

solar energy

May 2013

# Reducing Uncertainty in Solar Energy Estimates A Case Study

Marie Schnitzer Vice President of Consulting Services

Presented at the 2013 Sandia PV Performance Modeling Workshop Santa Clara, CA. May 1-2, 2013 Published by Sandia National Laboratories with the Permission of the Author.

# **Uncertainty Matters**





# **Uncertainty Matters**





# 1. Sources of Energy Uncertainty

- 2. Solar Resource & Data Sources
- 3. Case Study: Impact of On-Site Data on Energy Assessment
- 4. Results: Impact on Project Finance





### **Energy Estimates and Probability of Exceedance**



**Reduced Uncertainty** Increased Value of P90



### **Industry Expectations**

As the solar industry matures, on-site data is becoming more and more important for the financial community...

#### Fitch Ratings – Rating Criteria for Solar Power Projects (February 2011)

"Fitch looks for a minimum of one year, hourly, well-maintained, onsite data for a complete solar resource supply assessment. Shorter data periods than one year will not capture the full seasonal and diurnal characteristics of solar irradiance at a particular site, and would be considered either midrange or weaker. Confirmation that the instruments used to collect the data were appropriate and properly calibrated and maintained is also expected."

"Fitch considers a solar resource assessment that provides three output probability scenarios, a P50, a one-year P90, and a one-year P99, to be stronger...may not rate a solar debt issue that provides as P50 alone."

#### Moody's Investors Service – PV Solar Power Generation Projects (July 2010)

"...there has to be high degree of confidence that solar irradiation will meet or exceed certain minimum levels. For PV solar projects, Moody's will likely use a P90 forecast in calculating base case financial ratios..."







Albany, New York | Barcelona, Spain | Bangalore, India | awstruepower.com | +1 877-899-3463

©2011 AWS Truepower, LLC

- 1. Sources of Energy Uncertainty
- 2. Solar Resource & Data Sources
- 3. Case Study: Impact of On-Site Data on Energy Assessment
- 4. Results: Impact on Project Finance





## **Elements of Solar Radiation**

- Global Horizontal Irradiation (GHI)
- Direct Normal Irradiation (DNI)
- Diffuse Horizontal Irradiation (DHI)
- Solar PV primarily relies on GHI for energy estimates
- CPV and CSP rely on DNI



Source: ESRI, Inc.



#### **Modeled Data – Various Sources**



#### **On-site Measured Data**



#### Nearby Reference Station Data



#### Data Sources



# **Modeled Data Sources**

- US National Solar Radiation Database (NSRDB)
  - Mostly modeled solar data using numerical and satellite models
  - NSRDB TMY3 data set for specific locations in U.S



- 14% difference in a 60km radius around Dallas, TX
- Other sources of public and private modeled data (Meteonorm, NASA, others)





An Example Solar Resource Monitoring System



### **On-Site Monitoring Best Practices**

### **Measurement Plan**

- Solar instrumentation
- Meteorological: temperature, wind speed, precipitation
- Sampling/recording rate
- Measurement period

#### Installation and Commissioning

- Site selection
- Sensor verification
- Communications and data QA
- Documentation

#### Site Maintenance

- Regular schedule
- Clean, level instrumentation
- Site security

### Data Validation and Quality Control

- Regular system monitoring
- Comparison with reference data and concurrent satellite data
- Visual data screening
- Clear sky / extreme values

# Data Source Advantages and Limitations

Data Source	Advantages	Limitations and Risks	Intended Use
Modeled	<ul><li>Grid-cell specific</li><li>Publicly available</li><li>High data recovery</li></ul>	<ul><li>Grid resolution</li><li>Regional biases</li><li>Greater uncertainty</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Initial prospecting</li> <li>Smaller projects</li> <li>Correlation with on-site data</li> </ul>
Observed Reference Station	<ul> <li>Ground measurements</li> <li>Period of record may be longer</li> <li>Publicly available</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Scarcity of sites</li> <li>Location compared to project site</li> <li>Uncertainty: quality of O&amp;M, instrumentation, inconsistencies in data</li> </ul>	<ul><li>Confirm trends</li><li>Identify regional biases</li><li>Correlation with on-site data</li></ul>
On-Site Measurements	<ul> <li>Site-specific data</li> <li>Customized for project needs</li> <li>Station details well-known</li> <li>Reduced uncertainty</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Shorter period of record (correlate with long-term data)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>High-confidence resource and energy estimates</li> <li>Bankable reports</li> <li>In-depth characterization of seasonal and diurnal climate</li> </ul>



- 1. Sources of Energy Uncertainty
- 2. Solar Resource & Data Sources
- 3. Case Study: Impact of On-Site Data on Energy Assessment
- 4. Results: Impact on Project Finance





# The Case Study

# Why we did it

- AWS Truepower has long held the position that the risk of using modeled data alone can add unnecessary risk to a solar project when characterizing a project site.
- To further validate that on-site monitoring supports high confidence energy estimates (i.e. P90, P99) for bankable energy analysis, and quantify the differences between modeled and on-site measurement.



# The Case Study

# How we did it

- 11 sites with 1-2 years of data
- 2 solar energy assessments for each site
  - Modeled data alone
  - On-site measurements projected over project life
- Uncertainty assessment for each scenario





# Solar Resource Difference – Modeled vs. Measured





.

# **Uncertainty Assessment Using Modeled Data**



for our modeled scenario. In reality it would vary by site.

Representativeness of Monitoring Period (%) Spatial Variability (%)





# Uncertainty Assessment Using On-site Measurements





# Uncertainty Difference: Modeled vs. Onsite

Average uncertainty reduction of over 3.5%, range from 2.2% to 4.6% (3.9% reduction excluding outliers for maintenance practices)



Sites 10 and 11 represent monitoring programs that didn't employ best practices, corresponding to higher uncertainty.



Based on this case study, combined project uncertainty (solar resource and energy uncertainty) was compared for modeled data and on-site data:

Solar Data Source	Solar Resource Uncertainty (from case study)	Typical Uncertainty for Energy	Combined Project Uncertainty
Modeled Data	8.7 - 9.5%	5.0%	10.0 - 11.0%
On-Site Measured Data	4.5 – 5.9%	5.0%	6.7 – 7.7%



- 1. Sources of Energy Uncertainty
- 2. Solar Resource & Data Sources
- 3. Case Study: Impact of On-Site Data on Energy Assessment
- 4. Results: Impact on Project Finance





# Uncertainty Impact at Different Confidence Intervals

P-Values as Percent of P50



Effect of uncertainty is greater for higher confidence energy estimates (i.e., P90, P95, P99)

# **Impact on Project Finance**

# An accurate P50 is important because:

- P50 too low  $\rightarrow$  additional potential funding left on table
- P50 too high  $\rightarrow$  project returns reduced during operational phase

### Low uncertainty is important because:

- P90 and P99 are higher
- Level of debt is dependent on value of P90/P99
- Greater P90/P99 = greater debt sizing





# **Effect of Uncertainty**





# Conclusions

- On-site monitoring increases accuracy of P50.
- On-site monitoring with best practices reduces energy uncertainty by 3.5% or greater.
- On-site monitoring can increase the P90 by over 5% and the P99 by over 10%.
- Best practices for on-site monitoring mitigate risks from the start to avoid bigger risks later in the project.
- On-site monitoring = lower financial risk





# **Company Snapshot**

- Established in 1983; nearly 30 years of renewable energy industry experience
- Independent assessments on 50,000+ MW
- Project roles in over 80 countries

- Over 100 professional staff
- Experts in meteorology, spatial analysis, environment, and engineering
- Seasoned project managers and field technicians



# Questions

+1 877-899-3463

mschnitzer@awstruepower.com

www.awstruepower.com

Marie Schnitzer Vice President of Consulting Services



