

# Evaluation of the usability and usage of the integrated tool

Gerard Schepers, Igor Waldl, Gregor Giebel, Charlotte Hasager, Rainer Cordsen

July 2015

Agreement n.: Duration: Co-ordinator: FP7-ENERGY-2011-1/ n°282797 January 2012 to June 2015 DTU Wind Energy, Risø Campus, Denmark

Support by:



#### PROPRIETARY RIGHTS STATEMENT

This document contains information, which is proprietary to the "EERA-DTOC" Consortium. Neither this document nor the information contained herein shall be used, duplicated or communicated by any means to any third party, in whole or in parts, except with prior written consent of the "EERA-DTOC" consortium.



# **Document information**

Document Name:	Evaluation of the usability and usage of the integrated tool	
Document Number:	D5.13	
Author:	Gerard Schepers;Igor Waldl;Gregor Giebel;Charlotte Hasager;Rainer Cordsen	
Date:	July 2015	
WP:	5	
Task:		



I	I ABLE OF CONTENTS	
1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	. 3
2	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	. 4
3	EERA-DTOC END USER QUESTIONNAIRE	. 6
4	RESULTS FROM EERA-DTOC TEST RUNS	. 8
5	CONCLUSIONS	9



# **2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report describes the value of the integrated wind farm cluster design tool. Deliverable D5.12 shows the results of the scenarios. The present report contains the evaluation, implementations, and future perspectives. Thereto the evaluations as a result from user questionnaires as well as the evaluation reported in D5.12 based on test runs of various scenarios carried by WP5 participants are included.

The DTOC spin-off tool Wind & Economy is evaluated during the project by partners including industry participants. Additional user experiences are evaluated in D5.12 based on test runs of various scenarios made by EERA-DTOC participants.

Finally the future perspective beyond the project is integrated into the end-user questionnaire evaluation.

As main conclusions, the following points were highlighted as positive or as to-be-improved:

#### **Main Positives**

- Clearly arranged GUI, easy to use
- Excellent scenario management, good depth of information
- Integration of Google maps
- Fast and light user interface
- Video documentation as tutorials, steep learning curve
- Runs stable under Windows

#### Main drawbacks

- Problems using the tool under Linux/Mac platform
- VPN connection
  - o Slow
  - o Company restrictions
- QGIS
  - o Learning QGIS is too complicated
  - o Slow
  - $\circ$   $\;$  Functionality for editing cable connections is not sufficient yet
- Reporting
  - Still limited
  - o Scenario comparison missing
  - o Many details missing in report

### Future developments based on drawbacks

Commitment of software developers and design changes:

- Replace VPN connection by web services
- Faster connection to GIS via web/map service (instead of direct data base access)
- Tutorial for GIS usage and integration
- Extensive reporting of scenarios and scenario comparison



## Wishes for future releases

- Extended reporting
- Calculate complete tree at once
- FAQ
- Better usability under Linux and Mac
- Future integration of electrical model



# 3 EERA-DTOC END USER QUESTIONNAIRE

In the following a summary of the end user questionnaire, which was handed out to all EERA-DTOC partners, is shown.

The detailed analysis of answers and the questionnaire template can be found in the Appendix document

Number of completed questionnaires: 7

# What is implemented in a good way?

# badexcellentGUIScenario managementImage: Scenario managementImage: Scenario managementGoogle mapsImage: Scenario managementImage: Scenario managementGoogle mapsImage: Scenario managementImage: Scenario managementFast and lightImage: Scenario managementImage: Scenario managementVery robust under Windows environmentImage: Scenario managementImage: Scenario managementGIS integrationImage: Scenario managementImage: Scenario managementWRFImage: Scenario managementImage: Scenario managementWAsP/ParkImage: Scenario managementImage: Scenario managementFugaImage: Scenario managementImage: Scenario managementLCOEImage: Scenario managementImage: Scenario managementUncertaintyImage: Scenario managementImage: Scenario managementExtent of modules/functionsImage: Scenario managementImage: Scenario management

### What should be improved?

	bad	excellent
Connection via VPN QGIS with Linux/Mac		
<b>GIS integration</b> Editing scenarios in QGIS GIS/GUI interplay	bad	excellent
<b>Missing features</b> Scenario comparison Creating projects/scenarios from scrato Wind farm scale wake modelling	bad	excellent
Reporting Usefulness Is the reporting adequat for prototype? Requirements fulfilled Details of reports Single turbine reports Comparative Reports	bad	

اء م ما

#### System experience

.....





# 4 RESULTS FROM EERA-DTOC TEST RUNS

Several parties carried out calculations with the software. These results are summarized in D5.12. Thereto a test matrix has been defined with which user stories and scenarios were divided over the partners. All parties were asked to report the results of their calculations in a prescribed format so that a consistent and comparable set of user reports has been obtained.

One of the main obstacles for a thorough testing was formed by remote access problems, since firewall problems prevented many users to run the tool from their offices. These problems could sometimes be solved through workarounds.

Generally speaking the users reported positive experiences, with easy installation (apart from the firewall problems) and a steep learning curve. The QGIS was sometimes mentioned to have long runtimes.

Most results which have been obtained were believed to be realistic. In many cases a comparison was made between Fuga and WAsP leading to a reasonable to good mutual agreement. Interfacing to other tools was however not possible yet from the EERA-DTOC tool by which the users who wanted to run other models than Fuga and WAsP had to run these cases off-line.

Very interesting was a study on the near future scenario in which the production was compared of a wind farm consisting of INNWIND.EU turbines and the production of the farm where the turbines were replaced by low induction (and higher diameter) AVATAR turbines. The farm with AVATAR turbines led to a higher gross energy production (as expected from the larger turbine) but also to lower wake losses which are attributed to the design concept (low induction) of the AVATAR turbine. The results of this study will be communicated to the AVATAR project.

Moreover a large number of observations were made which sometimes led to improvement of the tool, e.g.

- Too little detail in output results (largely solved)
- Expiry of licences without notice (solved)
- The use of an unconventional turbine type (i.e. the AVATAR turbine) led to unrealistic results (solved)
- The user story which investigates the effect of different turbine heights led to unrealistic cost variations, since the effect of tower height on turbine costs is not included yet.
- Some functionality didn't work on Unix, Mac (solved)
- Some puzzling results were found on the gross energy yield (still under investigation)
- It was found that the wind resource has to be changed at least once in the wind resource manager to get the correct wind resource even if other wind data are preselected in the GUI. This is an initialisation / misconfiguration problem. (Users have been informed on this).



# 5 **CONCLUSIONS**

The tool has been used extensively for testing by the user community. Usability and fitness for purpose was generally good, but a number of issues held up the progress. Most of these issues were resolved underway, and the remaining ones are being resolved for the commercial launch.