

## BACKGROUND

- Partial repowering involves decommissioning/removal of selected equipment/parts in a wind asset and replacing with new parts of recent technology to attain higher performance and financial benefits out of the a
- Partial repowering has notably accelerated in US over the past 3 4 years increasing diversification of sponsors/investors, turbine technologies and geography (states) involved;



- Key market drivers:
  - More than 21 GW of capacity in North America is in excess of 10 years
  - Renewed Production Tax Credit (PTC) qualification;
  - Improved energy production and capacity factor;
  - Reduced OPEX through re-negotiated contracts and newer equipment
  - Improved energy sales structure through re-negotiated PPA; and
  - Improved asset value for M&A transactions.

## **OBJECTIVES**

- Understand the key valuation drivers for partial repowering activities in the industry;
- Understand the technological and engineering challenges and considerat associated with partial repowering of wind assets;
- Evaluate the trade-off between CAPEX and future revenue; and
- Evaluate the impact of the PTC sunset on partial repowering of wind asset and the possible future scenarios of such practice.

## METHODOLOGY

Key valuation drivers for repowered projects (vs greenfield projects):

- Energy assessment based on historical operational data and modelling
- Trade off between CAPEX and OPEX/production/revenue
- Go-forward revenue mechanism, e.g. with negative bidding
- Interface risks for new contracts and physical components with existing on
- Performance and reliability of re-used equipment

# Partial repowering of wind asset: technical considerations and financial return

A. GHORASHI, P. BRODEUR, H. NGUYEN, N. NITSCHE, and K-H. CHEW

RESULTS	
Key technology risks – Reused foundations:	
Fatigue performance	
<ul> <li>Typical weak links include pull-out fatigue, top mat fatig pedestal bearing/bursting fatigue.</li> </ul>	gue
<ul> <li>Case study: 10-year baseline + 20-year repowered damage</li> </ul>	е
<ul> <li>Existing foundation: octagonal spread footing, inadeque fatigue strength on top mat steel; and</li> </ul>	late
<ul> <li>Retrofitted foundation: reinforced concrete collar on to existing foundation.</li> </ul>	p of
Fatigue location10 yrs20 yrsTotal30-year RepowerFatigue life ~ 20 years only*	
1       Concrete bearing       0.006       0.016       0.022       OK       (non-conforming for total 30 year repowering)	
2Pullout of vertical steel0.0040.0080.012OK3Concrete shear fatigue0.0400.0800.120OK	
4         Bottom and top mat steel         0.540         1.120         1.660         Not OK           5         Grout         0.002         0.004         0.007         OK         Collar top bar	
Epoxied dowels	
<ul> <li>Recommendations &amp; mitigations:</li> </ul>	
$\circ$ Inspection/monitoring programs (to manage the risk), (	e.g.
Section 8 of DNV OS C502; and	
$\circ$ Structural retrofit (to achieve the target reliability).	
Einancing considerations:	
• DTC bonofite Ponoworod projects can qualify for DTCs (a	nd
impacted by the PTC sunset) in generally the same way as	s and a
greenfield project, subject to the "80/20" rule;	
<ul> <li>Increase in production*;</li> </ul>	
35.0%	
30.0%	
25.0%	
20.0%	al Capa
15.0% Production	tion Inc
10.0%	
5.0%	
0.0%	







### CONCLUSIONS Partial repowering could bring high financial and performance benefits to existing wind assets; Key technology risks in repowered projects typically focus on the foundations and wind turbine components; Assessment of remaining useful life of foundation and turbine components should be performed in a probabilistic approach; • Fatigue failure is the major failure mode of concern for reused foundation in repowered projects; Interface risks exist between new and old/ re-used physical components and contracts; responsibilities of suppliers and contractors on new and old components should be clearly defined; OPEX reduction and production/revenue increase through software optimization and use of recent technology could make additional CAPEX for repowering economical. However, this on its own may not be sufficient to make the practice financially feasible in the absence of PTCs, and therefore markets with higher offtake pricing, e.g. feed-in tariffs, may be more appealing for partial repowering in the absence of the PTCs; Recommendations & mitigation of technical & financial risks: Good quality SCADA data for future evaluation of feasibility in partially repowering; Maintain regular inspection/condition monitoring and good O&M practices; and • Maintain sufficient reserve for inspections and repairs. REFERENCES

- AWEA, Webinar The age of partial repowering of wind assets, https://webinars.awea.org/products/the-age-ofpartial-repowering-of-wind-assets-sponsored-by-dnv-gl, 18 November 2019.
- Norton Rose Fulbright, Currents Podcast EP63: The business of repowering, https://www.projectfinance.law/podcasts/2019/may/ep63the-business-of-repowering/, 29 May 2019.
- DNV GL White Paper on *Technical and contractual* considerations in partial repowering of wind turbines, EAA-WP-07, 19 Aug 2016.

## **CONTACT INFORMATION**

Ali Ghorashi, Director, Wind Independent Engineering

Ali.Ghorashi@dnvgl.com