, with turbulence intensity data missing in the repaired time steps.

[Table 9](#page-35-1) lists the results of each repair procedure. The 12- and 40-meter heights are repaired only using the horizontal repair procedure, and the outcome of those repairs are not included in the presented table.

Table 7. Example of shear matrix, here for 150 m height ASL at KG-1-LB. Values are shear exponents a, *which are calculated using data from three different height: 130 m, 150 m and 170 m.*

Table 8. Correlation coefficient, r, between KG-1-LB and HS-1 measurements at the equivalent height.

4.5 Data Analysis

EMD has combined the datafiles, forming time series of wind speed, wind direction, turbulence intensity and data package count for each measurement height. For 4 m height, temperature, relative humidity and pressure is added. The signals for maximum wind speed and vertical wind speed are only added to the 150 m height dataset.

4.5.1 Wind Speed

The mean wind speed on the LiDAR measurements is calculated both as arithmetic mean wind speed and as Weibull-derived mean wind speed through a Weibull fit. The Weibull fitting is done in windPRO using an energy conservation condition.

The following table summarizes the resulting wind speeds before and after data substitution.
	PERIODS [MONTHS]	BEFORE DATA SUBSTITUTION	AFTER DATA SUBSTITUTION				
HEIGHT [m]		ARITHMETIC MEAN WIND SPEEDS [m/s]	ARITHMETIC MEAN WIND SPEEDS [m/s]	WEIBULL MEAN [m/s]	$WEIBULL -$ A PARAMETER	$WEIBULL -$ $\mathsf k$ PARAMETER	
4	8	7.76	7.74	7.73	8.72	2.314	
12	8	8.32	8.32	8.29	9.36	2.290	
40	8	9.28	9.29	9.27	10.46	2.281	
80	$\,8\,$	9.93	9.93	9.90	11.18	2.263	
100	8	10.14	10.15	10.13	11.44	2.256	
130	8	10.40	10.41	10.42	11.77	2.246	
150	8	10.54	10.55	10.57	11.94	2.234	
170	8	10.66	10.67	10.71	12.09	2.221	
190	8	10.77	10.78	10.83	12.23	2.210	
220	8	10.92	10.93	10.98	12.40	2.184	
260	8	11.10	11.11	11.16	12.60	2.155	
300	8	11.26	11.27	11.31	12.77	2.114	

Table 10. Weibull parameters of the repaired datasets.

Further details on the directional wind speed and Weibull distribution can be found in [Appendix C.](#page-165-0)

4.5.2 Turbulence Intensity

Standard deviation of wind speed and hence turbulence intensity from LiDAR measurements are not immediately comparable to those of cup anemomters. The standards reffered to in this study do not recognize turbulence intensity mesurements from LiDARs and the observed turbulence data from KB-1 are therefore not used or documented here. They are however included in the datapackage produced as part of the deliverables.

4.5.3 Wind Direction

The wind direction distribution for the 8 months of measurements is presented in [Figure 9.](#page-37-0) There is a rotation of the wind direction clockwise with increasing height of 10.3 degrees from 40 m to 300 m, amounting to a rate of 0.040 degrees/m [\(Figure 10\)](#page-37-1).

The direction distribution for each height can be found in [Appendix C.](#page-165-0)

Figure 9. Directional distribution at selected heights of LiDAR measurements.

Figure 10. Rotation of wind direction relative to 150 m measurements.

There is a minor variation in wind speed across the day with marginally higher wind speed at night and lower wind speed at daytime.

The temperature at the buoy is almost uniform across the day.

Figure 11. Diurnal wind speed variation.

4.5.5 Seasonal Variations

The specific year of measurement has the typical pattern for the region with higher wind speed during winter than during summer.

The temperature at 4 m height varies across the year from a mean temperature in January of 1.7˚C to 17.3˚C in August.

Figure 12. Monthly mean wind speed.

Figure 13. Monthly mean temperature.

4.6 Measurement Uncertainty

Measurement uncertainty of the LiDAR measurement consists of three components:

- Classification uncertainty
- Verification uncertainty
- Data repair uncertainty

The classification uncertainty, giving the maximum expected uncertainty, is obtained from the ZX300 classification document [16] as 1.41% (average at 130 and 135 m height). These heights are the tallest heights reported and are here considered representative of the 150 m measuring height. The classification table is included i[n Appendix B.](#page-163-0)

The verification of the WS199 buoy mounted LiDARs was provided [15]. The test site was at the Frøya, Norway.

In this studies the Key Performance Indicators (KPI) according to the OWA Roadmap [19] are tested and the verification uncertainty is here calculated according the method suggested by the CT/OWA LiDAR Uncertainty Standard Review [20]. All KPI's were successfully fulfilled.

The reference LiDAR at Frøya is also ZX Z300 LiDAR and both reference LiDAR and the buoy mounted LiDARs were verified prior to the verification test at Pershore test site, UK.

The verification uncertainties from the verification reports are included in [Appendix B](#page-163-0) for 140 m and 160 m, the closest heights to 150 m. The average of the two uncertainty assessments is used. Verification uncertainty is calculated by frequency weighting the uncertainty at each wind speed. For both 140 m and 160 m this uncertainty is 1.98%, hence the average of the two heights is also 1.98%.

The uncertainty from the vertical data repair is found by assuming a 20% uncertainty on the wind speed change from source to destination. With a 1.3% wind speed difference (from 130 m to 150 m), this results in an additional uncertainty of 0.32% on wind speed of the synthesized data. At 150 m, the vertically synthesized data contribute 0.2% of the dataset at KG-1-LB. Resulting vertical data repair uncertainty is 0.001% at KG-1-LB.

For the horizontal data repair at 150 m, a linear regression method is used to transfer data from the HS-1 dataset (Buoy SWLB059/WS190) to the KG-1-LB dataset. The transfer function has a mean bias error of -0.15% and an RMS error on hourly basis of 14%. Using the same procedure as used for assessing LiDAR verification uncertainty (wind speed binned mean deviation), the transfer function uncertainty is assessed to 3.8%. This additional uncertainty applies to the horizontally synthesized part of the dataset at KG-1-LB (4.2%), resulting in an uncertainty component of 0.159%.

Combined, vertical and horizontal data repair contribute 0.16% uncertainty to the measurement dataset at KG-1-LB at 150 m.

The verification and classification uncertainty are combined together with a contribution from the data repair to a combined uncertainty on the LIDAR measurements at 150 m [\(Table 11\)](#page-40-0).

5 Reference Data

Mesoscale data have been obtained for the dual purpose of long-term correcting the onsite measurements and calculating a wind speed gradient across the wind farm area. The period length is limited by the data availability and has afterwards, through a consistency analysis, been curtailed to an appropriate length.

Different mesoscale and re-analysis products have been used as long-term data sources:

- 34 years of ERA5 merged with the preliminary ERA5(T) [21] for the last 3 months, hourly data at a height of 100 m AGL have been obtained. ERA5 is a climate reanalysis dataset developed through the Copernicus Climate Change Service (C3S) and processed/delivered by ECMWF. ERA5(T) is the initial release of ERA5 with availability 5 days behind real time. ERA5 is final data with availability 2-3 months behind real time, hence the merging of ERA5(T) to the ERA5 data for the missing months of the period. The locations are the closest available data node to the buoy.
- 25 years of EMD-WRF On-Demand [22], high resolution mesoscale data have been obtained. The mesoscale model developed by EMD [\(http://www.emd.dk\)](http://www.emd.dk/) has been run for the location of the Kattegat measurements. ERA5(T) data from ECMWF (http://www.ecmwf.int) has been used as the global boundary data set. The temporal resolution is hourly. Similar datasets have been obtained for the locations of selected supporting datasets including the location of a third location for the site parameter analysis.
- 25 years and 1 month of NORA3 [23] data have been obtained. The NORA3 data have been sourced from the Norwegian Meteorological Institute. The NORA3 dataset uses a combination of ERA5 reanalysis data and an extensive surface model database. Instead of a WRF model, the NORA3 model is processed using the HARMONIE-AROME model. The model grid is 3 km, and the temporal resolution is hourly. The closest available node is used. The data is available until 31/01/2024.

The location of the mesoscale reference data around KG-1-LB is presented i[n Figure 14](#page-42-0) and [Table 12.](#page-41-0) All data are extracted through windPRO software.

Figure 14. Location of modelled and mesoscale reference data near KG-1-LB.

6 Long-term Correction

6.1 Review of Reference Data

6.1.1 Long-term Consistency & Selection of Reference Period

The consistency of historical wind reference data is of vital importance when determining the long-term variation of wind speed. EMD has conducted consistency checks on the data sets in order to ensure that these would be suitable for use. These checks aim to identify trends and to establish a suitable baseline period. Two metrics have been used: The Mann-Kendall trend test and production indices.

To avoid trends in the data set, EMD recommends, based on experience, a Mann-Kendall (MK) [24] test value above 0.4, but preferably higher. Analysis of the ERA5(T) dataset using the Mann-Kendall trend test [24] indicated the dataset back to 1994 (30 years) results in a high MK value (1.00) with no trend in the time series. The mean wind speed of the 30-year period 1994-2023 at 100 m of the ERA5(T) dataset is 8.95 m/s. Similar results of high MK value (0.965) and wind speed (8.96 m/s) with a 26-year period (1998-2023) can be observed in [Figure 15.](#page-44-0) Such periods can be qualified as long-term representative and consistent. The mean wind speed for a 22-year period (2002-2023) can also be considered as a proper reference period since it also has a mean wind speed of 8.96 m/s. This period has a lower but still good MK value of 0.778. Using a 22-period allows to include more data sets which wouldn't have been available for a 26 or 30-year period.

An alternative measure of considering consistency in long-term data is to compare windiness index. A windiness index can be constructed by scaling the wind speed to the expected long-term wind speed at the site, applying a power curve to each record and dividing by the average of the records. The index value serves as an energy index value for each period considered. As a starting point, a windiness index was calculated using the period 1994-2023 as baseline, reflecting the long period of data available in the ERA5 dataset. This is plotted in [Figure 15](#page-44-0) as average index of period.

Figure 15. Consistency tests on ERA5(T) data. Period length in years dating back from January 1st, 2024, are analyzed for M-K trend test, mean wind speed and windiness (energy) index of period. Baseline period 2002-2023.

Based on the 30-year base line period, the index of different periods as plotted in [Figure 15](#page-44-0) varies between 99.6 and 100.5 with a median value of 99.9. The 26- and 22-year periods have both an index value of 100.1, which confirms that these periods are consistent with each other and also representative of the long-term energy level.

It can be noted that the variations of mean wind speed and energy index of different periods is rather limited.

Finally, the 22-year period of 2002-2023 is selected as the base line period since it has proven to be consistent, based on wind speed comparison with the 26-year and 30-year period, and for this shorter period the population of available reference data is larger. The 22-year period can therefore be considered representative to the long-term period for even longer periods than 22 years.

Since EMD-WRF data and to some extent NORA3 data are derived from ERA5/ERA5(T), these datasets can be expected to have similar consistency properties. A comparison of the ERA5(T)-based wind index with the EMD-WRF-based wind index confirms that the above conclusions based on ERA5 are also valid for EMD-WRF. The index of the ERA5 data for the period 2002-2023 is indeed perfectly correlating with the index for EMD-WRF data.

Figure 16. Annual windiness (energy) index for ERA5(T) and EMD-WRF data. Baseline period: 2002-2023.

Similar plots are made with six of the secondary ground stations described in Appendix A, where a long continuous time series are available. It is clear that Nakkehoved is very trended and unsuited to verify the trend at Kattegat. The Anholt data have similar problems. There are here three distinct periods: Until 1999, from 1999 to 2012 and after 2012 with larges offsets between each which could mean the mast may have been moved or significantly changed. In any case, it cannot be used to verify the trend at Kattegat. Data from Gniben and Røsnæs are of higher quality, consistency-wise, and while not giving a perfect match, go a long way to confirm the pattern seen in the ERA5(T) data. Data from Väderö show a good match as well, except for the years impacted by data recovery issues. Sletterhage shows a downward trend.

A diagram superimposing the windiness index of progressively longer periods [\(Figure 18\)](#page-47-0), show the trends of ERA5 imitated by Gniben and Røsnæs.

The analysis of windiness indices from secondary data therefore confirms the selection of the period of 2003 to 2023 as long-term representative and consistent.

Figure 17. Annual windiness indices for a selection of secondary meteorological stations.

Figure 18. Progressive windiness index with time. The index of each year is the average of all following years.

6.1.2 Selection of Reference Data

Three potential reference datasets were considered for long-term correction of the LiDAR measurements from KG-1-LB. These are the three datasets described in section [5:](#page-41-1) EMD-WRF, ERA5(T) and NORA3. The data have all been successfully evaluated for use as long-term reference, passing all tests as described above. The correlation r of the data sets with the LiDAR data is equally high for all datasets. NORA3 does not cover the entire measurement period (6.3 concurrent months with the LiDAR). This places it for at a disadvantage compared to the other datasets which are covering the whole measurements period (8 months). Since the measurement period does not cover a full year, priority must be given to datasets allowing for the longest concurrency between the reference and the measured datasets. NORA3 remains useful though as validation of the long-term correction.

The standard deviation on the resulting long-term wind speed across references and three different methodologies is limited to 0.09 m/s on 150 m measurements. There is a good match in predicted longterm wind speed across the selection of reference data and MCP methodologies. The overall best performances are obtained with EMD-WRF data together with the Matrix methodology as described in section 6.2. EMD has decided to proceed with EMD WRF as reference.

The reference dataset is 22 years of EMD-WRF data at KG-1-LB covering the period 01/01/2003 to 31/12/2022. The dataset is available in the data package.

6.2 Correlation between Onsite and Reference Data

6.2.1 Wind Speed and Energy Correlation

The concurrent period of LiDAR data and EMD-WRF data is 8 months (21/07/2023 to 21/03/2024).

The correlation of the wind speed between LiDAR measurements and EMD-WRF data is high.

Correlation coefficient, r, is calculated without averaging. That means that the 10-minute data of the LiDAR measurements are correlated with the hourly value of the reference data with the assumption that the hourly reference data value represents the last 10-minute period of the hour. That may not actually be the case, but the observed scatter is from the 10-minute measurements are important for the following long-term correction.

The wind energy dataset is calculated by applying a power curve (NREL IEA 15 MW reference turbine) to the measured and reference data time series and divide with the average production. This is a measure of what a turbine would produce in a given period relative to average. Correlation is calculated on monthly averages and represent the seasonal variation in production output.

Table 13. Correlation coefficient r between the reference data (EMD-WRF, 150 m) and the onsite floating LiDAR data at 150 m ASL.

6.2.2 Wind Direction Correlation

According to the instrument description from Fugro [11], the wind direction of measurements is referenced to true north with a secondary compass oriented against magnetic north (see sectio[n 4.2.2\)](#page-30-0). Upon verification with EMD-WRF data an average deviation in wind direction was found within -0.8˚, confirming that the measured wind direction is correct.

There is a good match of wind direction roses between the LiDARs (150 m) and EMD-WRF (150 m) concurrent data [\(Figure 19\)](#page-49-0).

The 8 months of concurrent data does not represent a long-term representative directional distribution, as the comparison of EMD-WFR data on the measurement period and on the long-term period shows on [Figure 20.](#page-49-1) For example, the eastern and western sectors have been more frequent during the measurement periods than on the long-term. It must be expected that a long-term correction of data will change the observed directional distribution.

Figure 19. Wind direction roses for the concurrent period of LiDAR (blue) and EMD-WRF (red) data.

Figure 20. Wind direction roses for EMD-WRF data. Light red represents the entire long-term period and deep red the period concurrent with LiDAR measurements.

6.2.3 Long-term Correction and Validation

EMD has several long-term correction methodologies at disposal. A full description of these can be found in the windPRO reference document on Measure-Correlate-Predict (MCP) methods [25].

The relevant windPRO methodologies that will correct for the wind direction are linear regression, neural network and the matrix methods.

The performance of each method is tested through a 24-hour slicing test. In this test, the transfer function is trained of every second day of the data set and used to predict a period consisting of every other day. The metric for comparison is the Mean Bias Error (MBE) on production output, which is comparable to the difference in turbine production in percentage between using measured or predicted data. The result of this test is presented i[n Table 14.](#page-50-0)

A similar test is done using the entire concurrent period, which amounts to a self-test.

Additionally, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test metrics using each method are presented in [Table 14.](#page-50-0) The K-S test measures the maximum difference between measured and predicted wind distribution and is an expression of how well the observed wind distribution is captured by the prediction [25].

The Neural network methods is disqualified since it gives high MBE on the production output. The matrix method generally produces the smallest error and gives satisfying results in predicting the direction distribution and Weibull distribution shape (the K-S test). The matrix method provides the median predicted mean wind speed value.

The long-term correction has been performed using a wind speed/direction matrix. The windPRO Matrix MCP method is described by developing a relationship matrix for the wind speed bins and direction bins between the wind data at the reference and a concurrent period of wind data from the local site and applying this relationship matrix to all the long-term wind data to determine the estimated site data wind climate. This method corrects for changes in both wind speed and direction.

Table 14. Prediction test using a 24-hour slicing method and a self-test using the entire concurrent period. The parameter presented is over-prediction of production in percent. (KG-1-LB - 150 m data).

The artificially generated time series from EMD-WFR and Matrix method represent the long-term wind climate. Time series are generated for all the heights of the LiDAR (12 m to 300 m). The EMD-WFR data at the closest height of a given LiDAR height is used for the long-term correction. Similar to the 150 m data, the EMD-WFR data at 10, 25, 50, 75, 100 and 200 m give good correlation and performance indicators for the long-term correction.

The resulting artificial time series is presented in the following chapter, focusing on the 150 m results.

6.3 Long-Term Wind Climate

6.3.1 Long-term Wind Speed Distribution

The long-term wind speeds for the KG-1-LB buoy in Kattegat OWF are summarized in the following tables. A detailed breakdown of the Weibull parameters can be found in Appendix D.

HEIGTH [m]	PERIOD [Y]	ARITHMETIC MEAN WIND SPEEDS [m/s]	WEIBULL MEAN[m/s]	WEIBULL - A PARAMETER [m/s]	WEIBULL - k PARAMETER
12	22	7.53	7.55	8.52	2.37
40	22	8.44	8.51	9.59	2.46
80	22	9.04	9.13	10.29	2.44
100	22	9.22	9.32	10.52	2.41
130	22	9.47	9.57	10.8	2.36
150	22	9.56	9.64	10.88	2.32
170	22	9.67	9.76	11.02	2.30
190	22	9.75	9.84	11.11	2.28
220	22	9.87	9.95	11.23	2.23
260	22	10.05	10.13	11.44	2.21
300	22	10.19	10.27	11.6	2.17

Table 15. Weibull parameters of the long-term wind data from KG-1-LB (all heights).

6.3.2 Long-term Wind Direction Distribution

The long-term frequency and energy distribution for the long-term corrected LiDAR data from KG-1-LB at 150 m ASL indicate a main wind direction from west to south-southwest.

Frequency (%) - 150.00m - MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix] Energy Rose (%) - 150.00m - MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix]

Figure 21. Left: Wind direction distribution of long-term corrected LiDAR data (KG-1-LB) at 150 m. Right: Energy distribution of long-term corrected LiDAR data (KG-1-LB) at 150 m, both divided in wind speed intervals.

6.3.3 Long-term Diurnal Variations

The diurnal long-term wind speed has similar variations than the measured mean wind speed but adjusted to a lower level for the long-term dataset [\(Figure 22\)](#page-52-0).

Figure 22. Diurnal wind speed, long-term corrected (red) and observed (green), KG-1-LB.

6.3.4 Long-term Seasonal Variations

The long-term seasonal variation of wind speed at 150 m is presented in [Figure 23 a](#page-53-0)nd compared to the actual observations. Whereas the seasonal variation of the measurements is based on 8 months, the seasonal variation of the long-term timeseries is an average of 22 years of data and therefore predictably smoother.

Figure 23. Seasonal variation of long-term corrected dataset (red) and observed dataset at 150 m, KG-1- LB.

7 Validation of Wind Model

7.1 Secondary Models

The wind resource at Position KG-1-LB was assessed through long-term correction of measured LiDAR data. This remains the primary model for the site.

Three secondary models were tested, translating secondary measured data from Hesselø South (HS-1), Hesselø (H1) and Læsø (M1) to the site. The two Hesselø data sets are located relatively close to KG-1- LB further from the coast to the west. The M1 mast is at a greater distance, north of KG-1-LB. These were used to validate the primary wind model at Kattegat OWF. The locations of the secondary data sets are presented in [Figure 24.](#page-54-0)

Figure 24. Location of HS-1, H1 LiDAR buoys and Læsø meteorological mast M1 relative to KG-1-LB LiDAR buoy.

For the validation, the secondary data sets are transferred from their locations to KG-1-LB using the relative differences resulting from the comparison of mesoscale data. This transfer is based on the

assumption that the difference between the two sites can be fully described by the difference observed in mesoscale data.

For each data set, an EMD-WRF dataset was extracted (section [5\)](#page-41-1). The correlation in terms of wind speed, energy content and direction has been analysed for sufficiency. If mismatches are identified, a transfer function has been developed to mitigate the differences.

The datasets are described and adjusted to long-term wind climate in Appendix A.

7.1.1 Hesselø South Floating LiDAR (HS-1)

Based on 8 months of LiDAR measurements on the buoy deployed for the Hesselø South site (HS-1), a 22-year dataset was produced with the same reference period as for KG-1-LB. The height of interest is at 150 m ASL.

The HS-1 buoy is located 35 km east of KG-1-LB buoy [\(Figure 24\)](#page-54-0). The HS-1 and KG-1-LB buoys are exposed differently to the impact of land. Still the HS-1 buoy has the advantages of being relatively close to KG-1-LB, with concurrent wind data, same height of measurements and technology.

For the validation of the wind model for KG-1-LB, the long-term corrected dataset at HS-1 is transferred to the location and height of the buoy following the below-described methodology.

An EMD-WRF dataset was extracted for the HS-1 buoy location (sectio[n 5\)](#page-41-1). The correlation between the HS-1 LiDAR data and EMD-WRF is very high, both on wind speed, monthly energy content and directional distribution as discussed in Appendix A and the EMD-WRF data can therefore be said to capture the wind dynamics very well at HS-1.

Comparing the wind direction distribution between EMD-WRF data at KG-1-LB and EMD-WRF data at HS-1, a difference in directional distribution and particularly energy distribution is noted [\(Figure 27\)](#page-58-0). A transfer function is therefore required to both transfer the directions and the energy content in each direction.

Figure 25. Left: Directional distribution between EMD-WRF at KG-1-LB (green) and EMD-WRF at HS-1(red), 22 years. Right: Energy rose of same two datasets, 22 years.

A translation function is created using linear regression with a translation function for every 1° direction, used data in a +/-15° window, giving a scale and offset on wind speed as well as an offset on wind direction.

This translation function is then applied to the 22-year of long-term corrected 150 m HS-1 data, creating a 22-year dataset at KG-1-LB.

A comparison of directional distribution of transferred HS-1 data at 150 m with long-term corrected KG-1-LB data is presented [Figure 26.](#page-57-0) The match is very good with almost identical wind energy roses.

Figure 26. Comparison of directional distribution of transferred KG-1-LB data (green) with HS-1 (red) (22 years). Left: by frequency, Right: by energy.

The mean wind speed through the steps can be followed in [Table 16.](#page-57-1) The wind distribution and Weibull fit can be found in detail in Appendix F.

Table 16. Mean wind speed through the transfer stages, HS-1 data.

STAGE	ARITHMETIC MEAN WIND SPEED [M/s]
8 months of measured, HS-1, 150 m	10.75
22 years, long-term corrected HS-1, 150 m	9.69
22 years, transferred to KG-1-LB, 150 m	9.64

7.1.2 Hesselø Floating LiDAR (H1)

Based on 12 months of LiDAR measurements on the buoy deployed for the "Old" Hesselø site (H1), a 22 year dataset was produced with the same reference period as for KG-1-LB. The height of interest is at 150 m.

The H1 buoy is located about 41 km east-northeast of KG-1-LB buoy [\(Figure 24\)](#page-54-0). The buoys are differently exposed to the impact of land. Still the H1 buoy has the advantages of covering one full year (although not concurrent to KG-1-LB), and being relatively closed to KG-1-LB, with similar heights of measurements and technology.

For the validation of the wind model for KG-1-LB, the long-term corrected dataset at H1 is transferred to the location and height of the buoy following the below-described methodology.

An EMD-WRF dataset was extracted for the H1 buoy location (section [5\)](#page-41-1). The correlation between the H1 LiDAR data and EMD-WRF is very high, both on wind speed, monthly energy content and directional distribution as discussed in Appendix A and the EMD-WRF data can therefore be said to capture the wind dynamics very well at H1.

Comparing the wind direction distribution between EMD-WRF data at KG-1-LB and EMD-WRF data at H1, a small difference in directional distribution and energy distribution is noted [\(Figure 27\)](#page-58-0). A transfer function is therefore required to both transfer the directions and the energy content in each direction.

Figure 27. Left: Directional distribution between EMD-WRF at KG-1-LB (red) and EMD-WRF at H1(green), 22 years. Right: Energy rose of same two datasets, 22 years.

A translation function is created using linear regression with a translation function for every 1° direction, used data in a +/-15° window, giving a scale and offset on wind speed as well as an offset on wind direction.

This translation function is then applied to the 22-year of long-term corrected 150 m H1 data, creating a 22-year dataset at KG-1-LB.

A comparison of directional distribution of transferred H1 data at 150 m with long-term corrected KG-1-LB data is presented in [Figure 28.](#page-59-0) The match is good but with slight overprediction of the transferred data from H1 in the two main wind sectors (W and WNW).

Figure 28. Comparison of directional distribution of transferred H1 data (red) with KG-1-LB (green) (22 years). Left: by frequency, right: by energy.

The mean wind speed through the steps can be followed in [Table 17.](#page-59-1) The wind distribution and Weibull fit can be found in detail in Appendix F.

7.1.3 Læsø Mast (M1)

Based on 4 years of mast measurements at Læsø offshore met mast (M1), a 22-year dataset was produced with the same reference period as for KG-1-LB (Appendix A). The measurement height of interest is at 62 m ASL.

The location of the M1 mast is about 82 km north relative to the KG-1-LB buoy, as presented in [Figure](#page-54-0) [24.](#page-54-0)

For the validation of the wind model for KG-1-LB, the long-term corrected dataset at M1, 62 m, is transferred to the location and height of the KG-1-LB buoy.

An EMD-WRF dataset was extracted for the M1 mast location (section [5\)](#page-41-1). The correlation between the M1 data and EMD-WRF is very high, both on wind speed, monthly energy content and directional distribution as discussed in Appendix A and the EMD-WRF data can therefore be said to capture the wind dynamics very well at M1.

Comparing the wind direction distribution between EMD-WRF data at M1 and EMD-WRF data at KG-1- LB, shows a difference in directional distribution [\(Figure 29\)](#page-60-0). A transfer function is therefore required to both transfer the directions and the energy content in each direction.

Figure 29. Left: directional distribution between EMD-WRF, 75 m at M1 (green) and EMD-WRF at KG-1- LB (red). Right: Energy rose of same two datasets.

A translation function is thus created using linear regression with a translation function for every 1° direction, used data in a +/-15° window, giving a scale and offset on wind speed as well as an offset on wind direction.

This translation function is then applied to the 22 year of long-term corrected 62 m M1 data, creating a 22-year dataset at KG-1-LB.

A comparison of directional distribution of transferred M1 data at 62 m with long-term corrected KG-1- LB data at 80 m is presented i[n Figure 30.](#page-61-0) The match is reasonably good but with some deviation in the south-southeast sector.

Figure 30. Comparison of directional distribution of transferred M1 data, 62 m (green) with KG-1-LB, 80 m (red) (22 years). Left: by frequency, right: by energy.

The translated data are at 62 m ASL at KG-1-LB need to be extrapolated to 150 m ASL. The obvious way to do this is through a shear extrapolation. This is however not trivial. A shear extrapolation from 62 m to 150 m is far outside the 2/3 ratio set by the MEASNET guideline ([26]).

The shear based on the measurements at KG-1-LB is not optimal because it has a seasonal bias due to 8 months of available data.

The available shear from the floating LiDAR H1 at Hesselø is not used either because it is not expected to be representative of the directional shear distribution on the Kattegat OWF site. Kattegat OWF area is indeed more affected by the coast than at the Hesselø (H1) location.

The alternative is to use a shear based on long-term corrected observations at KG-1-LB. Due to the inherrent random scatter in the matrix MCP function usde in the long-term correction, and the resulting noise in the directional and diurnal shear values, the most robust shear extrapolation was found to be a shear matrix based on long-term corrected data using only seasonal binning. Analysis on the data from the floating LiDAR H1 have proven that the shear based on data obtained by long-term transformation can reproduce the measured sheared with a small discrepancy (0.4% on wind speed, when extrapolating from 70 m to 160 m at H1).

The shear used to extrapolate the 62 m M1 data translated to KG-1-LB from 62 m to 150 m is thus calculated from the long-term data at KG-1-LB from 100 m to 150 m [\(Table 18\)](#page-62-0).

Table 18. Shear by season, based on long-term corrected measurements at KG-1-LB 100 m to 160 m.

The mean wind speed through the steps can be followed in [Table 19.](#page-62-1) The wind distribution and Weibull fit can be found in detail in Appendix F.

Table 19. Mean wind speed through the transfer stages, M1 data.

STAGE	ARITHMETIC MEAN WIND SPEED [M/s]
4 years of measured mean wind speed, 62 m	8.80
22 years, long-term corrected at 62 m	8.98
22 years, transferred to KG-1-LB, 62 m	8.82
22 years, transferred to KG-1-LB, shear extrapolated to 150 m	9.46

7.2 Comparison of Primary Model with Secondary Models

The wind resource at KG-1-LB was assessed through long-term correction of measured LiDAR data. This remains the primary model for the site. Three secondary models were tested, translating measured data from Hesselø South (HS-1), Hesselø (H1) and Læsø (M1) to the site. They cover different directions and distances from the Kattegat OWF and have all advantages and disadvantages as described previously.

The results of these tests are summed up i[n Table 20.](#page-63-0)

The long-term corrected mean wind speeds of the primary model are strongly supported by the secondary models, with a maximum deviation of 1% on the mean wind speed at 150 m ASL, which is far inside the expected uncertainty.

The results from the M1 met mast deviate slightly more when looking at the wind speed distribution [\(Figure 31\)](#page-63-1), mean wind speed per sector [\(Figure 32\)](#page-64-0), frequency distribution [\(Figure 33\)](#page-65-0) , diurnal and monthly variations [\(Figure 34,](#page-65-1) [Figure 35\)](#page-66-0). The difference may well be explained by the distance between M1 and the Kattegat OWF.

The secondary models support the primary wind model, but it is also clear that the primary model is stronger than any of the secondary models. Therefore, only the primary model is submitted in the data package. The frequency distributions and Weibull parameters of the secondary model are submitted in [Appendix E](#page-215-0) and [Appendix F.](#page-222-0)

Figure 31. Wind speed probability function for the four datasets at KG-1-LB position. Primary model (purple), HS-1 model (green), H1 (red) and M1 (blue).

Figure 32. Mean wind speed per direction for the four datasets at KG-1-LB position. Primary model (purple), HS-1 model (green), H1 (red) and M1 (blue).

Figure 33. Directional distribution of the four long-term wind models at KG-1-LB position. Primary model (purple), HS-1 model (green), H1 (red) and M1 (blue).

Figure 34. Diurnal wind speed of the four long-term wind models at KG-1-LB position. Primary model (purple), HS-1 model (green), H1 (red) and M1 (blue).

Figure 35. Seasonal variation of the four long-term wind models at KG-1-LB position. Primary model (purple), HS-1 model (green), H1 (red) and M1 (blue).

7.3 Uncertainty of Primary Wind Model

7.3.1 Measurement Uncertainty

Uncertainty on measurements was discussed in section [4.6.](#page-39-0) The results are summarized in [Table 21.](#page-66-1)

Table 21. Measurement uncertainty.

7.3.2 Long-term Correction Uncertainty

The long-term correction uncertainty consists of components with very low uncertainty (correlation, reference consistency, reference period length) and one component with high uncertainty, which is the measurement period of 8 month. This is therefore the dominant uncertainty with very minor contributions from other components.

Based on [27], the combined long-term correction uncertainty of an 8-month period is of the scale of 5%. The long-term correction changes the wind speed from 8 months to 22 years by 10%. In this context, a high uncertainty is expected.

For the long-term correction three different references (EMD-WRF, ERA5 and NORA3) were tested using four different methods in a sensitivity analysis. The standard deviation on predicted wind speed of these was 0.9%. Alternatively, the range from minimum to maximum resulting wind speed can be used as an indicator of the uncertainty. This range is 2.2% for KG-1-LB.

While this indicates a high level of agreement among references and methodologies, it does not remove the potential for seasonal bias. The references are not entirely independent from each other as they are

We therefore consider an uncertainty on long-term correction of 5% a reasonable though likely conservative value for long-term correction of the primary data from the buoys. This uncertainty will drop significantly when the measurement campaign is complete.

7.3.3 Very Long-term Uncertainty

The future climate uncertainty is the potential difference in mean wind speed of the next 20 years from the past period considered in the wind study. Northern Europe is subject to longwave oscillations meaning that a 20-year operation period can be quite different from the very long-term average. As suggested by [27], we estimate that for a 20-year dataset in this region this uncertainty is 1.5 % on wind speed.

This is supported by [28] who indicate 20-year multidecadal variability amplitude of the Kattegat on yield around 3%. Given a yield to wind speed ratio near unity, this translates well to wind speed and results in an uncertainty of wind speed of 1.5%.

While the reference period applied in this study is 22 years, we do not consider this materially different when considering the conclusions above for a 20-year reference period.

7.3.4 Year-to-year Variability

Based on the annual variation on the EMD-WRF data the inter-annual variability is 4.5% at KG-1-LB. Over a 20-year lifetime this uncertainty is reduced to 1.0%.

7.3.5 Total Uncertainty

The uncertainty components are combined to a total wind speed uncertainty. A total is given for 1- and 20-year periods.

The results from the secondary data provide a standard deviation on the four reported wind speed results for the KG-1-LB location at 0.9%. Due to the horizontal extrapolation distortion and in some cases poorer measurement uncertainty than at the buoy, the uncertainty on the transferred secondary data should be considered higher than on the local data, however the standard deviation of the results from the four different models remain within the uncertainty of the total wind speed uncertainty of the primary model [\(Table 22\)](#page-68-0) and therefore confirms the primary model.

Table 22. Combined uncertainty on long-term wind data. Uncertainty given as one standard deviation wind speed.

To calculate the wind resource for the whole Kattegat OWF area from the primary wind model (longterm corrected LiDAR data), it is necessary to establish a flow model to account for the variation in wind speed distribution across the site. This modelling is used to calculate the wind resource at two additional positions (KG-A and KG-B) within the Kattegat OWF area and a wind resource map for the whole development area.

8.1 WFR Model

Due to the distance from the coast, a mesoscale modelling is most suitable for flow modelling on the Kattegat area. EMD has customized WRF model runs including the wake energy drain from the surrounding existing wind turbines from the Anholt wind farm. This wind farm is located at the closest about 12 km from the northern boundary of the Kattegat area, in North-northwest direction.

The WRF model used is version 4.5 with ERA5 data as the boundary data.

The wind turbines are represented in the WRF model using a Fitch scheme [29] with TKE advection.

A representative year is used as input data to reduce the calculation time, while to a sufficient degree maintaining the correct wind speed level and direction distribution.

The criteria for being a representative year is that the windiness index (production output index) must be close to unity and the wind direction distribution should be close to the long-term distribution. Windiness index is preferred to wind speed index as this ensures that the wind speed distribution in the range producing wakes is representative.

A twenty two-year period, 2002 to 2023 of EMD-WRF data was considered. From this period, 2012 to 2023 was excluded since it corresponds to the time where Anholt OWF was built and in operation. From the remaining period, the year 2004 was selected as representative with a windiness index of 99.4 and a direction distribution close to the 22-year average [\(Figure 36\)](#page-70-0).

- EmdWrf_OD_N56.350_E011.201 KG 1y 2004 (1) 150.00m -- EmdWrf_OD_N56.350_E011.201 KG (1) 150.00m -

Figure 36. Direction distribution of EMD-WRF mesoscale data at KG-1-LB position in 2004 (green) compared to the 22-year period (red).

The WRF run is based on a domain of 200 by 200 km and produces a grid of time series with 1 km resolution, centered on the Kattegat wind farm area.

The temporal resolution of the output time series is 1 hour (internal model steps are of the order of seconds to ensure numerical stability).

The simulation is run for two scenarios: a baseline scenario 1 with no wind turbines, and a scenario 2, with the currently operating wind farm of Anholt.

The relative change in wind speed between the two scenarios are presented i[n Figure 37,](#page-71-0) as the ratio on the average Weibull wind speed at 150 m height ASL between the scenarios.

The impact of the Anholt wind farm on the wind resource is limited. Only the northern part of the Kattegat OWF area is affected. For example, on the KG-B location [\(Figure 37\)](#page-71-0), the calculated mean Weibull wind speed is 0.2% lower when Anholt is included in the modelling than without. The wind speed reduction in direct wake wind directions is of course higher, with a 1.9% lower mean Weibull wind speed in the 330 degrees direction [\(Figure 37\)](#page-71-0). This direction is however not a main wind direction. It must be noted that the mentioned wind speed ratios consider all wind speed bins and is not calculated per wind speed bins. It is expected that the impact of an operating wind farm is larger for the wind speed bins with high thrust curve values (5-20 m/s), and that the relative difference between the modeling with and without the Anholt turbine would then be wind speed dependent. Nevertheless, EMD has deemed that it was not necessary to generate mesoscale modelling by wind speed bin because the impact is small and concerns wind directions with low frequency.

Figure 37. Map of the ratio between Weibull mean wind speed calculated by mesoscale modelling with and without Anholt OWF; left for all wind directions; right: for the most impacted wind direction (330 degrees).

Finally, the mesoscale gradient file including the Anholt OWF is the WFR model used to calculate the wind resource in the project area, as presented in the following sections.

8.2 Wind Resource for Positions KG-A & KG-B

The location of two additional positions (KG-A and KG-B) for siting parameters have been provided by Energinet. The coordinates are presented in [Table 23.](#page-72-0) KG-A is placed about 6 km southwest from the central position of KG-1-LB. KG-B is located about 18 km northeast of KG-1-LB.

Figure 38. Location of the measurement point and additional positions (KG-A, KG-B) for siting parameters within the Kattegat OWF boundaries.

NAME	UTM WGS84 ZONE 32		GEOGRAPHICAL COORDINATES WGS84	
KG-A	633033	6241637	11.149960°E	56.300810° N
KG-B	650360	6258787	11.439540°E	56.449580° N

Table 23. Coordinates for Additional Siting Parameters Positions

For KG-A and KG-B, a long-term time series has been produced for 150 m ASL.

This is achieved through the gradient file method available in windPRO. With this method observed data are moved around the site using a mesoscale gradient file (section [8.1\)](#page-69-0): Weibull A parameter of the Weibull distribution is picked up from the location of the observed data (KG-1-LB) and the prediction location (KG-A and KG-B) and the ratio is applied to the observed time series. A specific ratio is found for each of 12 direction sectors. No change is made to the wind direction data.

The validity of this assumption is tested by comparing the long-term directional distribution of EMD-WRF data for the locations close to KG-1-LB, KG-A and KG-B. There is a marginal difference in wind direction, but small enough to assume that a similar direction distribution is valid.

Figure 39. Comparison of 22 years direction distribution between EMD-WRF Europe + data for locations close to KG-1-LB (red), KG-A (purple) and KG-B (green).

For KG-A and KG-B the resulting time series at 150 m was generated using the long-term corrected time series for KG-1-LB at 150 m and the mesoscale wind gradient.

With this method, a time series can be extracted for any location on the site using the wind data time series and the gradient file. The time series are included as deliverables. The time series for KG-A and KG-B includes wind speed and wind direction for 22 years in an hourly resolution.

The arithmetic mean wind speed and Weibull parameters are for KG-A and KG-B are presented in [Table](#page-74-0) [24.](#page-74-0) Details can be found in [Appendix D.](#page-188-0)

Table 24. Weibull parameters of the long-term wind data, KG-A and KG-B.

8.3 Wind Resource Map

The wind resource map over the Kattegat area is calculated from the long-term corrected measurements at KG-1-LB and the mesoscale gradient calculated by the WFR modelling described above and including the impact of Anholt OWF.

The resulting recalibrated wind resource map with 250 m resolution is presented in [Figure 40](#page-75-0) and provided as a deliverable.

As expected, the wind resource is increasing with the distance to the coast.

Figure 40. Wind resource map for the Kattegat OWF area.

9 Siting Parameters

This chapter outlines the requested siting parameters for assessment of structural integrity of wind turbines in accordance with the relevant design standards: IEC 61400-1 Ed. 4 [1], IEC 61400-3-1 Ed. 1 [2], IEC 61400-15-1 [6], DS 472 Ed 2. [5], and EN1991-1-4 including the Danish Annex DK NA EN1991-1-4 [3] [4].

For siting parameters that require turbine specific information, the following has been assumed.

Table 25. Turbine specific information used for siting parameters.

TURBINE SPECIFICATION	VALUE
Hub height	150 m
Rotor diameter	240 m
Cut-in wind speed	3 m/s
Cut-out wind speed	25 m/s
Wind turbine class	I

9.1 Normal Wind Conditions

Normal wind conditions have been derived in accordance with IEC 61400-3-1 Ed. 1 [2], IEC 61400-1 Ed. 4 [1] and IEC 61400-15-1 [6]. All parameters except for the wind speed distribution have been estimated as omnidirectional characteristic values. This is in line with the IEC 61400-3-1, which allows omnidirectional values to be considered for offshore sites that are far away from the coast where the environment generally exhibits little directional variation.

Due to the site location being offshore, the terrain is classified as "not complex" (terrain complexity factor is 1.0) and the wind flow is assumed without any inclination (flow inclination 0°).

9.1.1 Wind Speed Distribution

The 10-min mean wind speed probability distribution at hub height is modelled by a Weibull distribution for each direction [1]. The distributions are estimated based on long-term corrected data from the LiDAR. Note that the temporal resolution of this data is 1 hour but according to IEC 61400-3-1 the longterm probability distribution of mean wind speed may be assumed to be independent of averaging periods between 10 minutes and 3 hours. The results are summarized in the table below. Mean wind speed is derived from the Weibull distribution. Details can be found in Appendix D.

Table 26. Weibull distribution parameters based on long-term corrected LiDAR data at 150 m ASL, KG-1- LB. Wind speeds are derived from the Weibull distribution.

Table 27. Weibull distribution parameters based on long-term corrected LiDAR data at 150 m ASL, transferred to KG-A. Wind speeds are derived from the Weibull distribution.

Table 28. Weibull distribution parameters based on long-term corrected LIDAR data at 150 m ASL, transferred to KG-B. Wind speeds are derived from the Weibull distribution.

9.1.2 Normal Wind Profile (NWP)

The site-specific normal wind profile is characterised by the mean wind shear power law coefficient (α_c) . According to IEC 61400-1 Ed. 4 [1] the site-specific omnidirectional characteristic wind shear should be evaluated as the energy-weighted average of the sector-wise values.

The repaired 8 months LiDAR dataset was used to calculate the characteristic shear. Two values are offered: A power law coefficient based on heights 130 m, 150 m, and 170 m, the expected hub height range, and, secondly, the shear across to expected rotor range, based on 40 m, 150 m, and 260 m height data. As a full year is not available yet, the shear values are preliminary values. For comparison shear is calculated for the Hesselø floating LiDAR (H1). Here 12 months are available, though for a different year. Hub height range shear is calculated for 120 m, 140 m, 160 m and 180 m. Rotor range shear is based on 40 m, 140 m and 240 m measurement heights. The shear values are consistent with the Kattegat LiDAR measurements. The results are summarised in the table below.

For Position KG-A- and KG-B, the shear from KG-1-LB can be assumed.

Table 29. Site specific omnidirectional wind shear exponent.

WIND PROFILE CHARACTERISTICS.

The observed wind profile at Kattegat is presented as a function of heat flux [\(Table 30\)](#page-80-0). The heat flux is obtained from EMD-WRF data at buoy location. Three distinct zones can be found [Figure 41:](#page-81-0)

- 1. Negative heat flux, typical for stable conditions, with a clear link between shear and heat flux,
- 2. A middle range, typical for neutral condition, with a well-defined shear
- 3. Positive heat flux with a substantial scatter in shear.

The different regimes are summarized in [Table 30.](#page-80-0)

Table 30. Range of observed shear by heat flux, Kattegat

Figure 41. Shear power law coefficient as a function of heat flux at Kattegat.

Stability classes are defined though the Monin Obukhov length, here using three categories as described in [Table 31.](#page-81-1) The 1/L signal in the EMD-WRF data is used to describe stability at Kattegat in [Figure 42.](#page-82-0) Stable conditions are fairly rare and typical for the spring months. Both stable and unstable conditions are suppressed at high wind speed.

Figure 42. Frequency of stability classes as a function of month and wind speed, EMD-WRF at location of KG-1-LB.

Shear as a function of stability (1/L) at Kattegat is presented in [Figure 43.](#page-83-0) It is clear that unstable conditions result in low shear in the range of -0.2 to 0.2 while during stable conditions, the scatter increase, and much higher shear can occur. Note that the 8 months of data exclude the period of most frequent stable conditions (see [Figure 42\)](#page-82-0).

Figure 43. Shear coefficient as a function of stability (1/L), based on KG-1-LB and EMD-WRF data.

At offshore locations, the main driver of the shear coefficient is seasonal rather than diurnal and a plot of rotor radius shear as a function of month [\(Figure 44\)](#page-84-0) fits well with distribution of stability over the year and shear for different stability regimes with higher shear and stability in spring months.

As Kattegat data are only available for 8 months, monthly shear is also plotted for the Hesselø LiDAR buoy (H1). The H1 data was collected during a different year and while it demonstrates the expected difference in shear between summer and winter, it also shows that for individual months the shear can be quite different from year to year. Using the H1 data to adjust the KG-1-LB shear to a full year is therefore problematic and the observed 8-month shear is preferred until a full year of measurements become available.

Figure 44. Monthly shear coefficient α across the rotor at Kattegat (KG-1-LB) and Hesselø (H1).

9.1.3 Normal Turbulence Model (NTM)

TURBULENCE MODEL AND FIT

The normal turbulence model in the IEC 61400-1 [1] standard defines a linear relationship between the characteristic 90% quantile of turbulence ($\sigma_{c,90}$) and wind speed. For offshore sites, this is not representative, due to the Charnock effect, which adds a second order effect to the turbulence increase with wind speed [2]. A special purpose offshore model is therefore considered where the turbulence mean value (σ_{μ}) is modelled as a second order function of wind speed, and the turbulence standard deviation (σ_{σ}) is modelled as a linear function of wind speed. The models are outlined by the equations:

$$
\sigma_{\mu}(u) = A_{\sigma_{\mu}} + B_{\sigma_{\mu}} u + C_{\sigma_{\mu}} u^2
$$
\n(1)

$$
\sigma_{\sigma}(u) = A_{\sigma_{\sigma}} + B_{\sigma_{\sigma}} u \tag{2}
$$

The characteristic turbulence required for structural design can be calculated by combining the two models as [1]:

$$
\sigma_{c,90}(u) = \sigma_{\mu}(u) + 1.28\sigma_{\sigma}(u) \tag{3}
$$

SELECTION OF TURBULENCE DATA

The models and safety factors forming the basis of the IEC 61400-1 and IEC 61400-3-1 are calibrated using turbulence measured by cup anemometers. LiDARs measure turbulence in a different way than cup anemometers, as they represent a volumetric average contrary to the point observation of a cup. No industry standard has yet been established to define corrections of LiDAR turbulence for use in site assessments and loads, although attempts are ongoing as e.g. CFARS. On top of this limitation floating LiDARs are exposed to wave movements which are amplified with increasing height. This movement appears as an additional contribution to the apparent turbulence seen by a floating LiDAR. As a consequence, floating LiDARs are not consistent with the requirements in IEC61400-1 or IEC61400-3 for assessment of turbulence and cannot be used to characterise the site turbulence.

Luckily, far offshore conditions are relatively uniform, at least regionally, which is documented in the highly relevant master thesis [30]. Causes of local variations are mainly due to coastal effects and changes in wave-seabed interaction in areas of shallow water affecting the waves. The closest alternative data sources based on cup anemometry, which are available to this study is the Læsø measurement mast. The Læsø mast is located 80 km north of the Kattegat buoy at sufficient distance from shore, but at shallow water (5 m water depth) extending at least 10 km in all directions around the mast [\(Figure 45\)](#page-86-0). EMD has investigated the turbulence data recorded at 62 m height AMSL and find the turbulence conditions not representative to a deep-water site, like the Kattegat site. For comparison, the Læsø turbulence data are presented in Appendix A.

EMD is in possession of more representative turbulence data for the Kattegat site, but due to confidentiality these data cannot be disclosed.

Instead, a pragmatic solution is found by combining the turbulence model for the North Sea and the turbulence model for the Baltic Sea as reported by EMD for the Site Wind Conditions Assessment, Energy Island North Sea [31] and Site Wind Conditions Assessment, Energy Island Baltic Sea [32].

These two turbulence models are based on data from the FINO3 and FINO2 masts, both of which are located at similar water depth albeit in two different bodies of water[\(Figure 46](#page-87-0) an[d Figure 47\)](#page-87-1).

Figure 45. Plot showing the bathymetry of the Kattegat and the relative positions of the Læsø mast to the Kattegat (KG-1-LB) and Hesselø (HS-1) buoys.

Figure 46. Water depth around the FINO3 mast.

Figure 47. Water depth around the FINO2 mast.

The master thesis [30] documents that the turbulence level at a given height as a function of wind speed is surprisingly uniform and consistent across masts in the entire North Sea, even including the Irish Sea. While the two Site Wind Conditions Assessment reports document a difference between the North Sea and the Baltic Sea, it is a reasonable assumption that the turbulence conditions in Kattegat will form a gradient between the two bodies of water.

FINO3 was the primary source of turbulence information for the Site Wind Conditions Assessment, Energy Island North Sea where it was documented there that the FINO3 turbulence is representative of turbulence conditions in the North Sea. The measurements used for turbulence assessment is at 91 m height AMSL. The FINO3 mast is described in Appendix A. The below presentation of turbulence at FINO3 summarized the findings of the Energy Island North Sea study [31].

FINO2 was the primary source of turbulence information for the Site Wind Conditions Assessment, Energy Island Baltic Sea where it was documented there that the FINO3 turbulence is representative of turbulence conditions in the Baltic Sea. The measurements used for turbulence assessment is at 102 m height AMSL. The FINO2 mast is described in Appendix A. The below presentation of turbulence at FINO2 summarized the findings of the Energy Island Baltic Sea study [32].

FIT OF THE TURBULENCE AT FINO3

As described above, a second-order fit is required to fit the mean turbulence offshore whereas a linear fit is sufficient for the offshore standard deviation of turbulence. According to [2] turbulence may be considered omnidirectional far offshore, which is the setting for the FINO3 data and Kattegat site, hence, the turbulence data are fitted independently of direction.

[Figure 51](#page-93-0) shows the turbulence observations and associated omnidirectional fits for the 91 m level at FINO3. Notice the clear non-linear effects for the mean turbulence due to wave interaction (i.e. the 'Charnock' effect).

Figure 48. Left: observed mean turbulence versus wind speed at FINO3 91 m including the second order fit. Stars are observations and circles are model values. If the bin has enough samples the star is inside the circle and the bin will contribute to the fit. Right: observed standard deviation of the turbulence versus wind speed at FINO3 91 m including the first order fit.

VERTICAL EXTRAPOLATION AT FINO3

The target height of 150 m for the Kattegat site means 64% extrapolation from the 91 m turbulence data at FINO3. Utilizing the variation of turbulence across the three measurement heights 51 m, 71 m, and 91 m has been considered for the vertical extrapolation model. [Figure 49](#page-90-0) shows the turbulence data (parameterized) at winds speeds from 5 m/s to 25 m/s as a function of height. For each wind speed a fit modelling the variation with height has been added as dashed lines. For the mean turbulence the best fit type is linear and shows as expected a decrease with height. The decrease with height increases with wind speed. For the standard deviation of turbulence, a second order fit is a better match, showing a slightly increasing positive gradient with wind speed but also an increasing nonlinearity.

Due to the large extrapolation, there is a high risk that turbulence gradients or fits for heights between 51 m and 91 m are not representative of the conditions from 91 m to 150 m. In particular, for the mean turbulence the fits predict a very strong decrease for large wind speeds, with an associated risk of nonconservatism for the resulting loads. Therefore, a simpler and more conservative vertical extrapolation model has been chosen for the mean turbulence. This model bases the extrapolation on the local wind shear as a function of wind speed $(\alpha(u))$ estimated at the Energy Island North Sea site. It reproduces the patterns of variation with height and wind speed seen in [30]. For the mean turbulence the wind speed in the expressions for mean and standard deviation of turbulence is scaled by the speed-up factor relative to 91 m due to the local wind speed dependent shear. This is consistent to assuming a constant wind speed standard deviation (i.e. turbulence mean) with height and assuming only the wind speed changes due to shear. This is in line with the proposal in IEC 61400-15-1 [6] that the wind speed standard deviation may be kept constant while wind speed is extrapolated upwards to hub height.

For the standard deviation of turbulence, the behaviour is opposite that for the mean as it increases with height, again showing stronger gradients at larger wind speeds. Hence, pragmatically the reverse model is adopted as it reproduces the general patterns in [30]. Both models lead to less adjustment of the original 91 m turbulence data and their expressions are given below, with *f(u)* representing the speed-up from 91 m to height *h* due to shear.

$$
f(u) = \left(\frac{h}{91m}\right)^{\alpha(u)}\tag{4}
$$

$$
\sigma_{\mu,h}(u) = A_{\sigma_\mu} + B_{\sigma_\mu}(u/f(u)) + C_{\sigma_\mu}(u/f(u))^2
$$
\n(5)

$$
\sigma_{\sigma,h}(u) = A_{\sigma_{\sigma}} + B_{\sigma_{\sigma}} u f(u) \tag{6}
$$

Figure 49. Variation of turbulence with height (y-axis) shown for wind speeds 5, 10, 15, 20 and 25 m/s. Turbulence mean (left) and standard deviation of turbulence (right), shown for the three heights at FINO3: 51 m, 71 m and 91 m, together with possible fits to extrapolate across heights as well as the chosen model based on scaling using the wind speed dependent shear.

The consequence of choice of vertical extrapolation model is shown in [Table 32,](#page-91-0) which compares the mean, standard deviation and characteristic turbulence values at 15 m/s. As the table shows the extrapolation based on the fitting of the height variation at lower heights ('extrapolation') leads to considerably lower turbulence levels than the shear scaling method described above. The shear scaling method is therefore preferred.

Table 32. Comparison of the extrapolation models at 150 m with observations at 91 m for the different turbulence values at a wind speed of 15 m/s at FINO3. The shear scaling is chosen as the final model for the North Sea.

FIT OF THE TURBULENCE AT FINO2

As for FINO3, a second-order fit is required to fit the mean turbulence offshore whereas a linear fit is sufficient for the offshore standard deviation of turbulence. According to [2] turbulence may be considered omnidirectional far offshore, which is also the setting for the FINO2 data, hence, the turbulence data are fitted independently of direction. This also allows the exclusion of the wind direction interval from 340˚ to 40˚ where significant measurement disturbances were detected (see Appendix A).

[Figure 50](#page-92-0) shows the turbulence observations and associated omnidirectional fits for the 102 m level at FINO2. Notice the clear non-linear effects for the mean turbulence due to wave interaction (i.e. the 'Charnock' effect).

Figure 50. Left: observed mean turbulence versus wind speed at FINO2 102 m including the second order fit. Stars are observations and circles are model values. If the bin has enough samples the star is inside the circle and the bin will contribute to the fit. Right: observed standard deviation of the turbulence versus wind speed at FINO2 102 m including the first order fit.

VERTICAL EXTRAPOLATION AT FINO2

The target height of 150 m for the Kattegat site means approximately 50% extrapolation from the 102 m turbulence data at FINO2. Utilizing the variation of turbulence across the eight measurement heights from 32 m to 102 m has been considered for the vertical extrapolation model. [Figure 51](#page-93-0) shows the turbulence data (parameterized) at winds speeds from 5 m/s to 25 m/s as a function of height. For each wind speed a fit modelling the variation with height has been added as dashed lines. For the mean turbulence the best fit type is linear and shows as expected a decrease with height. The decrease with height increases with wind speed. For the standard deviation of turbulence, a second order fit is a better match, showing a slightly increasing positive gradient with wind speed but also an increasing nonlinearity.

The extrapolation model used for FINO3 is also used on the FINO2 data. The local wind shear is here the observed shear at the Energy Island Baltic Sea.

It may also be noted that there is an odd jump from 92 m to 102 m on the standard deviation of turbulence curves. The jump results in a lower standard deviation of turbulence based on 102 m data than based on 92 m data and is consistent for all wind speed bins. Below 92 m results for all heights are consistent. The primary difference between the 102 m and the lower measurements is that 102 m anemometer is top mounted while at the lower heights they are side mounted on booms that are not long enough to be IEC compliant. Our understanding is therefore that the mounting of the side anemometers is the cause of a higher-than-expected standard deviation of turbulence and that the top mounted anemometer is correct. The extrapolation of standard deviation of turbulence is therefore based on the 102 m measurements.

Figure 51. Variation of turbulence with height (y-axis) shown for wind speeds 5, 10, 15, 20 and 25 m/s. Turbulence mean (left) and standard deviation of turbulence (right), shown for the eight heights at FINO2: 32.4 m to 102.5 m together with possible fits to extrapolate across heights as well as the chosen model based on scaling using the wind speed dependent shear. Note the offset at 102.5 m for standard deviation of turbulence. The extrapolation is based on the top-mounted anemometer.

The consequence of the choice of vertical extrapolation model is shown in [Table 33,](#page-93-1) which compares the mean, standard deviation and characteristic turbulence values at 15 m/s. As the table shows the extrapolation based on the fitting of the height variation at lower heights ('extrapolation') leads to considerably lower turbulence levels than the shear scaling method described above. The shear scaling method is therefore preferred.

Table 33. Comparison of the extrapolation models at 150 m with observations at 102 m for the different turbulence intensity values at a wind speed of 15 m/s at FINO2. The shear scaling is chosen as the final model for the Baltic Sea.

COMBINED MODEL FOR KATTEGAT

As a pragmatic solution, the turbulence model suggested for the Kattegat body of water is an average of the North Sea and the Baltic Sea model.

The combination is done by averaging the turbulence model parameters (A, B and C) for mean turbulence and standard deviation of turbulence of the North Sea and the Baltic Sea models. The characteristic turbulence is then calculated from the resulting mean and standard deviation of turbulence.

Figure 52. Turbulence intensity models for the North Sea and the Baltic Sea as well as the combined model for Kattegat, which is the average of the North Sea and Baltic Sea models. TI_mean signifies mean turbulence intensity, TI std is standard deviation of turbulence intensity and TI_char is the characteristic turbulence intensity.

EMD has verified the combined model for Kattegat with internally available data for the Kattegat region and finds a very good match with the combined model, especially on the characteristic turbulence intensity. The turbulence model should however be considered uncertain and EMD recommends obtaining local turbulence measurements from the Kattegat area.

Table 34. Turbulence intensity at 150 m for the North Sea model, the Balic Sea Model and the combined model for Kattegat.

Coefficients of the final turbulence model at the Kattegat site are presented i[n Table 35.](#page-95-0) The chosen final model is based on the average of the North Sea and the Baltic Sea models. A, B and C represent the zeroth, first and second order terms, respectively.

Table 35. Turbulence model parameters at the Kattegat site (150 m) for the chosen model. See equations (1), (2) and (3).

9.1.4 Air Density

Air density during normal wind conditions is characterised by its average value at hub height, which is here set to 150 m. Two sources for air density information have been used.

Based on long-term mean temperature found in section 9.1.5, air density is calculated at 150 m elevation assuming standard pressure at this height of 995 hPa. The resulting air density is for KG-1-LB is 1.228 $kg/m³$. This is used as primary result.

Alternatively, the air density at 150 m elevation is estimated based on the recent Global Atlas and Siting Parameters (GASP). GASP is the outcome of an EUDP sponsored project by DTU and EMD [33] where site parameters such as air density are defined for the heights 50 m, 100 m and 150 m. The air density based on GASP data is found to be 1.227 kg/m³ for position KG-1-LB, KG-A and KG-B. This secondary result corroborates the primary result.

9.1.5 Air Temperature

Air temperature was measured on the Kattegat Buoy (4.1 m) throughout 8 months of operation. The average temperature measured during that period was 8.8°C. The temperature has been long-term corrected with EMD-WRF Europe+ data from the buoy location to 9.7°C. This temperature conforms with temperatures at surrounding meteorological stations [Table 37.](#page-97-0) The limited local measurement period is expected to have only marginal impact on the uncertainty of the temperature assessment.

The temperature at 150 m height has been found using the atmospheric lapse rate of -4.3 K/km derived from the EMD-WRF Europe+ data. The result is 9.1˚C at the Kattegat buoy.

The EMD-WRF Europe+ time series at 150 m has been calibrated to represent the LiDAR position at 150 m height by applying and offset 0.9˚C (difference between EMD-WRF Europe+ and measurements). The resulting time series has then been used to estimate how many hours the temperature is outside the normal and extreme temperature ranges defined in the IEC 61400-3-1 as -10°C to 30°C and -15°C to 40°C, respectively. The results are summarized in [Table 36.](#page-96-0) The probability of temperatures falling outside the defined ranges is assessed by Gaussian distributions fitted to either the 10% highest or lowest temperatures [34].

For KG-A and KG-B, the same temperature than at KG-1-LB can be assumed.

Table 37. Temperature measurements from surrounding stations.

9.2 Extreme Wind Conditions

9.2.1 Extreme Wind Speed Model (EWM)

The site-specific extreme wind speed model is characterized by the extreme wind speed with a 50-year return period [1], which for offshore conditions is supplemented by the extreme wind speed with a 1 year return period [2].

Typically, more onsite data is required to reliably estimate extreme events, than what is currently available to this project. The site-specific extreme wind speeds have therefore been estimated using the approach recommended by the Eurocode for wind loads on structures EN1991-1-4 [3] including its Danish Annex DK NA EN1991-1-4 [4] as well as the Danish Standard DS 472 [5]. This result is supplemented with alternative methods/data.

EN1991-1-4 [3] defines a fundamental value of the basic wind speed $(v_{h,0})$ which corresponds to a 50year extreme wind speed at 10 m height, independent of direction and time of year and with a standard surface roughness length of $z_{0,II} = 0.05$ m. Inland in Denmark this basic wind speed is set to 24 m/s [4]. It is specified that this value also covers the inner seas of Denmark where the current site is located.

Instead of the simplified method to vertically extrapolate extreme winds in EN 1991-1-4 [3], the dedicated flow model WAsP Engineering (WEng) has been used for this purpose. WEng includes the effects of waves, formulated by Charnock, including the effect of upstream fetch on wave development and resulting roughness and vertical speed-up. It is noted that atmospheric conditions are assumed neutral in WEng which matches with high wind speed conditions [35]. The analysis was performed through Site Compliance in windPRO with settings as shown below:

WAsP Engineering 4.0

 $1,2$ $0,8$ $0,6$ $0,4$ 0.2 $\overline{0}$ $-0,2$ $-0,4$ $-0,6$ -0.8

 30

 31

Select site data object (WAsP or Statgen purpose): - defines terrain and roughness (roughness roses not allowed)

34
Eurocode_WEng [m/s]

 37

36

 38

39

 40

The resulting 1-year and 50-year extreme wind speeds are summarized in the table below:

 32

33

For comparison, we also include two alternative estimates of the onsite extreme wind speeds based on mesoscale data and the annual maximum method (AM) combined with a spectral correction to compensate for the use of mesoscale data, see e.g. [33]. For the method details of AM, see [36]. The spectral correction may be based either on a theoretical assumption about the slope of an undampened spectrum at high frequencies or on a site estimate of the actual spectral slope using onsite measurements. Below we include both spectral correction estimates, the theoretical and the site specific for the buoy.

Finally, as a fourth option the peak-over-threshold (POT) method is used based on the onsite buoy data.

EXTREME WIND METHOD	50-YEAR EXTREME WIND SPEED [m/s]		
$EN1991-1-4 + WEng + DS472$	40.1 (main result)		
AM Mesoscale (20y) + Spectral correction (theoretical)	39.5		
AM Mesoscale (20y) + Spectral correction (site specific)	39.9		
POT (N=20, Δt_{min} =4 days)	40.9		

Table 39. Extreme wind speed alternative results using different methods (150 m).

It is noted that the alternative estimates are surprisingly consistent around 40 m/s even if they are based mostly on different data and statistical methods. However, using the Danish Standard [5] directly focused on offshore design conditions for wind turbines is still considered the best alternative as it is based on decades of building experience and knowledge of regional extremes condensed into the building codes.

9.2.2 Wind Shear at Extreme Wind Speed

The site-specific wind profile associated with extreme wind speed events has been estimated based on the on-site LiDAR data at the Kattegat and the Hesselø buoys. The plot below shows the wind shear exponent versus wind speed at 150 m above sea level for the two buoys. The wind shear exponent is estimated for each time step and then averaged in 0.5 m/s bins. Notice the linear increase in shear from around 0.01 at 5 m/s, to 0.13 around 17 m/s. Above 17 m/s wind shear levels out at 0.17 but with a noticeable scatter. As the dataset covers only 8 months of data, the plot is very noisy. During this short period, there are very few data points at high wind speed.

Figure 54. Observed wind shear versus wind speed (0.5 m/s bins) at the Kattegat KG-1-LB buoy (left) and the Hesselø South HS-1 buoy (right). For both buoys, the wind shear clearly levels off at around 0.13 for wind speeds above ca. 17m/s. At lower wind speeds the wind shear increases linearly.

Given these observations the expected wind shear at extreme wind speeds is summarized below.

9.2.3 Extreme Wind Shear (EWS)

To estimate the site-specific extreme wind shear, it is recommended to use equations (27) and (28) in section 6.3.3.7 of the IEC 61400-1 [1] with site-specific values for the ambient turbulence standard deviation together with the site-specific wind shear exponent.

9.2.4 Turbulence at Extreme Wind speed

In addition to the extreme turbulence model, the IEC 61400-3-1 [2] requires that the site-specific turbulence for extreme wind speed is defined. Using the turbulence model defined in sectio[n 9.1.3](#page-84-1) the turbulence is estimated at the site estimate of the 50-year extreme wind speed as shown below:

Table 40. Turbulence at extreme wind speed.

Wave development and growth is limited, such that, for a given wind speed, the significant wave height and peak wave lengths stop growing above a certain wind speed. In effect, this means that the sea surface roughness will eventually saturate as the wind speed becomes increasingly extreme, and the Charnock effect (second order effect) will cease to grow. In [37] and [38] it was reported that the 10 m wind speed required for saturation of the surface roughness is in the range 33-40 m/s while [39] indicates saturation at 35 m/s in 10 m height. In this work the latter saturation value of 35m/s at 10 m height is adopted. The saturation estimates correspond to a virtually infinite fetch, and prolonged wind duration for full wave development, it is therefore expected that the wind speed required for saturation at the real sites will be lower than 35 m/s, making this assumption conservative.

9.2.5 Extreme Turbulence Model (ETM)

The site-specific extreme turbulence model as function of wind speed (σ_{ETM}) is assessed using the peak factor method described in the IEC 61400-1 footnote 32 [1]:

$$
\sigma_{ETM}(V_{hub}) = \sigma_{mean}(V_{hub}) + k_p(V_{hub}) \cdot \sigma_{stddev}(V_{hub}), \quad [7]
$$

$$
k_p = 0.01 \left(\frac{V_{ave}}{(m/s)} - 21\right) \left(\frac{V_{hub}}{(m/s)} - 5\right) + 5 \tag{8}
$$

Omnidirectional values are used for the mean wind speed (V_{ave}) as well as the mean and standard deviation of turbulence. The extreme turbulence values are plotted below:

Figure 55. Extreme turbulence model. Turbulence is standard deviation of wind speed.

9.2.6 Air Density for Extreme Wind

The air density for extreme wind conditions is found based on average temperature at high wind speed events. This is calculated as 1.25 kg/m^3 for the position of KG-1-LB. Alternatively, the air density for extreme wind conditions can be taken from GASP [33], which results in a value of 1.23 kg/m³.

It was decided to proceed with the air density for extreme wind speeds from the buoy.

9.3 Additional Site parameters

9.3.1 Salinity

The IEC 61400-1 [1] does not specify details when assessing the salinity of the site. EMD proposes to use the salinity of the upper part of the water column as salinity figure. The water can form droplets at high wind speed which get in contact with the wind turbine structure.

The salinity is assessed though the Copernicus Marine Service [40]. The average salinity at surface level based on the period 2021-2024 is found to be 22.5 g/m2.

9.3.2 Lightning

The IEC 61400-1 [1] does not specify details when assessing the impact of lightning on the site. Based on data from NASA, Global Hydrology and Climate Center [41], the lightning frequency of the site is 1.18 flashes/year/km2.

9.3.3 Solar Radiation

Based on Heliosat, SARAH3 data [42] the average solar irradiation during the period 2004 to 2024 is 121 W/m2. Peak solar radiation does not exceed 880 W/m2.

9.3.4 Earthquake

The site rates as Low Hazard with a peak ground acceleration of 0.22 m/s2 [43]. With the low hazard rating, earthquakes need not be investigated further [2].

9.3.5 Relative Humidity

The buoy measures the humidity near sea level. Based on 8 months of measurements the average relative humidity is 83.8% with a standard deviation of 9.3%. As a full year is not yet available, this value may be seasonally biased.

9.4 Climate Change

In the context of this report, the impact of the climate change is consired relevant for the following signals types :

- Mean wind speed
- Extreme wind

- Temperature (and therefore air density)
- Rain (as being driver for blade degradation)

Of these parameters, all, except for extreme winds, are covered by the Copernicus Interactive Climate Atlas [44]. The atlas contains 25 models for each scenario. Two scenarios have been considered, SSP3- 7.0 and SSP5-8.5, which are estimated to be the most realistic with the current development of emissions. The two terms which cover the operational period of the planned project are studied: nearterm (2021-2040) and medium term (2041-2060).

For the relevant area in Kattegat the Copernicus Interactive Climate Atlas finds no change of the annual mean wind speed signal or no robust signal for neither of the two scenarios under consideration. Also, the seasonal mean wind speed signals show no change or no robust signal. A robust signal is defined through the requirement that at least 80% of the models agree on the sign of change and at least 66% of the models show a change greater than the internal-variability threshold. Note that while the average annual mean wind speed might remain unaffected, there are indications of an increase in prolonged weather patterns [45]. These patterns may be characterized by extended periods of either low wind speeds, such as during high-pressure omega blocks, or high wind speeds.

Other studies [46] identify a significant correlation around 0.9 between equator-to-pole temperature gradient and wind speed reduction, which imply that that the arctic amplification is a risk for European offshore wind energy. While the North Sea seems clearly affected, the project area does not indicate a significant correlation [\(Figure 56\)](#page-103-0).

Figure 56: Relationship between changes in wind speed and the equator-to-pole gradient in Europe in the full CMIP6 ensemble. Correlations between changes (a) and the slope of a linear regression in locations where correlations exceed absolute values of 0.4 (b) [46]

Not only forcing like global warming affect mean wind speeds, but also natural variations, like Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation (AMO). Some work indicates that CMIP6 shows weaknesses and does not capture the AMO sufficiently [47]. Therefore, it is advisable to investigate multidecadal oscillations separately.

Wohland et al [48] compares natural oscillations with forced wind speed changes: For the historic period the trends of the forced wind speed changes for the are at the order of 0.01m/s per decade (green histogram, [Figure 57](#page-104-0) a), while the observed trends are 1 order of magnitude larger (orange histogram). The trend in the forced wind speed changes increase for increased radiative forcing (green histogram in [Figure 57](#page-104-0) c and d) but stay still at below 1/4 of the natural changes.

Figure 57: Twenty-year trends in European annual mean wind speed in Max Planck Institute - Grand Ensemble (MPI-GE) under historic (a) and future climate conditions (c) and (d). Trends are computed for each ensemble member after subtraction of ensemble mean (orange – representing internal variability) and for the ensemble mean (green – representing forced changes). Different subplots show different experiments. Trends are only shown if they are different from zero at a 95% significance level.

We conclude that the potential change of mean wind speed in the Baltic Sea is smaller than the natural variability.

Among many studies on climate change impact, the impact on extreme wind conditions is one of those that does not lead to clear conclusions. We refer to the recent work of Xiaoli Guo Larsén et al, DTU [49]. A selection of models from the SSP5 scenario were compared with reanalysis data (ERA5) and the offshore masts Fino 1-3. The near-term period from 2020 to 2049 was analysed, which overlaps well with the operational period of the planned projects. In contrast to the North Sea, Larsén finds no significant signal for most of the SSP5 ensemble models for the projected area in the Baltics.

For temperature, however, the Copernicus Interactive Climate Atlas [44] shows a robust signal when compared to the period 1991-2020. The absolute temperatures are illustrated i[n Figure 58.](#page-105-0) In the worst

case (SSP5, medium term), the temperature will increase by 2˚C corresponding to 0.7% lower air density, which will impact the power production of wind turbines in the area.

Figure 58: Development of the absolute annual temperature in the Kattegat area

To evaluate the changes of precipitation, the daily accumulated precipitation in mm/day was analysed from the Copernicus Interactive Climate Atlas [44]. Here SSP3 shows a robust signal showing an increase of precipitation, both for near and medium term. An increase of precipitation might lead to more blade degradation. SSP5 shows no signal or no robust signal.

9.5 Summary Table of Siting Parameters

The requested omnidirectional siting parameters are summarized in [Table 41.](#page-106-0)

Table 41. Summary table of siting parameters (150 m).

**Turbulence values at other wind speeds can be found in Appendix H*

10 Data Package

EMD has submitted datasets in support of this study. These are as far as it is possible provided in accessible formats.

10.1 Filtered and Repaired LIDAR Data

Datasets for the filtered and repaired datasets are provided in folder "20 Analysis/22 Filtered time series". The filter and repair process is described in section [4.4.3.](#page-32-0) The dataset represents 8 months of data. The text file can be imported directly into windPRO, but as an open format, it is generally accessible.

WS199_8 months.txt

The text file includes measurements at all heights. Measurements on the buoy (non-LiDAR data) are for practical reasons set at 4 m. The dataset is organized in columns, grouped by height. Data for a given height with Sample Status flagged as "1" is disabled by EMD.

The content of the columns is explained i[n Table 42.](#page-108-0)

The data set is also included as windPRO Meteo objects in an Object export file

WS199_8 months.wpobjects

The object export file can be imported into windPRO 4.0 by right-clicking in the Object list and select Import -> Import from windPRO object import file.

Table 42. Column explanation for data time series.

10.2 Long-term Corrected LiDAR data

The long-term corrected time series at the positions of KG-1-LB, KG-A and KG-B are included in the data package in the folder "20 Analysis/23 Long-term time series". Position KG-1-LB include all LiDAR measurement heights. Position KG-A and KG-B only includes the 150 m height.

- KG-1-LB LTC.txt
- KG-A LTC.txt
- KG-B LTC.txt

All three datasets are included as windPRO Meteo objects in an Object export file.

LTC Position KG-1-LB, KG-A, KG-B.wpobjects

The object export file can be imported into windPRO 4.0 by right-clicking in the Object list and select Import -> Import from windPRO object import file.

10.3 EMD-WRF Dataset

The EMD-WRF dataset for the positions of KG-1-LB is included in the data package in the folder "10 Models" as a text file export with selected parameters:

EMD-WRF Position KG-1-LB.txt

The data columns are described i[n Table 43.](#page-110-0)

The EMD-WRF datasets is included as windPRO Meteo objects in an Object export file.

EMD-WRF KG-1-LB position.wpobjects

The object export file can be imported into windPRO 4.0 by right-clicking in the Object list and select Import -> Import from windPRO object import file. The object export file includes more parameters than presented in the text file.

Table 43. Column explanation for EMD-WRF data time series.

10.4 Wind Resource Map

The wind resource map calculated in sectio[n 8.3 \(](#page-74-0)coordinates system: UTM-WGS84, Zone 32) is provided as an .rsf file (recognized WAsP format) in the folder "50 Wind resource maps":

Kattegat_Res_250_Hub_150.0_0.rsf

The file "Kattegat_Res_250_Hub_150.0_0.emdinfo" is a helping file which contains information about the coordinates system that can be used in windPRO software.

11 References

- [1] IEC, International Standard IEC 61400-1 ed. 4: Wind Turbines Part 1: Design Requirements, 2019.
- [2] IEC, International Standard IEC 61400-3-1 ed. 1, Wind Energy generation systems Part 3-1: Design requirements for fixed offshore wind turbines, 2019.
- [3] Eurocode, EN1991-1-4: Eurocode 1: Actions on structures Part 1-4: General actions Wind actions., 2005.
- [4] Eurocode, EN1991-1-4 DK NA, 2007.
- [5] Dansk Standard, DS 472 Ed. 2: Forudsætninger for vindmøllekonstruktioner i Danmark, 2007.
- [6] IEC, International Standard IEC PRV 61400-15-1, Wind energy generation systems Part 15-1: Site suitability input conditions for wind power plants, 2024.
- [7] Energinet, "Scope of Services Site Wind Conditions Assessment," 2023.
- [8] DMI, "Danish Meteorological Institute Open Data," Danish Meteorological Institute , [Online]. Available: https://confluence.govcloud.dk/display/FDAPI/Meteorological+Observation.
- [9] SMHI, "SMHI Open Data API Docs Meteorological Observations," Swedish Meteorological and Hydraulic Institute, [Online]. Available: https://opendata.smhi.se/apidocs/metobs/index.html.
- [10] Fugro Norway AS, "SWLB measurements Danish Offshore Wind 2030, Project Measurement Plan, All Lots, DNV report C75516/C75517/C75518_Project_Measurement_Plan_All_Lots 09, 25 November 2023," 2023.
- [11] Fugro Norway AS, "C75516-PEP 07, SWLB measurements at Danish Offshore Wind 2030 Lot 1 Project Execution Plan Lot 1, 5 December 2023," 2023.
- [12] Fugro Norway AS, "Danish Offshore Wind 2030 Floating LiDAR Measurements, Monthly report (8 instalments)," 2024.
- [13] Fugro, "Service Report, Kattegat and Hesselø South, C75516-KG-HS-SER," 2023.
- [14] DNV, "ZX1741, Independent analysis and reporting of ZX LiDARs performance verification executed by Zephir Ltd. at the UK Remote Sensing Test Site. DNV GL report 10422597-A-38, Rev. A. 2023-05-23," 2023.
- [15] DNV, "Independent performance verification of Seawatch Wind Lidar Buoy WS199 at Frøya. DNV GL report 10422674-R-11, Rev. B. 2023-07-13," 2023.
- [16] DNV-GL, "Type ZX300 LIDAR, Remote Sensing Device Type-specific Classification Summary, Report No.: GLGH-4275 18 14741 258-R-0003, Rev. D," 2018.
- [17] DNV, "Technical Letter 10299802-L-1-B, SEAWATCH Wind LiDAR Buoy Stage 3 confirmation, 2022-02-17," 2022.
- [18] DNV, "Independent performance verification of Seawatch Wind Lidar Buoy WS199 at Frøya. DNV GL report 10422674-R-11, Rev. B. 2023-07-13," 2023.
- [19] Carbon Trust , "Carbon Trust Offshore wind Accelerator Roadmap for the Commercial Acceptance of Floating LiDAR Technology, Version 2.0," 2018.
- [20] OWA, "Lidar Uncertainty Standard Review Methodology Review and Recommendations, OWA Report 2017-001," 2018.
- [21] EMD International A/S, "ERA5 Gaussian Grid," [Online]. Available: https://help.emd.dk/mediawiki/index.php?title=ERA5_(Gaussian_Grid).
- [22] EMD International A/S, "EMD-WRF On-Demand," [Online]. Available: https://help.emd.dk/mediawiki/index.php?title=EMD-WRF_On-Demand_and_Custom-Area.
- [23] EMD International A/S, "NORA3," [Online]. Available: https://help.emd.dk/mediawiki/index.php/NORA3.
- [24] T. Pohlert, Non-Parametric Trend Tests and Change-Point Detection, 2017.
- [25] EMD International A/S, "WindPRO / MCP, An Introduction to the MCP Facilities in windPRO," 2021.
- [26] MEASNET, Evaluation of Site Specific Conditions v3, 2022.
- [27] S. Liléo, E. Berge, O. Undheim, R. Klinkert and R. Bredesen, "Long-term correction of wind speed measurements State of the art, guidelines and future work," Kjeller Vindteknikk, Norway, 2013.
- [28] J. e. a. Wohland, "Mitigating a century of European renewable variability with transmission and informed siting," *Enivron. Res. Lett.,* vol. 16, no. 064026, 2021.
- [29] A. C. Fitch, J. B. Olson, J. K. Lundquist, J. Dudhia, A. K. Gupta, J. Michalakes and I. Barstad, "Local and Mesoscale Impacts of Wind Farms as Parameterized in a Mesoscale NWP Model," *Monthly Weather Review,* vol. 140, no. 9, 2012.

- [31] EMD International A/S, "Site Wind Conditions Assessment, Energy Island North Sea," 2023.
- [32] EMD International A/S, "Site Wind Conditions Assessment, Energy Island Baltic Sea," 2023.
- [33] X. G. e. a. Larsén, "DTU Wind Energy E-Report-0208: Calculation of Global Atlas of Siting Parameters," 2020.
- [34] EMD International A/S, "WindPRO 4.0 User Manual," 2023.
- [35] A. Pena, "Sensing the Wind Profile," Risø DTU, 2009.
- [36] L. Svenningsen, "windPRO LOADS user manual," EMD International A/S, [Online]. Available: https://help.emd.dk/knowledgebase/content/windPRO3.6/c5-UK_windPRO3.6-LOADS.pdf. [Accessed March 2023].
- [37] A. V. e. a. Babanin, "Waves and Swells in High Wind and Extreme Fetches, Measurements in the Southern Ocean," *Front. Mar. Sci,* vol. 6, no. Jul, pp. 1-12, 2019.
- [38] M. D. Powell, P. J. Vickery and T. A. Reinhold, "Reduced drag coefficient for high wind speeds in tropical cyclones," *Nature,* vol. 422, no. 6929, pp. 279-283, 2003.
- [39] B. A. Harper, J. D. Kepert and J. D. Ginger, "Guidelines for converting between various wind averaging periods in tropical cyclone conditions," World Meteorological Organization (WMO), Geneva, 2010.
- [40] Copernicus Programme, "Copernicus Marine Service," [Online]. Available: https://marine.copernicus.eu/.
- [41] NASA, Global Hydrology and Climate Center, "GHRC Portal," [Online]. Available: https://ghrc.nsstc.nasa.gov/home/.
- [42] EUMETSAT CM SAF, "EUMETSAT CM SAF," [Online]. Available: https://www.cmsaf.eu/EN/Home/home_node.html.
- [43] GSHAP, Global Seismic Hazard Assessment Program., "GSHAP, Global Seismic Hazard Assessment Program.," [Online]. Available: http://www.seismo.ethz.ch/static/GSHAP/.
- [44] "Copernicus Interactive Climate Atlas," Copernicus Climate Change Service, [Online]. Available: https://atlas.climate.copernicus.eu/atlas.
- [45] G. Rapelle, D. Faranda, M. Gaetani, P. Drobinski and M. Ginesta, "Climate change on extreme winds already affects offshore wind power availability in Europe," *Environmental Research Letters,* vol. 18 034040, 2023.
- [46] J. Wohland, "Process-based climate change assessment for European winds using EURO-CORDEX and global models," *Environmental Research Letters,* vol. 17, 2022.
- [47] J. Coburn and S. Pryor, "Differential Credibility of Climate Modes in CMIP6," *Journal of Climate,* vol. 34, no. 21, p. 8145– 8164 , 2021.
- [48] J. Wohland, D. Folini and B. Pickering, "Wind speed stilling and its recovery due to internal climate variability," *Earth Syst. Dynam.,* vol. 12, p. 1239–1251, 2021.
- [49] X. Larsen, M. Imberger, Á. Hannesdóttir and A. Hahmann, "The impact of climate change on extreme winds over northern Europe according to CMIP6," *WInd Energy Science,* 2023.
- [50] DNV-GL, "SWLB059 Independent performance verification of Seawatch Wind Lidar Buoy at Frøya, Norway, 10332389-R-6, Rev. A," 2022.
- [51] EOLOS, "HESSELØ FINAL DATA REPORT (28/02/2021 00:00 UTC 27/02/2022 23:50 UTC), report code EOL-HSS59 rev 05," 2022.
- [52] DNV-GL, "Independent analysis and reporting of ZX Lidars performance verification executed by Zephir Ltd. at Pershore test site, including IEC compliant validation analysis".
- [53] Multiversum, "Assessment of EOLOS FLS-200 E01 Floating Lidar PRE-Deployment Verification at the TNO Lichteiland Goeree Offshore Test Site, NL".
- [54] Eolos, "Measurement Plan, HESSELØ Project, report code EOL-HSS07 rev 05, 17/02/2022," 2022.
- [55] Tech-wise A/S, "Wind Resources at Laesoe Syd, Report no.: D-160950, December 2002," 2002.
- [56] IEC, "International Standard IEC 61400-50-1, Ed. 1: Wind measurements Application of meteorological mast, nacelle and spinner mounted instrumnets," 2022.
- [57] FuE-Zentrum FH Kiel GmbH, "FINO2 Research Platform," 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.fino2.de/en/. [Accessed 14th August 2023].
- [58] 4. Offshore, "https://map.4coffshore.com/offshorewind/," [Online]. Available: https://map.4coffshore.com/offshorewind/.
- [59] BSH Bundesamt für Schifffahrt und Hydrographie, "Standardisierung und vergleichende Analyse der meteorologischen FINO-Messdaten (FINO123)," Hamburg, 2016.

[60] FuE-Zentrum FH Kiel GmbH, "FINO3 Research Platform," 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.fino3.de/en/. [Accessed 21rst February 2023].

Appendix A. Supporting Data

Several data sources have been used to support the assessment of site wind conditions. These data are of different types and quality and have thus been used for different purposes. The description of the measurement setup, data quality check and processing are presented in section [Appendix A.1.](#page-114-0) The [Appendix A.2](#page-150-0) section deals with data analysis of different parameters. Finally, the long-term correction of the relevant supporting data is described in [Appendix A.3.](#page-156-0)

Appendix A.1. Available Data, Data Treatment and Quality Check

For an overview of the measurements station please refer to [Table 3,](#page-22-0)

[Table 4,](#page-22-1) [Figure 3](#page-24-0) an[d Figure 4.](#page-25-0)

i. Hesselø South Floating LiDAR (HS-1)

The LiDAR was commissioned by Energinet and operated by Fugro Norway AS. The LiDAR was located in Kattegat Sea, 20 km east of Djursland peninsula, in Denmark.

Instrumentation

The LIDAR is a ZX300M LIDAR from ZXLiDARs Ltd and is mounted on the SWLB059 buoy [\(Figure 59\)](#page-115-0).

The general measurement setup, sensors, configurations, and measurement scheme are described in the measurement plan [10]. In the following, only instruments relevant for the site wind conditions are described.

Figure 59. ZXLidars – ZX300M, source: www.zxlidars.com

This LIDAR model is classified by DNV-GL [16]. The LiDAR buoy SWLB059 has been pre-validated and passed Best Practice Criteria for all wind speed and direction ranges at all heights, except wind speed slope at 40 m [50].

Level	Measurement height [m]
$11\,$	300
$10\,$	260
$\boldsymbol{9}$	220
$\,8\,$	190
$\overline{7}$	170
$\boldsymbol{6}$	150
5	130
$\pmb{4}$	100
$\mathsf{3}$	80
$\overline{2}$	40
$\mathbf 1$	12

Table 44. LIDAR measurement height levels

The SWLB059 is equipped with two additional meteorological sensors. Vaisala PTB330A measuring air pressure, Vaisala HMP155 measuring air temperature and humidity.

Operation history

Wind LiDAR buoy SWLB059 was deployed at Hesselø South on 21st of July 2023 and the measuring campaign is ongoing.

Data gaps:

30/11/2023 – unknown reason

Since 24 February 2024, lidar had intermittently been unavailable to measure wind data due to insufficient input power from an unhealthy fuel cell. This problem was resolved remotely on 2 March 2024 by adjusting the internal fuel cell process .

23/03/2024 - The buoy had been replaced with WS190.

Fugro post-processing of Data

Fugro has provided some information on the post-processing of the LIDAR data [11]. ZX LiDARs typically equip their instruments with a standard data filter, known as industry filter, designed to ensure the acquisition of high-quality data by eliminating data points that have a low signal-to-noise ratio. Fugro has disabled the industry data filter on the LiDAR data and has implemented a simpler filtering algorithm [10]. The processing of the LiDAR data by Fugro involves the following steps:

- Removing values outside of those times where the system is deployed at the target position.
- Check that data was saved for all 10-min intervals. Out of the 36-37 data packages produced every 10 minutes, a minimum of 9 packages (25%) are required to qualify as a valid measurement.
- Check for duplicates measurements.
- Removing out of range values (e.g. speed below 0.001 m/s and above 58 m/s, degrees above 360)
- Apply 180˚ ambiguity fix on LiDAR wind directions using Gill directions.

Beyond the 9-data-package filter already provided by Fugro, EMD has determined that increasing the threshold for the number of data packets does not enhance the quality of the data. Therefore, no additional filtering based on packet count has been conducted.

EMD Filtering of LIDAR Data

EMD has conducted a qualitative, manual filtering process. EMD has found that the overall quality of the dataset is quite good, with very few discrepancies identified.

Typical anomalies identified in the dataset include instances of peak wind speeds at great heights (over 130 meters) that occur for very brief periods and are not consistent with the wind speed and shear observed at lower altitudes. These discrepancies were specifically targeted during the manual filtering process to ensure the reliability of the dataset.

According to Fugro reports [11], the primary sensor for wind direction is measuring relative to true north. EMD has compared the wind direction signal against mesoscale derived dataset (EMD WRF) and finds the average difference within 1° at equivalent heights. EMD therefore finds the wind direction data correct with no need for adjustment.

However, at very low wind speeds, some remnants of the 180-degree ambiguity in wind direction measurements persist. Given the high uncertainty of wind direction at these low speeds, EMD has decided not to make any corrections to these data.

Recovery Rate and Data Substitution

With the industry filter disabled, the data recovery rate for the LiDAR measurements is substantially higher than is sometimes seen with ZX LiDAR instruments. Notably, the data recovery rates decrease with increasing height above sea level (ASL), and these rates are detailed in [Table 45.](#page-118-0) Additionally, a small data recovery loss is still experienced due to the applied filtering.

To address some of the data loss, data substitution procedures were implemented: one based on measured shear on the Hesselø South LIDAR (HS-1), referred to as "shear repair" and another using data from Kattegat LIDAR (KG-1-LB), referred to as "horizontal repair". The shear repair procedure is

[Table 45](#page-118-0) lists the results of each repair procedure. The 12- and 40-meter heights are repaired only using the horizontal repair procedure, and the outcome of those repairs are not included in the mentioned table.

Table 46. Treatment summary of the primary wind data source from HS-1 floating LiDAR.

ii. Hesselø Floating LiDAR (H1)

The LiDAR was commissioned by Energinet and operated by EOLOS Floating LiDAR Solutions. The LiDAR was located in Kattegat Sea, between north of Zealand coastline and the island of Anholt, in Denmark.

Instrumentation

The LIDAR mounted on the Eolos FLS200-E01 is a ZX300M LIDAR from ZXLiDARs Ltd [\(Figure 59\)](#page-115-0).

The instrumentation on the Eolos FLS200-E01 is described in documents [51]. In the following, only instruments relevant for the site wind conditions are described.

This LIDAR model is classified by DNV-GL [16]. A similar model, but not the same instrument was verified at the Pershore, UK, test site by DNV-GL [52]. The specific instrument deployed on the Eolos FLS200-E01 was verified by Multiversum at the TNO Lichteiland Goeree Offshore Test Site, NL [53].

The LiDAR window is located 1.6m above sea level. This should be compensated for when interpreting the measurement results together with an 0.4 m offset built into the tidal correction of the data processing by Eolos. This means a 2 m offset between the measurement height reported and the real heights. This results in measurement heights according to Final Data report [51].

The Eolos FLS200-E01 is equipped with two additional meteorological stations. These are a Vaisala WXT536 package and the second is an Aimar 200WX package. Both are capable of measuring standard parameters: Wind speed, wind direction, air pressure, temperature, humidity and rainfall.

The mounting of the instruments is 3.25 m above the waterline, however as they are not used for shear or wind model analysis, they are by EMD assigned a generic height of 10 m.

Operation history

The measurement campaign has run for a period of 12 months. EMD has received measurement data starting from 28/02/2021 to 28/02/2022.

Data gaps: 19/03/2021 - corrective maintenance 14/07/2021 -17/07/2021 - control box replacement 23/12/2021 – ADCP replacement

Eolos Post-processing of Data

Eolos has provided some information on the post-processing of the LIDAR data [54].

Wind direction data are corrected for the yaw of the buoy and the homodyne behaviour of the LIDAR. This is the 180-degree ambiguity in the LIDAR measurements. The METEO data are used for this correction.

No motion correction is applied. Eolos states that this is a valid approach.

Eolos corrects for tidal variations. It is understood that this makes the measurements comparable with a fixed structure, such as a mast or a wind turbine, but it also means that the actual measurement height above sea level is variable, within the range of tidal variations. The tidal correction includes an 0.4m offset to convert the 1.6 m window height to 2 m.

Data are filtered if:

- buoy location is outside maximum drift radius + 20 m $(97 + 20 = 117 \text{ m})$
- the LIDAR returns invalid values, such as N/A, 9998 or 9999, representing poor quality data.
- \bullet out of wind speed (V < 0 m/s or V > 50 m/s) or wind direction (Dir < 0° or Dir > 360°) range.

Eolos has applied a quality control algorithm to the raw measurement data and defines four states:

- 0 System not available
- 1 System available & post-processed data passing quality checks
- 2 System available but data filtered for not passing quality checks
- 3 System available & postprocessed data are passing quality checks for wind speed but not direction

State 0 and state 3 are not present in the datasets. EMD has disabled data records with state 2.

EMD Filtering of LIDAR Data

Eolos reports [54] that the wind direction sensor used in the datafiles is that of the ZX LIDAR. In a comparison with EMD-WRF data an average offset of -7.9 degrees is noted. In the validation study [53], Multiversum finds good agreement between reference station direction and the buoy main compass,

but a -6.5-degree offset to the ZX LIDAR wind direction measurements. As these two offsets are in agreement, EMD has applied a 6.5 degree offset on the LIDAR wind direction measurements.

EMD has used the code setting 2 (section 3.2.5) to filter the data. This has effectively removed the inherent ZX error settings (n/a, 9998 and 9999).

No filtering has been done on the METEO data. They are provided as is.

Recovery Rate and Data Substitution

The LIDAR dataset suffers data loss as a result of above filtering. In order to recover some of this loss a data substitution procedure was done.

The recovery rate on the LIDAR is higher at lower heights than at taller heights. The substitution procedure transfers lower height measurements upwards in the profile with a shear transfer function.

The shear matrix transformation method is described in detail in the WindPRO manual, section 12.3.3.4.2.1 [34].

For each height repaired, the height one or two levels below was used as source. A shear matrix was built using the most relevant heights (immediately above or equal to the height and below the repaired height), including the source height. The binning for the matrix consists of 12 diurnal bins and 12 directional bins. No seasonal binning was used in order to increase the count of data records in each bin. Only data concurrent at all selected heights feed into the shear matrix. The shear value in each bin is calculated based on a Weibull derived mean wind speed for each selected height.

The synthesized data replaces gaps and disabled data in the recorded dataset (wind speed and direction)[. Table 47](#page-121-0) lists the properties of each repair procedure.

Table 47. Results of data repair.

Finally, the repaired data at 140 m has been extrapolated to the height of interest for the model validation of 150 m. A shear matrix was built using the heights from 120, 140 and 160 m, with 12 diurnal bins and 12 directional bins.

Table 48. Shear matrix used to extrapolate 140 m data to 150 m height. Values are shear exponent a.

Table 49. Treatment summary of the primary wind data source from H1 floating LiDAR.

iii. Læsø Offshore Met Mast (M1)

Wind data from an offshore measurement mast has been provided by Energinet. The met mast was setup in Kattegat Sea about 17 km south of the island of Læsø. The distance to Danish and Swedish coast is about 45 km and 66 km. The available measurements used are shown in [Table 50.](#page-123-0)

Table 50. Measurement data at Læsø met mast

Besides the analysed data, the Læsø mast was also equipped with relative humidity, atmospheric pressure and solar radiation sensors.

The available data covers a period of 4 years and 8 months from 24/04/1999 until 09/12/2003. However, the wind speed data from the anemometer at 58 m ends on 18/04/2000. This data is therefore not considered further on in the analysis.

EMD had access to a wind resources report [55] analysing the measured data until November 2002 and describing the equipment installed and mast details. According to the documentation available [55] EMD has not received any calibration reports nor installation report describing the type of sensors and the detials of the mounting (boom orientation, length, distance to lightning finial). It has thus not been possible to check if the installation has been conducted according to the IEC standards [56]. The only information available comes from the csv files itself, from which the setup of the mast has been deducted and is presented in [Table 51.](#page-124-0)

Figure 61. Pictures and details from Læsø met mast, source: [55]

Table 51. Mounting of sensors on the Læsø met mast

EMD has obtained access to the data as csv files. Therefore, the conversion of the raw data could not be verified.

A discrepancy between the documented boom direction (from the file) and the observed direction can be noticed on the wind speed difference graph between anemometers at same height. For example the booms for the 45 m anemometers seem to be orientated at 15 deg (instead of 45 deg) and 210 deg (instead of 225 deg), as seen o[n Figure](#page-126-0) *62*. No wind veer has been applied to the data since it correlates well with other data sources wind direction.

Figure 62. Wind speed difference between 45 m SV and 45 m NE, binned by direction at Læsø

The data at 45, 30 and 10 m have been merged to remove the tower shadowing, based on the observed distortions.

From [Figure](#page-126-0) *62* it can also be observed that not only the shadowing of the mast creates a difference larger than 0. It could be due to the vicinity of the wind vane.

In general, the data quality is good. The correlation of the wind directions data and wind speed data at different heights is as expected. The data has been filtered for faulty equipment and failures.

A final of 4 full years, from 01/07/1999-01/07/2003, have been selected. The data from the 62 m anemometer is the primary data from the Læsø met mast considered in the study. The recovery rate of the data for this period (94.7%) complies with the minimum requirements of MEASNET [26]. The following major gaps (consecutive days with missing or erroneous data) in the wind data (wind speed at 62 m and wind direction at 58 m) can be noted:

- 35 days from 12/01/2000
- 25 days from 04/01/2002, gap concerning all channels
- 3 days from 01/11/2002

At this stage, the 62 m data has not been extrapolated to the height of interest 150 m. The shear determined from the available measured data at 62, 45 and 30 m would indeed not be representative of the expected shear at 150 m.

Table 52. Treatment of the primary wind data source from Læsø met mast.

iv. FINO2 Met Mast

Wind data from the FINO2 offshore measurement mast has been used to assess the expected turbulence conditions on the Kattegat site.

The data was made available by the FINO (Forschungsplattformen in Nord- und Ostsee) initiative, which was funded by the German Federal Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate Action (BMWK) on the basis of a decision by the German Bundestag, organised by the Projektträger Jülich (PTJ) and coordinated by the German Federal Maritime and Hydrographic Agency (BSH).

The FINO2 mast is mounted on a platform and is part of the FINO research project. The met mast was setup in the Baltic Sea about 38 km north of the German coast, 39 km east of the Danish coast and 40 km south of Swedish coast. The distance from the FINO2 mast to KG-1-LB is about 190 km [Figure 4.](#page-25-0)

The collected measurements considered in this report are:

- wind speed from cup anemometers at 102.5, 92.4, 82.4, 72.4, 62.4, 52.4, 42.4, and 32.4 m above MSL as 10-minute values (mean, min, max and standard deviation)
- wind direction at 91.8, 71.8, 51.8 and 31.8 m above MSL as 10-minute values (mean, min, max and standard deviation)
- wind speed and wind direction from sonic anemometers at 82.1, 62.1 and 42.1 m above MSL as 10-minute values (mean, min, max and standard deviation)
- absolute temperature at 99.3, 70.3, 50.3, 40.3 and 30.3 m above MSL, as 10 minutes values (mean values)

Besides the data obtained, the FINO2 mast was also equipped with sonic anemometers, relative humidity, air pressure, precipitation, and global irradiance sensors.

Figure 63. Picture of FINO2 met mast, and view on the top anemometer from top and southeast (source: [57]).

The available data covers a period of around 14.8 years, from April/2008 to February/2023. However, the series was trimmed to 7 full years, from 31/08/2008 to 31/08/2015, in order to avoid the influence of wakes from the neighbouring wind farm installed after September 2015 (EnBW Baltic 2/Kriegers Flak 1) [\(Figure 64\)](#page-129-0).

Figure 64. Indicative location map for FINO2 with existing wind farms in green (background map: 4C Offshore [58]).

EMD has access to a mast report [59] describing the equipment installed and mast details. EMD has not received any anemometer calibration reports. The data obtained was considered to be logged with the right calibration factors. EMD has obtained access to the data as csv files. Therefore, the conversion of the raw data could not be verified.

According to the documentation available [59], FINO2 design and installation has not been conducted fully according to the IEC standards [56], especially in relation to the sizes of the mast and booms for the side anemometers (92.4, 82.4, 72.4, 62.4, 52.4, 42.4, and 32.4 m).

Table 53. Mounting of sensors on the FINO2 mast.

* Information not available

As FINO2 is a large offshore mast, the observed mast disturbance on the wind speed measurements is significant, especially for the anemometers mounted on horizontal booms. On [Figure 65](#page-131-0) it can be seen how the turbulence intensity is increasing with heights (except for the top anemometer at 102.5 m) in the sector where anemometers are affected by mast shadowing.

The top anemometer is not installed on the very top of the mast structure, but on the side facing south [\(Figure 63\)](#page-128-0). The lightning finial (in the northwest corner) as well as the pyramidal top of the mast are expected to cause flow disturbance of the 102.5 m measurements. On [Figure 66,](#page-132-0) the wind speed

measured at 92.5 m is indeed greater than the wind speed measured 102.5 m in east northeast sector. It has not been possible to remove the tower shadowing from the data since no double nor triple cup anemometry has been available at the same heights.

Data from sonic anemometers has not been deemed reliable for the purpose of this analysis (low data availability) and couldn't be used to remove the shadowing either.

Figure 65. Directional Turbulence Intensity for the cup anemometers, FINO2.

Figure 66. Directional wind speed ratio between 102.5 m and 92.5 m data, FINO2.

In general, the data quality is good. The wind directions and wind speed data at each height correlates well with the data at the other heights. The data has been filtered for faulty equipment and failures. Where possible, the missing direction data has been substituted with data from the available closest wind vanes.

7 full years have been selected from 01/09/2008 to 31/08/2015. The data from the 102.5 m anemometer is the primary data from the FINO2 met mast considered in the study. The recovery rate of the final data for the 7-year period is 93.3%.

For the turbulence intensity evaluation, the data heavily affected by shadowing has been excluded (340- 40 degrees).

The following major gaps (consecutive days with missing or erroneous data) in the wind data (wind speed at 102.5 and wind direction at 91.8 m) can be noted:

- 15 days from 30/11/2009
- 7.5 days from 09/09/2010
- 20.5 days from 15/05/2011
- 11 days from 22/05/2012
- 11.5 days from 08/06/2012
- 16.5 days in January 2015 (divided in about 5 different periods)
- 10 days from 19/03/2015

Due to the unavailability of some information, as mast's maintenance and instrument certification, it was not possible to precisely assess an uncertainty on FINO2's measurements. The uncertainty on FINO2 measurements was estimated to be in the magnitude of 3.5%, taking into account the lack of information and the noncompliance to the standards [56].

v. FINO3 Met Mast

Wind data from the FINO3 offshore measurement mast has been used to assess the expected turbulence conditions on the Kattegat site.

The data was made available by the FINO (Forschungsplattformen in Nord- und Ostsee) initiative, which was funded by the German Federal Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate Action (BMWK) on the basis of a decision by the German Bundestag, organised by the Projektträger Jülich (PTJ) and coordinated by the German Federal Maritime and Hydrographic Agency (BSH).

The FINO3 mast is mounted on a platform and is part of the FINO research project. The met mast was setup in the North Sea about 84 km west of the island of Rømø, on the Danish coast. It is located at about 285 km southeast of the KG-1-LB buoy [\(Figure 4\)](#page-25-0).

The collected measurements are:

- wind speed at 107, 101, 91, 81, 71, 61, 51, 41 and 31 m as 10-minute values (mean, min, max and standard deviation)
- wind direction at 101, 61 and 29 m as 10-minute values (mean, min, max and standard deviation)
- absolute temperature at 95 and 29 m, as 10 minutes values (mean values)

Besides the data obtained, the FINO3 mast was also equipped with relative humidity, air pressure, precipitation, and global irradiance sensors.

Figure 67. Pictures and details from FINO3, source: [60]

The available data covers a period of around 13.5 years, from September/2009 to February/2023. However, the series was trimmed to 4 full years, from 01/01/2010 to 31/12/2013, in order to avoid the influence of wakes from the neighbouring wind farm installed after 2014 (DanTysk OWF).

EMD had access to a mast report [59] describing the equipment installed and mast details. EMD has not received any anemometer calibration reports. The data obtained was considered to be logged with the right calibration factors. According to the documentation available [59], FINO3 design and installation has not been conducted according to the IEC standards [56], especially in relation to the sizes of the mast and booms.

Table 54. Mounting of sensors on the FINO3 mast

*Although those instruments are listed on the mast description, they were not included in the data files EMD had access to.

EMD has obtained access to the data as csv files. Therefore, the conversion of the raw data could not be verified.

As FINO3 is a large offshore mast, the observed mast disturbance on the wind speed measurements is significantly. Only for the data at 91, 71 and 51 m it has been possible to remove most of the tower shadowing thanks to the 3 cup anemometers in different direction for each height, as shown in [Table 53](#page-129-1) and [Figure 68.](#page-137-0) The data has been merged based on the detected distortions (Figures [65](#page-131-1) and [70\)](#page-138-0).

Figure 68. Representation of the boom's positioning in FINO3 and the undisturbed inflow directions, source: [59]

Figure 69. Directional Mean wind speed (left) and Turbulence Intensity (right) for the 3 cup anemometers at 91 m, before merging.

Figure 70. Directional Mean wind speed (left) and Turbulence Intensity (right) at 91 m, after merging.

In general, the data quality is good. The wind directions data at each height correlates well with wind direct at the other heights and wind speed data at each height correlates well with wind speed data at the other heights. The data has been filtered for faulty equipment and failures.

4 full years have been selected from 01/01/2010-31/12/2013. The data from the 91 m anemometer is the primary data from the FINO3 met mast considered in the study. It is deemed more reliable than the 101 and 107 m data, heavily impacted by the mast shadowing. The recovery rate of the merged data for the 4-year period is 92.2%. The following major gaps (consecutive days with missing or erroneous data) in the wind data (wind speed at 91 m-B and wind direction at 101 m) can be noted:

- 50 days from 14/01/2013
- 35 days from 03/07/2013
- 17 days from 08/11/2010, gap concerning all channels.
- 11 days from 01/01/2011, gap concerning all channels.
- 9 days from 11/01/2012, gap concerning all channels.
- 8 days from 27/07/2011, gap concerning all channels.

Due to the unavailability of some information, as mast's maintenance and instrument certification, it was not possible to precisely assess an uncertainty on FINO3's measurements. The uncertainty on FINO3 measurements was estimated to be in the magnitude of 3.5%, taking into account the lack of information, the noncompliance to the standards [56] and compensating for the possibility to correct the mast distortion.

vi. Ground Meteo Stations

A N H O L T

The observations made at Anholt come from a meteorological mast (#06079) from Danish Meteorological Institute (DMI) [8]. Wind speed and direction measurements are recorded at 10 m AGL. Temperature measurements are recorded at 2 m AGL. No turbulence data are available. The observations have been conducted from several locations during the measurement period as shown on [Figure 71](#page-140-0) and [Table 55.](#page-139-0)

Table 55. Measuring information of Anholt meteorological station

The coordinates available for the first three positions cannot be validated from the orthophoto map.

The forth position can be confirmed satellite imagery from Google Earth. The mast is located about 17- 25 m from the pier, at an altitude of 2.3 m ASL. The mast does not seem obstructed by local obstacles in the main wind direction. However, effects can be expected from a building about 50 m south-east of the mast. The setup of the anemometer on the mast is unknown, which prevents the assessment of possible distortion from the mast.

Figure 71. Four positions of Anholt met mast (DMI #06079) over time. Source: windPRO European Satellite Imagery.

Raw data verification and data treatment

In general, the data quality is good. The data have been filtered for faulty equipment and failures due to weather conditions.

To ensure the consistency of data in terms of location and time resolution, only the data from the last period of measurements and with 10 minute resolution is kept for this analysis (29/09/1999 – 01/05/2024).

The data is trimed to 22 full years (01/05/2000 – 01/05/2024). The recovery rate of the wind data for this period is very good with 98.9%. The following gaps (consecutive days with missing or erroneous data) in the wind data can be noted:

- 5 days in 09/2000
- 7 days in 07/2001
- 7 days in 10/2006
- 14 days in 04/2013
- 1 months between 04/05/2013 and 03/06/2013
- 2 days in 02/2018
- 5 days in 03/2022

The reasons for missing data is unknown.

The recovery rate of the temperature data is also good with 95.7%.

The observations made at Gniben come from a meteorological mast (#06169) from Danish Meteorological Institute (DMI) [8]. Wind speed and direction measurements are recorded at 10 m AGL. Temperature measurements are recorded at 2 m AGL. No turbulence data are available

The DMI met mast of Gniben is located on Sjællands Odde peninsula. At this outermost point, the peninsula is only 200 m wide, so the location of the met mast is well exposed to the open sea. However, the site is elevated from the sea level by 14 m at the position of the mast. At 23 m south of the met mast, one can notice a large (about 6 m wide) and tall (about 60 m high) lattice tower. Flow distortion from this tower can be expected on the measurements, however with a minimum impact as it does not concern any primary wind directions. Buildings east of the met mast are less than the measurement height and far enough to impact the flow. Steep slopes 80 m upwind in the western direction may affect the flow and hence the quality of the measurements. The setup of the anemometer on the mast is unknown, which prevents the assessment of possible distortion from the mast.

Observations at Gnibben have been conducted in different periods, characterized by different time interval and locations, as provided by DMI [8]. The locations are shown o[n Figure 72](#page-142-0) and listed on [Table](#page-141-0) [56.](#page-141-0)

Table 56. Measuring information of Gniben meteorological station

Figure 72. Four positions of Gniben met mast (DMI #06069)

Raw data verification and data treatment

In general, the data quality is good. The data have been filtered for faulty equipment and failures due to weather conditions.

To ensure the consistency of data in terms of location and time resolution, only the data from the last period of measurements is kept for this analysis. Out of this period, only 21 full years of 10 minutes values have been selected (01/05/2003 - 01/05/2024). The recovery rate of the wind data for this period is very good with 98.1%.

The following gaps (consecutive days with missing or erroneous data) in the wind data can be noted:

- 6 days in 08/2006
- 2 and 7 days in 04/2011
- 23 days between 05/2011 and 06/2011
- 32 days between 12/2012 and 01/2013
- 1 day in 04/2014
- 3 days in 12/2021

The reasons for missing data is unknown.

The recovery rate of the temperature data is also good with 97.4%.

N A K K E H O V E D

The observations made at Nakkehoved comes from a meteorological mast (#06168) from Danish Meteorological Institute (DMI) [8]. Wind speed and direction measurements are recorded at 10 m AGL. Temperature data is measured at 2 m AGL. No turbulence data are available.

The met mast of Nakkehoved is located on the northern coast of Sjælland, about 100 m from the shore. The surroundings are characterized by high roughness terrain with forest and cities (Gilleleje and Munkerup). The vicinity of trees (5-10 m tall) just next to the mast compromises the quality of the measurements due to the turbulences and displacement of the wind flow created by the canopy. The elevation of the mast is 36.4 m ASL.

Observations at Nakkehoved have been conducted with different time intervals. Two very similar and close sets of coordinates are available, see [Table 57.](#page-143-0) The actual position ("Na2" on [Figure 73\)](#page-143-1) which is valid for the 10 mintutes interval data sets can be verified from the Danish Orthophoto Mosaic (source: Geodatastyrelsen). The setup of the anemometer on the mast is unknown, which prevents the assessment of possible distortion from the mast.

Location	Longitude	Latitude	Measured period	Resolution
Na1	12.3429	56.1193	$07/02/1982 - 28/10/1983$ 02/09/1986 - 29/09/1999 30/09/1999 - 17/01/2001	3 hours 1 hour 10 minutes
Na ₂	11.2792	56.0064	18/01/2001 - 01/05/2024	10 minutes

Table 57. Measuring information of Nakkehoved meteorological station.

Figure 73. Two positions of Nakkehoved met mast (DMI #06068)
Raw data verification and data treatment

In general, the data quality is good. The data have been filtered for erroneous data usually due to faulty equipment and failures due to weather conditions.

To ensure the consistency of data in terms of location and time resolution, only the data from the last period of measurements is kept for this analysis. Out of this period, only 23 full years of 10 minutes values have been selected (01/05/2001 - 01/05/2024). The recovery rate of the wind data for this period is very good with 98.7%.

The following gaps (consecutive days with missing or erroneous data) in the wind data can be noted:

- \bullet 1 day in 07/2005
- 43 days between 01/2007 and 02/2007
- 27 days in 03/2014
- 17 days between 07/2021 and 08/2021

The reasons for missing data is unknown.

The recovery rate of the temperature data is also good with 98.5%.

H A L L A N D S V Ä D E R Ö

The observations made at Hallands Väderö come from a meteorological mast (#62260) from Swedish Meteorological and Hydraulic Institute (SMHI) [9]. The met mast is located on the northwest part of the island of Hallands-Väderö in Sweden. Wind speed, wind direction and temperature data are measured at 2 m AGL. No turbulence data are available.

Observations at Väderö have been conducted during two different periods at different locations. The first period consists of about 4.5 years (between 1961 and 1965), 540 m from the west coast of the island. The second period starts in 1995 (still ongoing) in the vicinity of the lighthouse, about 140 m from the west coast and at an elevation of 8.3 m ASL. The lighthouse and its dwelling are located about 25 - 32 m in the western direction. Flow distortion from these obstacles can affect the quality of measurements made at 2 m AGL. The landscape is open, but with low vegetation to the east.

The wind data is available as 10-minute averages delivered every hour. The temperature data are instantaneous values, also available as hourly data.

Table 58. Measuring information of Hallands-Väderö meteorological station.

Figure 74. Two positions of Hallands-Väderö met mast (SMHI #62260).

Raw data verification and data treatment

In general, the data quality is good. No filtering of erroneous data has been necessary. The data seems already filtered.

28 full years of h ourly data have been selected from 01/01/1996 - 01/01/2024. The recovery rate of the data for this period is good with 95.3%. The following gaps (consecutive days with missing or erroneous data) in the wind data can be noted:

- 12 days in 02/1996
- 1 day in 10/1996
- 14 days in 08/1997
- 7 days in 05/1998
- 10 days in 05/1999
- 4 days in 07/2000
- 34 days between 04/2002 05/2002
- 2 days in 09/2003
- 3, 4, 3 and 10 days in 10/2003
- 2 and 1 days in 11/2003
- 7 and 1 days in 03/2004

- 43 days between 01/2005 02/2005
- 8 and 4 days in 03/2005
- 9 days in 07/2005
- 24 days between 03/2011 04/2011
- \bullet 4 days in 05/2011
- 59 days between 11/2011 01/2012
- 8 days between 06/2017 07/2017
- 20 days in 03/2018
- 40 days between 02/2020 04/2020
- 22 days between 07/2021 08/2021
- 57 days between 02/2023 04/2023

Possible reasons for missing data:

- the station or transmitter has been out of order.
- the station has only delivered values with quality code Red (R).

The recovery rate of the temperature data is also good at 96.3%.

R Ø S N Æ S F Y R

The observations made at Røsnæs Fyr comes from a meteorological mast (#06159) from Danish Meteorological Institute (DMI) [8]. Wind speed and direction measurements are recorded at 10 m AGL. Temperature data is measured at 2 m AGL. No turbulence data are available.

The met mast of Røsnæs Fyr is located on the western coast of Sjælland, about 30 m from the shore. At this outermost point, the peninsula is only 90 m wide, so the location of the met mast is well exposed to the open sea, and the site elevation is only 1 m ASL at the position of the mast. At 10 m west of the met mast, one can notice a water tower (about 4 m wide and about 10 m high). Flow distortion from this tower is expected on the measurements. The vicinity of buildings and trees just next to the mast, also compromises the quality of the measurements due to the turbulences and displacement of the wind flow created by the canopy. The setup of the anemometer on the mast is unknown, which prevents the assessment of possible distortion from the mast.

Observations at Røsnæs Fyr have been conducted with different time intervals and from two different locations, see [Table 59 a](#page-146-0)nd [Figure 75.](#page-147-0)

Location	Longitude	Latitude	Measured period	Resolution
Ro1	10.8691	55.7436	$01/01/1959 - 14/11/2001$	3 hours
Ro ₂	10.8694	55.7435	15/11/2001 - 01/05/2024	10 minutes

Table 59. Measuring information of Røsnæs Fyr meteorological station.

Figure 75. Two positions of Røsnæs Fyr met mast (DMI #06159)

Raw data verification and data treatment

In general, the data quality is good. The data have been filtered for erroneous data usually due to faulty equipment and failures due to weather conditions.

To ensure the consistency of data in terms of location and time resolution, only the data from the last period of measurements is kept for this analysis. Out of this period, only 22 full years of 10 minutes values have been selected (01/05/2002 - 01/05/2024). The recovery rate of the wind data for this period is very good with 98.9%.

The following gaps (consecutive days with missing or erroneous data) in the wind data can be noted:

- 1 day in 04/2006
- 8 days between 12/2007 and 01/2008
- 19 days in 02/2008
- 5 days in 09/2011
- 1 day in 09/2014
- 1 day in 10/2014
- 7 days in 04/2015
- 2 days in 02/2016
- 6 days in 09/2023

The reasons for missing data is unknown.

The recovery rate of the temperature data is also good with 98.9%.

S L E T T E R H A G E F Y R

The observations made at Sletterhage Fyr comes from a meteorological mast (#06073) from Danish Meteorological Institute (DMI) [8]. Wind speed and direction measurements are recorded at 10 m AGL. Temperature data is measured at 2 m AGL. No turbulence data are available.

The met mast of Sletterhage Fyr is located on the southern coast of Sjælland, about 30 m from the shore. At this outermost point, the peninsula is only 90 m wide, so the location of the met mast is well exposed to the open sea, and the site elevation is only 1 m ASL at the position of the mast. The vicinity of buildings and trees just next to the mast, compromises the quality of the measurements due to the turbulences and displacement of the wind flow created by the canopy. The setup of the anemometer on the mast is unknown, which prevents the assessment of possible distortion from the mast.

Observations at Sletterhage Fyr have been conducted with different time intervals and from two different locations, see [Table 59](#page-146-0) and [Figure 75.](#page-147-0)

Location	Longitude	Latitude	Measured period	Resolution
SI1	10.5134	56.0954	$01/07/1977 - 30/04/1985$	3 hours
SI2	10.5135	56.0955	21/05/2001 - 01/05/2024	10 minutes

Table 60. Measuring information of Sletterhage Fyr meteorological station.

Figure 76. Two positions of Sletterhage Fyr met mast (DMI #06073)

Raw data verification and data treatment

In general, the data quality is good. The data have been filtered for erroneous data usually due to faulty equipment and failures due to weather conditions.

To ensure the consistency of data in terms of location and time resolution, only the data from the last period of measurements is kept for this analysis. Out of this period, only 22 full years of 10 minutes values have been selected (01/05/2002 - 01/05/2024). The recovery rate of the wind data for this period is very good with 99.4%.

The following gaps (consecutive days with missing or erroneous data) in the wind data can be noted:

- 2 days in 07/2004
- 3 days in 09/2005
- \bullet 6 days in 06/2017
- 2 and 1 days in 11/2017
- 6 days between 02/2022 and 03/2022

The reasons for missing data is unknown.

The recovery rate of the temperature data is also good with 99.2%.

vii. Measuring Stations Not Used

Several other meteorological stations were considered, but not used in this study for different reasons which are presented below.

The data measured by the LiDAR ("ANH") located on a platform inside the Anholt OWF has not been used. Besides incomplete available information, the data is heavily impacted by the Anholt wind turbines. The use of turbulence data in from undisturbed sectors are not relevant because they are deemed unreliable when measured from a LiDAR.

Data (of salinity and temperature) from meteorological stations Anholt E, L:A Middelgrund, N14 Falkenberg, Stora Middelgrund could not been found on the SMHI website [9]. With data otherwise available, this information would have been redundant and the issue was not pursued.

The data measured from the Fladen Lighthouse and Ringhals have not been selected as they have been considered redundant with Anholt Haven station. They are also considered to be too far away from the analyzed wind farm area.

The period of the measured data from the Anholt OWF, Hamlstad Flygplats and P22 are too short and therefore not suitable for the study. The goal of these type of data being to check the long-term consistency and the air temperature.

WIND SPEED DISTRIBUTION

The following table summarizes the resulting wind speeds.

Table 61. Summary of secondary data wind speed

WIND DIRECTION DISTRIBUTION

The frequency and energy distributions indicate that there is not only one defined main direction, but scattered distribution, being the third and fourth quadrant, from South-southwest to Northwest, the most dominant wind directions.

EMD International A/S

Figure 77. Supporting data wind direction frequency (on the left) and energy (on the right) distribution.

T U R B U L E N C E I N T E N S I T Y

The turbulence intensity calculated from the mean wind speed and its standard deviation is presented in [Figure 78.](#page-152-0) For FINO3, the 91 m mean turbulence intensity is presented while FINO2 the 102 m mean turbulence intensity is presented. The observed mean turbulence intensity for Læsø at 62 m is added for comparison. As observed o[n Figure 79 t](#page-152-1)he turbulence intensity has a uniform distribution across the direction sectors in all three observations.

Figure 78. Turbulence intensity measured at FINO3, FINO2 and Læsø

Figure 79. Measured turbulence intensity measured at FINO3, FINO2 and Læsø by wind direction.

The Læsø turbulence measurements are considered not representative of the Kattegat site, due to very low water depth at Læsø, and they were disqualified in the discussion in section 9.1.3. It is, however, interesting to compare the combined turbulence function based on FINO2 and FINO3 with a turbulence model at 150 m based on Læsø data [\(Figure 80\)](#page-153-0). The match on mean and standard deviation is poor, but the characteristic turbulence functions are surprisingly close.

EMD has verified the combined model against confidential measurement in the Kattegat that confirms the combined turbulence model with good match on mean, standard deviation and characteristic turbulence from 12 m/s and up.

Figure 80. Mean turbulence intensity (TI_mean), Standard deviation of turbulence intensity (TI_std) and Characteristic turbulence intensity for the Combined model and Læsø turbulence extrapolated to 150 m.

DIURNAL VARIATION WIND SPEED

The wind speed is lowest at midday and highest during the night.

Figure 81. Daily variation of wind speed at H1, 1 y - 150 m (red), HS-1, 8 months 150 m (green) and M1, 4 year, 62 m (purple).

The monthly wind speed variations point to highest wind speeds during the late autumn and winter.

Figure 82. Monthly variation of wind speed measured at H1 - 150 m (1 y) (in red), HS-1 - 150 m (8 months) (in green) and M1 - 62 m (4 years) (in purple).

T E M P E R A T U R E

A summary of the mean temperature measured on the 9 secondary data sources is presented in [Table](#page-155-0) [62.](#page-155-0)

The diurnal distribution of temperature shows a distinct difference between onshore and offshore stations. The amplitude is far smaller on the offshore sites as expected, which will resemble the Kattegat OWF more than the onshore station[s Figure 83.](#page-155-1)

Table 62. Summary of Secondary Temperature data

Figure 83. Diurnal and monthly variation of absolute temperature at the 7 secondary data sources.

Long-term Correction of Supporting Data

The measurement data from Hesselø South (HS-1), Hesselø (H1) and Læsø (M1) have been long-term corrected for wind model validation use. The reference period used is 2002-2023 (22 years). The argumentation for use of this period is presented in section [6.1.2.](#page-47-0)

REFERENCE DATA AND CORRELATION

For each dataset, three different reference datasets were considered: EMD-WRF, ERA5(T) and NORA3. These reference datasets are discussed in section [5.](#page-41-0) The closest node to each location was used.

EMD has several long-term correction methodologies at disposal. A full description of these can be found in the WindPRO reference document on Measure-Correlate-Predict (MCP) methods [25].

As for KG-1-LB, the uncomplete year of measurements at HS-1, there is a of seasonal bias when performing the long-term correction based on the with 8 months of available data.

In each case correlation on wind speed, monthly correlation on energy content (index), self-prediction (concurrent period) and 24-hour slicing test (both converted to production output) as well as the ability to correctly reproduce observed directional distribution and wind speed frequency distribution was considered. The reference data and methodology with the best combined success was selected. This is summarized in [Table 63.](#page-156-0)

Table 63. Best performing reference data and long-term correction methodology (LTC) for each secondary dataset.

LONG-TERM WIND SPEED DISTRIBUTION

The long-term corrected wind speeds and wind distributions are presented in [Table 64.](#page-157-0)

Frequency tables for each dataset can be found in appendix E.

Table 64. Long-term corrected wind speed and wind distribution, secondary data.

Frequency (%) - 150.00m - MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix] HS

Energy Rose (%) - 150.00m - MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix] HS

LONG-TERM WIND DIRECTION DISTRIBUTION

Figure 84. Long-term corrected frequency and energy roses, secondary data.

L O N G - T E R M D I U R N A L V A R I A T I O N S

Daily variation of the three long-term corrected datasets is presented i[n Figure 85.](#page-159-0) All data sets are quite parallel with higher wind speed at night than at daytime, the same pattern observed in the measured data.

Figure 85. Long-term corrected diurnal variation, secondary data. Red: H1, green: HS-1, purple: M1.

LONG-TERM SEASONAL VARIATIONS

The long-term seasonal variation mirrors that of the observation but is not more regular in shape with high wind speed at winter and lower wind speed in summer.

There is a distinctly different directional energy distribution summer and winter common for all three datasets.

Figure 86. Long-term corrected seasonal variation, secondary data. Red: H1, green: HS-1, purple: M1.

Figure 87. Long-term monthly energy roses, HS-1 (first line: January-April; second line: May-August; last line: September-December).

Figure 88. Long-term monthly energy roses, H1 (first line: January-April; second line: May-August; last line: September-December).

Figure 89. Long-term monthly energy roses, M1 (first line: January-April; second line: May-August; last line: September-December)

Appendix B. Verification and Classification Uncertainty

Verification uncertainty at 160 m height for WS199 [15].

Verification uncertainty at 140 m height for WS199 [15]

Type specific classification uncertainty from classification report for ZX300 by DNV-GL [16]

" EV was not assessed in the height

Filtered & Repaired Dataset: KG-1- LB

Udmand User:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
145 6916 4850
Karolata:
Calculata:
Calculata: Calculated:
28/06/2024 09.09

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: KG-1 ST Period: Full period: 21/07/2023 - 21/03/2024 (8.0 months) **Frequency distribution (TAB file data)**

WIND PRO 28/06/2024 09:09 / 1

Dismand User:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
145 6916 4850
Karolatad:
Karolatad:
Karolatad: Calculated:
28/06/2024 09.09

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: KG-1 ST Period: Full period: 21/07/2023 - 21/03/2024 (8.0 months) Frequency distribution (TAB file data)

28/06/2024 09:09 / 2

Disnad User:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
145 6916 4850
Karolata:
Calculata:
Calculata: Calculated:
28/06/2024 09.09

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: KG-1 ST Period: Full period: 21/07/2023 - 21/03/2024 (8.0 months)
Frequency distribution (TAB file data)

28/06/2024 09:09 / 3

Project:
Kattegat
(23406)

Disease use:
 EMD International A/S

Niels Jernes Vej 10

--

445 6916 4850

Karaina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk

Kaiculated: Calculated:
28/06/2024 09.09

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: KG-1 ST Period: Full period: 21/07/2023 - 21/03/2024 (8.0 months) Frequency distribution (TAB file data)

28/06/2024 09.09 / 4

Dismand User:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
145 6916 4850
Karolatad:
Karolatad:
Karolatad: Calculated:
28/06/2024 09.09

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: KG-1 ST Period: Full period: 21/07/2023 - 21/03/2024 (8.0 months)
Frequency distribution (TAB file data)

28/06/2024 09.09 / 5

Liamad use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
445 6916 4850
Kaisulata:
Kaisulata:
Kaisulata: Calculated:
28/06/2024 09.09

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: KG-1 ST Period: Full period: 21/07/2023 - 21/03/2024 (8.0 months)
Frequency distribution (TAB file data)

28/06/2024 09.09 / 6

Dismand User:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
145 6916 4850
Karolatad:
Karolatad:
Karolatad: Calculated:
28/06/2024 09.09

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: KG-1 ST Period: Full period: 21/07/2023 - 21/03/2024 (8.0 months)
Frequency distribution (TAB file data) 13

28/06/2024 09:09 / 7

Kattegat (23406)

Licensed user:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10

- -
+45 6916 4850
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk 28/06/2024 09.09

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: KG-1 ST Period: Full period: 21/07/2023 - 21/03/2024 (8.0 months) Frequency distribution (TAB file data) 100.00m -
Bin Start
Mean
0 7-SSW 8-WSW 9-W 10-WNW 11-NNW
10.84 10.26 11.08 10.27 8.20
0 0 0 0 0 End 0.49 0.50 1.49 3.50 4.49 5.649 4.65 6.49 5.649 6.649 5.649 6.50 6.49 6.56 4.49 6.56 6.49 6.56 6.49 6.50 6.49 6.50 6.49 6.50 6.49 6.50 1.49 11.50 12.49 12.50 13.49 13.50 13.49 13.50 13.49 15.50 13.49 15.50 15.49 15.50 15.49 15.5 $\frac{12}{45}$
109 $\frac{12}{48}$
102 $\begin{array}{c} 14 \\ 17 \\ 57 \\ 105 \end{array}$ $\frac{11}{47}$
67 $\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \end{array}$ 209
302 161
203
309
329
422
331
207
267
268
380
287
56
380
387
56
380
387
568
380
287
568 363
351 331
330
397
420 64 5 $\begin{array}{c}\n 2 \\
 4 \\
 0\n \end{array}$ 000000000000 $\begin{smallmatrix}1\0\end{smallmatrix}$ 000000 $\overline{0}$

28/06/2024 09:09 / 8

Kattegat
(23406)

Licensed user:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
- -

- -
+45 6916 4850
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk Calculated:
28/06/2024 09.09

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: KG-1 ST Period: Full period: 21/07/2023 - 21/03/2024 (8.0 months) Frequency distribution (TAB file data) 80.00m -

Bin Start End Sum 0-N 1-NNE 2-ENE 3-E 4-ESE 5-SSE 6-S 7-SSW 8-WSW 9-W 10-WNW 11-NNW

Bin Start End Sum 0-N 1-NNE 2-ENE 3-E 4-ESE 5-SSE 6-S 7-SSW 8-WSW 9-W 10-WNW 11-NNW

Mean

0 0.49 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

28/06/2024 09.09 / 9

Kattegat
(23406)

_{Licensed user:}
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10 ∷

- -
+45 6916 4850
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk Calculated:
28/06/2024 09.09

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: KG-1 ST Period: Full period: 21/07/2023 - 21/03/2024 (8.0 months) Frequency distribution (TAB file data) **Frequency distribution (TAB Tile data)**
 $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccc} 40.00 \text{m} & 9.29 & 6.61 & 6.57 & 8.42 & 11.10 & 9.58 & 6.55 & 7.55 \text{W} & 8.49 \text{W} & 9.49 & 10.49 \text{W} & 11.41 \text{N} \text{W} & 11.41 \text{N} \text{W} & 12.41 \text{W} & 9.29 & 6.61 & 6.57 & 8.42 & 11$

28/06/2024 09.09 / 10

Kattegat (23406)

Lidensed user:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10

+45 6916 4850 Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk 28/06/2024 09.09

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: KG-1 ST Period: Full period: 21/07/2023 - 21/03/2024 (8.0 months) Frequency distribution (TAB file data) $\begin{array}{cccccccc} 7\text{-SSW} & 8\text{-WSW} & 9\text{-W} & 10\text{-WNW} & 11\text{-NNW} \\ 5 & 8.32 & 7.94 & 9.26 & 8.69 & 7.39 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 9 & 19 & 29 & 28 & 25 & 14 \\ 5 & 53 & 69 & 67 & 45 & 39 \\ 7 & 5168 & 134 & 141 & 161 & 83 \\ 7 & 376 & 348 & 389 & 249 & 104 \\ 2 & 495 & 48 &$ 12.00m
Bin
Mean
0 4 ESE 5-SSE 6-5

8.60 7.18 7.66

0 0 0 0 0 0

147 191 175

22 20 19

147 191 175

22 360 382

193 307 359

256 340 345

229 37 359

256 340 345

229 37 359

256 340 345

229 37 359

256 340 345

229 54 129 176

256 96 171
 Start End 0.49 0.50 1.49 3.50 4.49 5.649 4.65 6.49 5.649 6.649 5.649 6.50 6.49 6.56 4.49 6.56 6.49 6.56 6.49 6.56 6.49 6.50 6.49 6.50 6.49 6.50 1.49 11.50 12.49 12.50 13.49 13.50 13.49 13.50 13.49 13.50 13.49 15.50 13.49 15.50 15.49 15.5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 2 2 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 9 4 4 1 $\begin{matrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{matrix}$ 000000 0000 $\frac{0}{0}$ 00000000 $\overline{0}$ **000** $\begin{matrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{matrix}$

28/06/2024 09:09 / 11

Udmand User:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
145 6916 4850
Karolata:
Calculata:
Calculata: Calculated:
28/06/2024 09.09

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

28/06/2024 09.09 / 12

Kattegat
(23406)

_{Licensed user:}
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10

- -
+45 6916 4850
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk 28/06/2024 09.09

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview
Mast: KG-1 ST Period: Full period: 21/07/2023 - 21/03/2024 (8.0 months)
Height: 260.00m -
Weibull data

28/06/2024 09:09 / 13

Kattegat
(23406)

Licensed use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk
Kalculated: Calculated:
28/06/2024 09.09

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview
Mast: KG-1 ST Period: Full period: 21/07/2023 - 21/03/2024 (8.0 months)
Height: 220.00m -
Weibull data

28/06/2024 09.09 / 14

Licensed user:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
- -

- -
+45 6916 4850
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk Calculated:
28/06/2024 09.09

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Mast: KG-1 ST Period: Full period: 21/07/2023 - 21/03/2024 (8.0 months)
Mast: KG-1 ST Period: Full period: 21/07/2023 - 21/03/2024 (8.0 months)
Weibull data

windPRO 4.1.192 by EMD International A/S, Tel. +45 69 16 48 50, www.emd-international.com, support@emd.dk

_{Licensed user:}
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10

- -
+45 6916 4850
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk 28/06/2024 09.09

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview
Mast: KG-1 ST Period: Full period: 21/07/2023 - 21/03/2024 (8.0 months)
Height: 170.00m -
Weibull data

Licensed use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk
Kalculated: Calculated:
28/06/2024 09.09

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

windPRO 4.1.192 by EMD International A/S, Tel. +45 69 16 48 50, www.emd-international.com, support@emd.dk

Liamad Lise:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
445 6916 4850
Katolata:
Katolata:
Katolata: Calculated:
28/06/2024 09.09

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Udmand User:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
145 6916 4850
Karolata:
Calculata:
Calculata: Calculated:
28/06/2024 09.09

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Udmand User:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
145 6916 4850
Karolata:
Calculata:
Calculata: Calculated:
28/06/2024 09.09

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Licensed use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk
Kalculated: Calculated:
28/06/2024 09.09

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Mast: KG-1 ST Period: Full period: 21/07/2023 - 21/03/2024 (8.0 months)
Height: 40.00m -
Weibull data

Udmand User:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
145 6916 4850
Karolata:
Calculata:
Calculata: Calculated:
28/06/2024 09.09

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Appendix D. Long-term Corrected Dataset: KG-1-LB, KG-A and KG-B

Udmand User:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
145 6916 4850
Karolata:
Calculata:
Calculata: Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.37

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data)
Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)

25/06/2024 18.37 / 1

Kattegat (23406)

Licensed user:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10

+45 6916 4850 Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk 25/06/2024 18.37

3
1
0
0
1

00000000

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)

Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 **Period:** Ful

260.00m - MCPLT - EMD wFR - [Matrix]

260.00m - MCPLT - EMD wFR - [Matrix]

Bin Start End Sum 0-N 1-NNE

Mean

0 0.49 371 10 37.69 7.18

2 1.50 2.49 5274 446 456

4 3.50 3.49 7862 453 5 Frequency distribution (TAB file data) 2-ENE 3-E 4-ESE 5-SSE

3 7.89 9.09 10.08 9.91

4 95 33 28 48

5 50 417 233 518

5 621 553 624 785

7 724 710 879 814

860 927 896 41263 1036

7 669 927 896 980

7 669 4264 1263 1036

80 927 896 980

7 669 41263 1036 6-S
9.68
52
152
692
947 7-SSW 8-WSW 9-W 10-WNW 11-NNW
11.21 11.35 10.92 10.83 8.37
111 24 9 12 15
111 106 164 152 175
52 400 311 470 349
818 572 544 829 602
148 572 544 829 602 1113
1114
1058
1074 1169
1169
996
1350
1515 1096
1291
1206
1325 1190
1640
1664
1850 824
824
1043
1550
1080 1263
1303
1265
1124 1056
1210
1093
1248 1515
1535
1401
1289 1325
1759
1877
1852 1850
1727
1981
2403 1327
1315 891011213141516171819201223141526223030313133333333333333334441 1400 10.50 11.49 15.50 19.49 19.50 19.49 19.50 14.49 15.50 14.49 15.50 14.49 15.50 14.49 15.50 14.49 15.50 16.49 16.50 17.49 15.50 16.49 16.50 17.49 17.50 18.49 17.50 18.49 18.50 19.49 22.50 23.49 23.50 23.49 23.50 23.49 23.50 1242
1242
1296
1200
1612 2226
1876
1877
1877 1382
1382
1686
1686
1347 1213
1210 1212

992

180

846

45

277

280

241

25

34

44

13

54

54 1709 1561 1081 936 559 565 466 467 948 559 565 466 470 948 559 565 466 567 568 569 569 569 569 569 56 4684

3112

2226

1663

167

666

505

250

161

98

62

43

28

11

40 $\mathbf{1}$ 00000 \circ $\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 7 \\ 0 \end{array}$ $\frac{1}{0}$ $\mathbf 0$ $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ 00000 $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ **000** $\begin{matrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{matrix}$ $\overline{0}$ $\overline{0}$ $\overline{0}$ $\overline{0}$ $\overline{0}$ $\frac{0}{0}$

25/06/2024 18:37 / 2

Licensed use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk
Kalculated: Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.37

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)

Frequency distribution (TAB file data)

220.00m - MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix]

Bin Start End Sum 0-N 1-NNE 2-ENE 3-E 4-ESE 5-SSE 6-S 7-SSW 8-

25/06/2024 18.37 / 3

Kattegat (23406)

Licensed user:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10

+45 6916 4850 Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk 25/06/2024 18.37

0000000

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)

Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 **Period:** Full Frequency distribution (TAB fill
190.00m - MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Mathix] Bin Start End Sum o-N 1-NNE
Bin Start End Sum o-N 1-NNE
Pin Start End Sum o-N 1-NNE
0 0.49 412 11 10 10
1 0.50 1.4 Frequency distribution (TAB file data) 4-ESE 5-SSE
9.99 9.74
64 84
104 154
223 502
623 781 7-SSW 8-WSW 9-W 10-WNW 11-NNW
10.98 10.80 10.40 10.16 8.06
30 42 17 31 147 21 17
119 113 144 212 138
356 373 351 513 348
660 636 691 908 687 2-ENE 3-E
7.91 8.95
11 53
203 196
581 515
635 581 6-S
9.56
42
216
508
1023 154
502
781
888
1052
1147
904
1438
1309
1235 766
766
754
886
852 1252
1100
1531
1599 1149
1756
1766
1770 643
1078
1327
1568 754
754
874
907
1256 1046
1012 836
921
1000
1219
1374
1290
1028 1258
1031 1508
1576
1489
1396 1635
1619
1402
1440
1378
1661
1616 1907
2237 1193
1882 999
3929 432
2011 168
303 47
37
11
2 8 2 6 1
1 0
1
0 2510 2510
2606
2070
2073
1454 1258
1230 $\begin{array}{l} 1318 \\ 1918 \\ 1459 \\ 1074 \\ 1041 \\ 653 \\ 337 \\ 317 \\ 241 \\ 102 \\ 49 \\ 251 \\ 38 \\ 9 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \end{array}$ 1215
1071 1519 880 664 77 880 664 77 880 664 77 880 664 77 880 864 77 87 880 881 882 882 883 882 883 883 883 8 \circ 000000 $\overline{0}$ $\mathbf 0$ $\begin{matrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{matrix}$ **000** $\overline{0}$ $\overline{0}$ $\overline{0}$ $\overline{0}$ $\frac{0}{0}$

25/06/2024 18:37 / 4

Licensed use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk
Kalculated: Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.37

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Frequency distribution (TAB file data)

25/06/2024 18.37 / 5

Liamad use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
-
145 6916 4850
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk
25/06/2024 18.37

WINDFRD 25/06/2024 18.37 / 6

Udmand User:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
145 6916 4850
Karolata:
Calculata:
Calculata: Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.37

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Frequency distribution (TAB file data)

WIND PRO

Licensed use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk
Kalculated: Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.37

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Frequency distribution (TAB file data)

25/06/2024 18.37 / 8

Udmand User:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
145 6916 4850
Karolata:
Calculata:
Calculata: Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.37

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Frequency distribution (TAB file data)

25/06/2024 18.37 / 9

Licensed use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk
Kalculated: Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.37

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Frequency distribution (TAB file data)

windPRO 4.1.190 by EMD International A/S, Tel. +45 69 16 48 50, www.emd-international.com, support@emd.dk

WindPRD

Udmand User:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
145 6916 4850
Karolata:
Calculata:
Calculata: Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.37

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Frequency distribution (TAB file data)

WINDFRD

Udmand User:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
145 6916 4850
Karolata:
Calculata:
Calculata: Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.37

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview
Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Height: 300.00m - MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix]
Weibull data

Licensed user:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10

- -
+45 6916 4850
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk 25/06/2024 18.37

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Height: 260.00m - MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix] **Weibull data**

Udmand User:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
445 6916 4850
Karolata:
Karolata:
Karolata: Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.37

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview
Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Height: 220.00m - MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix]
Weibull data

Ucansad use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
Karolina: Bredelle / kb@emd.dk
Karolina:
Calcination: Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.37

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Meteo data report - Welbull data overview
Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Height: 190.00m - MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix]
Weibull data

Ucansad use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
Karolina:
Bredelle / kb@emd.dk
Galoista: Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.37

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Weibull data

Ucansad use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
Karolina:
Bredelle / kb@emd.dk
Galoista: Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.37

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Weibull data

Licensed user:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
- -

- -
+45 6916 4850
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.37

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Meteo data report - Welbull data overview
Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Height: 130.00m - MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix]
Weibull data

Udmand User:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
145 6916 4850
Karolata:
Calculata:
Calculata: Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.37

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview
Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Height: 100.00m - MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix]
Weibull data

Udmand User:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
145 6916 4850
Karolata:
Calculata:
Calculata: Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.37

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview
Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Height: 80.00m - MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix]
Weibull data

Licensed user:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
- -

- -
+45 6916 4850
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.37

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview
Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Height: 40.00m - MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix]
Weibull data

Licensed use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk
Kalculated: Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.37

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview
Mast: KG-1 LT; KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Height: 12.00m - MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix]
Weibull data

Liamad Liam
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
445 6916 4850
Karolata:
Karolata:
Karolata: Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.45

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: KG-A LT; KG-A Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)

25/06/2024 18.45 / 1

Ucansad use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
- +45 6916 4850
Karolata:
Bakulata:
Galolata: Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.45

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview
Mast: KG-A LT; KG-A Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Height: 150.00m - Scaled Anholt gradient
Weibull data

25/06/2024 18.45 / 2

Udmand User:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
145 6916 4850
Karolata:
Calculata:
Calculata: Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.46

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data)
 Mast: KG-B LT; KG-B **Period:** Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
 Frequency distribution (TAB file data)

150.00m - Scaled Anholt gradient

25/06/2024 18.46 / 1

ä

Licensed use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk
Kalculated: Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.46

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Mast: KG-B LT; KG-B Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Mast: KG-B LT; KG-B Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Weibull data

25/06/2024 18.46 / 2

Licensed use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk
Kalculated: Calculated:
25/06/2024 16.40

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data)

Mast: MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix] HS-1, 22y; MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix] HS-1
Frequency distribution (TAB file data)

25/06/2024 16.40 / 1

_{Licensed user:}
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10

- -
+45 6916 4850
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk 25/06/2024 16.40

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Mast: MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix] HS-1, 22y; MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix] HS-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Height: 150.00m - MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix] HS-1 **Weibull data**

25/06/2024 16:40 / 2

Licensed use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk
Kalculated: Calculated:
19/06/2024 14.39

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data)

Mast: MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix] H1, 22y Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Frequency distribution (TAB file data)

Licensed use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk
Kalculated: Calculated:
19/06/2024 14.39

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview
Mast: MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix] H1, 22y Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Height: 150.00m - MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix] H1
Weibull data

19/06/2024 14.39 / 2

Licensed use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk
Kalculated: Calculated:
19/06/2024 14.40

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix] M1, 22y Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Frequency distribution (TAB file data)

_{Licensed user:}
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10

- -
+45 6916 4850
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk Calculated:
19/06/2024 14.40

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Mast: MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix] M1, 22y Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Height: 62.00m - MCP LT - EMD WFR - [Matrix] M1, 22y Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Weibull

19/06/2024 14.40 / 2

Appendix F. Translated to Position KG-1-LB: HS-1, H1, M1

Project:
Kattegat
(23406)

Liamad use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
-
145 6916 4850
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk
25/06/2024 18.49

_{Licensed user:}
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10

- -
+45 6916 4850
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk Calculated:
25/06/2024 18.49

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Mast: HS-1 LT [EMDWFR, Matrix] transfered to KG-1 **Period:** Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Height: 150.00m -
Weibull data

25/06/2024 18:49 / 2

Licensed use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk
Kalculated: Calculated:
19/06/2024 14.45

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: H1 LT [EMDWFR, Matrix] transfered to KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months) Frequency distribution (TAB file data)

WINDFRD 19/06/2024 14.45 / 1

_{Licensed user:}
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10

- -
+45 6916 4850
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk Calculated:
19/06/2024 14.45

Meteo data report - Weibull data overview

Mast: H1 LT [EMDWFR, Matrix] transfered to KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)
Height: 150.00m -
Weibull data

19/06/2024 14.45 / 2

Licensed use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk
Kalculated: Calculated:
19/06/2024 14.46

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: M1 LT [EMDWFR, Matrix] transfered to KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months) Frequency distribution (TAB file data)

Licensed use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk
Kalculated: Calculated:
19/06/2024 14.46

Meteo data report - Frequency distribution (TAB file data) Mast: M1 LT [EMDWFR, Matrix] transfered to KG-1 Period: Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months) Frequency distribution (TAB file data)

19/06/2024 14.46 / 2

_{Project:}
Kattegat
(23406)

Licensed use:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
Karina Bredelle / kb@emd.dk
Kalculated: Calculated:
19/06/2024 14.46

19/06/20
 Meteo data report - Weibull data overview
 Mast: M1 LT [EMDWFR, Matrix] transfered to KG-1 **Period:** Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)

Height: 150.00m - B Sheared
 Weibull data

19/06/2024 14.46 / 3

_{Project:}
Kattegat
(23406)

Liamad Lise:
EMD International A/S
Niels Jernes Vej 10
--
445 6916 4850
Karolata:
Karolata:
Karolata: Calculated:
19/06/2024 14.46

19/06/20
 Meteo data report - Weibull data overview
 Mast: M1 LT [EMDWFR, Matrix] transfered to KG-1 **Period:** Full period: 01/01/2002 - 31/12/2023 (264.0 months)

Height: 62.00m -
 Weibull data

19/06/2024 14.46 / 4

