Assessment of renewable wave energy resources in the French façade coastal zone

Sonia Ponce de León^{1,3}, Marco Restano², Jérôme Benveniste³

¹ Centre for Marine Technology and Ocean Engineering (CENTEC), IST, Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal

² SERCO/ESRIN, Frascati, Italy

³ European Space Agency (ESA-ESRIN), Frascati, Italy

World Ocean Circulation (WOC) User Consultation Meeting (OCM) 10-12 October, Frascati, Italy

11/10/2022

Motivation



The wave energy conversion technology is another sustainable energy source to supply energy offshore far from the grids and support the development of the **Blue Economy**.

The impact of the listed studies is twofold:

- They confirm that the wave energy resource is significant.
- That specific areas in the world have better wave resource than others.

_	
ſ	Fusco et al (2010)
	Fusco and Ringwood (2011)
	Arinaga and Cheung (2012)
	Ringwood and Brandle (2015)
	Roberstson et al (2016)
	Friedrich and Lavidas (2017)
	Reguero et al (2019)
	Lavidas (2020)
	Guillou et al (2020)
	Said and Ringwood (2021)
	Among many other authors



Objectives



- Investigate the feasibility of satellite altimetry-based assessments of wave renewable energy potential.
- Use the homogenized multi-mission altimeter (Ku-band) data "Sea State Climate Change Initiative" of the European Space Agency to estimate a map of the wave power density.
- Estimate the wave power density along the coast, taking advantage of the high-resolution satellite altimetry data products likethe Sentinel-3 mission, and using the improved geophysical retrieval algorithm SAMOSA+ (Dinardo et al., 2018, Dinardo 2020).
- Compare the wave power at coastal locations estimated from S3 SAMOSA2 with S3 SAMOSA+.



Data and Methods



- We use "CCI SEA STATE" data base (version 1.1), (1991-2018), [Dodet et al. (2020); Abdalla et al. (2021)] and Sentinel 3 & SAMOSA+ (Dinardo et al., 2018, Dinardo 2020) high resolution coastal products.
- The empirical model of Gommenginger et al. (2003) was employed to estimate the wave period, required for the estimation of the wave power density from the Ku-band radar altimeter significant wave height and the radar backscatter coefficient.
- The method has been validated with different wave buoys along the French and Iberian Pensinsula.

10 missions are considered in the CCI Sea State data base:

TOPEX, ENVISAT, ERS-1, ERS-2, GFO, SARAL, JASON-1, JASON-2, JASON-3, CRYOSAT





Study region





The wave power



For real seas, the wave power density P_{wave} can be computed by means of the expression:

$$\mathsf{P}_{\mathsf{wave}} = \frac{\rho g^2 \mathrm{H}_{\mathsf{s}}^2 \mathbf{T}_{\mathsf{e}}}{64\pi} \quad (\mathsf{W/m}) \tag{1}$$

In (1), ρ is sea water density (1025 kg/m³), **g** is the acceleration of gravity (9.81 m/s²),

 H_s is the significant wave height (m) (the mean of the 1/3 highest waves) and

 T_e is energy period, defined by m(-1)/m(0).

 T_e can be derived from the zero-crossing period T_z , as

T_e = 1.18 * T_z.





The method



We have the Hs directly from the altimeter, but we need to estimate the wave period using satellite altimeter data.

Gommenginger et al (2003), proposed a simple linear relationship between the variable X=(σ_0 Hs²) ^{0.25} and T_z:

 $T_z = a * X + b$ (a and b to be computed)

 σ_0 -radar backscatter coefficient

The coefficients a and b, are computed from values of X derived from the altimeter measurements and T_z values from wave buoys. A collocation of the altimeter and buoy measurements must be performed to get X, T_z pairs.

Mean (T_m) period and zero-crossing period (T_z) are computed from the moments of the 1d ocean wave spectra following Tucker (1991).



Table 1. Zero-lag correlation coefficients (a & b) for the Hs estimatedfromthesatellitealtimetrydataandbuoys.Legend:CC-correlationcoef.Wavebuoysnetworks:CANDHIS &SHOM (France),PAS-Ports of Authorities of Spain.

Buoys	Buoy/satellite fit	Regression coefficients
69	Bias=-0.44;Slope=1.20	a=1.5917
(2008-2018)	Si=0.19;CC=0.96	b=2.0901
74	Bias=-0.28;Slope=1.11	a=1.6616
(2011-2018)	Si=0.20;CC=0.97	b=1.7943
78	Bias=0.82;Slope=1.59	a=1.4302
(2010-2018)	Si=0.51;CC=0.92	b=1.6812
67	Bias=0.79;Slope=1.67	a=1.1129
(2005-2018)	Si=-0.43;CC=0.90	b=2.6728
80	Bias=-0.14;slope=1.0562	a=2.216
(2014-2018)	Si=0.16;CC=0.97	b=0.571
64	Bias=-0.26;Slope=1.11	a=1.713
(2004-2018)	Si=0.21;CC=0.96	b=2.025
66	Bias=-0.29 slope=1.11	a=2.21
(2004-2018)	Si=1.24;CC=0.94	b=1.3477
<mark>1</mark>	Bias=0.038;Slope=0.98;	a=1.8834
(1998-2018)	Si=0.17,CC=0.96	b=1.8863
<mark>24</mark>	Bias=-0.05;; slope=0.98	a=1.9861
(1990-2018)	SI=0.28;CC=0.91	b=1.1065
25	Bias=-0.14;slope=0.98; SI=0.37;CC=0.82	a=1.734 b=1.649
82	Bias=-0.14 ;Slope=1.023 SI=0.25;CC=0.91	a=1.679 b=1.517

Validation of the method





Validation of the employed method at wave buoy's locations (red circles) & locations of the assessment of the wave power from satellite altimeters of ESA CCI Sea State data (magenta circles) (1991 - 2018)

ESA UNCLASSIFIED - For ESA Official Use Only

+ 712 CONTENS **8** 7772 ACCUR

· e esa

Wave power density estimated from satellite altimetry data and wave buoys



Deep water buoy 6200001

Buoy/Satellite Fit

Wave Power Density Buoy/Satellite Fit

· e esa



Coastal buoy 6200064 (Depth = 52 m)

Wave Power Density Buoy/Satellite Fit

· e esa



Yearly mean wave power density estimated from the wave BUOYS



Table 2. Yearly mean WAVE Power density (W/m).



NCLASSIFIED - For ESA Official Use Only



12

5965

Yearly mean wave power density estimated in other locations using "only" satellite altimetry data





Location	Wave power
	(W/m)
1	32980
2	30133
3	27857
4	22738
5	19827
6	21180
7	21201
8	24184
9	<mark>25412</mark>
10	23719

Local estimation of the wave power density using only the CCI Sea State data

· eesa



Yearly mean wave power density maps (CCI Sea State data)







26-year wave power density mean map (CCI Sea State data)





26-year wave power density mean map (1992-2018) CCI Sea State



17



26-year mean map wave power density near the coast (1992-2018) CCI Sea State







SAMOSA+: Improved Retracker estimates



- Analytical retrackers try finding the best fitting model for each L1b experimental waveform.
- If a best fitting model is found, the associated parameters are provided in output products (epoch → SSH, SWH, Pu) as L2 estimates.
- The misfit parameter measures the mean quadratic error between waveform and model ('mqe' in official Sentinel-3 products) and gives an indication on the quality of estimates.
- A misfit < 4 indicates reliable estimates (EUMETSAT helpdesk, Dinardo et al., 2018).
- The value is higher in **presence of islands** or in **approaching the coastal zone:** the received waveforms are corrupted and do not respect the retracking model.

Maximum amplitude: related to wind speed Altimeter Signa itted Signa Trailing Edge units) Power (arbitrary Slope of leading edge: related to significant 0.2 wave height Thermal Noise 60 Gate Number corrupted waveform (Misfit > 4)

ESA UNCLASSIFIED - For ESA Official Use Only

▬ 〓 ▮! !! 〓 〓 ━ ┿ !! !! !! 〓 〓 !! !! 〓 〓 〓 ๛ !! ▶ !! \\ ** !!

SENTINEL-3 SAMOSA+ & SENTINEL-3 SAMOSA2 in the coastal zone





ESA UNCLASSIFIED - For ESA Official Use Only



Official S3



- Overall, SAMOSA+ presents a lower misfit & provides more valid estimates in scenarios in which contamination is present.
- Misfit is around 1-2 in the open ocean, increasing in the coastal zone (vertical blue lines) due to land contamination of the altimetry footprint.

SENTINEL-3 SAMOSA+ & SENTINEL-3 SAMOSA2 in the coastal zone





Method shortcomings



- Relies on the existence of wave buoys in the region of interest.
- The altimeter tracks should pass close to the buoy in order to obtain reasonable estimates of *a* and *b*.
- The effect of the length of the buoy time record in the calculation of *a* and *b* needs to be investigated.
- Proximity to the coast is a challenge for altimeter observations.
- Interpolation of *a* and *b* to the position of interest is challenging because it depends on the existence of enough buoys and their relative position.





Concluding remarks

• The different characteristics of chosen locations show some correspondence between variability and mean wave power which is important information in putting together a marine renewable energy strategy for any jurisdiction.

• These results obtained using CCI SEA STATE data do not give information very near the coast where the wave energy recuperation machines could be installed. The local energy available depends on bathymetry and wave-current interaction. Data closer to the coast are required and will be supplied for recent years with Sentinel-3A/B altimeter data processed with SAMOSA+ in the ESA Altimetry Virtual Lab hosted in the EarthConsole[®].

• The method will be extended to other coastal locations worldwide. *The investigation is still under development* to compare Sentinel-3 high-resolution altimetry products obtained with different retracking strategies (official SAMOSA2 & AVL SAMOSA+).





Future work



- Investigate the improvement in the wave power estimates near the coast using new retrackers.
- Perform wave power assessments in other regions with this method.
- Investigate the effect of the distance between the altimeter track and buoy and of the length of the buoy record on the regression coefficients value (the altimeter data extraction is slow so shorter extraction intervals are better)
- Investigate the effect of the interpolation method on the regression coefficients in the wave power estimates.

