

April 2002

ECN-C--02-001

LEARNING AND DIFFUSION FOR WIND AND SOLAR POWER TECHNOLOGIES

Monograph in the framework of the VLEEM project

P. Lako

Acknowledgement

This study is part of the so-called VLEEM project, the acronym for Very Long Term Energy-Environment Model. This project is executed by a team consisting of ENERDATA (project leader, F), Max Planck Institut für PlasmaPhysik (D), Forschungszentrum Jülich (D), Verbundplan (A) and ECN Policy Studies under a contract from the EU. The activities of ECN Policy Studies for the VLEEM project are co-financed by the Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs. The author wishes to acknowledge the valuable help he got from colleagues within ECN, notably F.J.L. van Hulle, H.C.C. de Moor, M. de Noord, G.J. Schaeffer, A.J. Seebregts, and B.C.C. van der Zwaan. However, the contents of this study remain the responsibility of the author. The study was carried out by ECN Policy Studies under ECN project number 7.7372.

Abstract

This study focuses on learning and diffusion for onshore wind, offshore wind, and photovoltaic power (PV, solar panels). The process is driven by the amalgam of technological development and increasing sales. The study addresses the development of onshore wind in Western Europe and the world at large, as well as the current state-of-the-art with respect to technology and cost. It also shows a possible development in the next ten years. An analysis is presented of the potential of cost reduction through 2030, based on a deployment scenario for onshore wind and learning effects that are deemed achievable both from the perspective of progress ratios determined for the last decades and of engineering judgements about future cost reductions.

A more or less similar view is presented for near-shore and offshore wind. Data are presented of near-shore and offshore windfarms that have been realised or are in various stages of preparation. The potential for cost reduction is analysed based on scenarios for deployment until 2030 and learning effects for components of near-shore and offshore windfarms.

At last, a view is presented on the development of photovoltaic power (PV) in OECD countries, the status of PV, and potential cost reductions through 2035 based on a deployment scenario for PV and 'progress ratios' for several components of a PV system, partly based on past experience.

CONTENTS

SUMMARY	5
1. INTRODUCTION	7
2. ONSHORE WIND	9
2.1 Introduction	9
2.2 Development in Western Europe	9
2.3 Global development	11
2.4 Current technology and cost	12
2.5 The next ten years	15
2.6 The next thirty years and beyond	16
3. NEAR-SHORE AND OFFSHORE WIND	22
3.1 Introduction	22
3.2 Onshore and offshore wind potential	22
3.3 Recent developments	23
3.4 Near-shore wind	27
3.4.1 Characteristics of near-shore windfarms	27
3.4.2 Perspectives for the next thirty years	28
3.4.3 Learning effects	29
3.5 Offshore wind	32
3.5.1 Characteristics of offshore windfarms	32
3.5.2 Perspectives for the next thirty years	34
3.5.3 Learning effects	34
3.6 Near-shore and offshore compared to onshore wind	36
4. PHOTOVOLTAIC POWER	38
4.1 Introduction	38
4.2 Photovoltaic power in the OECD	38
4.3 Status of PV	40
4.4 Learning in the past decades	42
4.5 The next thirty-five years	43
5. CONCLUSIONS	48
REFERENCES	50
INTERNET	52

SUMMARY

This study gives an analysis of the potential of cost reduction for wind and photovoltaic power (PV, solar panels). The process of cost reduction of such technologies is mainly driven by the amalgam of technological development and increasing sales.

Wind energy has developed rapidly in Western Europe (the EU-15, Switzerland, and Norway). Sluggish growth experienced in some countries may be caused by planning issues, lengthy approval procedures, and sometimes lack of financial incentives taking into account the difference in production cost between wind power and conventional power production. However, there is scope for improvement. Also, the upcoming offshore wind market offers new perspectives. Although Europe has the lead, non-European countries – the USA, China, and India – are crucial as well, because of their sheer dimensions, the magnitude of their population, the prevailing wind climate, and the size of their electricity demand.

Cost reduction for wind turbines is based on a number of factors. In case of onshore wind, the experience with cost reduction as a function of cumulative installed capacity may be used for estimates of future cost reductions. So-called ‘progress ratios’ are determined for key components of onshore wind turbines, viz. firstly the rotor & nacelle, secondly the tower, and thirdly civil work, infrastructure, and grid connection. For the main components – rotor & nacelle – a progress ratio of 0.9 is used. This means a cost reduction of 10% for each doubling of the cumulative capacity. Rather modest progress ratios applied to wind turbine components may be argued by:

- The advanced state of current wind turbines with capacities from 0.6 to 2.5 MW.
- Limited potential for further upscaling, one of the main drivers for cost reduction so far.
- Limited cost reduction potential for towers; towers are often sourced from local suppliers.
- Minor cost reduction potential for civil work, infrastructure, and grid connection. This part of a windfarm is more or less ‘conventional technology’.
- An estimated cost reduction potential of 10-34% in case of upscaling of production volumes from 1,000 to 30,000 turbines per year.

Enron Wind Corp published estimates of the market potential of wind energy until 2020 as well as a corresponding pattern of cost reduction for wind turbines. These estimates are used as a yardstick for future cost reductions of onshore wind until 2030. Application of a moderate progress ratio for rotor & nacelle (progress ratio 0.9) and even more modest learning effects for other components has the result that the specific investment cost decreases from \$ 900/kW in 2000 to € 590/kW (*reference*) or possibly € 560/kW (*low*) in 2030.

In such a scenario (extrapolation of an estimate of the market potential by Enron Wind Corp through 2030) around 30% of the economic potential of wind energy in Europe at a cut-off level of 6US¢/kWh - determined in a study from the British consultant Garrad Hassan and Partners - would be utilised. In nearly all of the regions of the world the economic potential of onshore wind will be far from depleted around 2030. Further growth towards 2100 is not so much limited by wind potential but by economic and other considerations such as the intermittent nature of wind energy and preservation of landscape.

Data have been collected of offshore wind farms that have been realised or are in various stages of preparation. A distinction is made between near-shore and offshore windfarms. Generally, offshore windfarms are characterised by more or less harsh wind and wave conditions prevailing at the North Sea and parts of the Baltic Sea. Near-shore windfarms are windfarms in more sheltered and shallow waters like the Baltic Sea coast near Denmark and Sweden.

The global cumulative capacity of near-shore wind is assumed to increase from 0.09 GW in 2000 to 69 GW in 2030 (nearly 10 doublings). It has been assumed that the cost of rotor & nacelle will decrease with the same speed as in case of onshore wind. For offshore constructions and cabling & grid connection rather modest learning effects are assumed. Based on such assumptions for the period 2000-2030, the specific investment cost of a near-shore windfarm could come down from € 1,375/kW in 2000 to € 885/kW (*reference*) or possibly € 755/kW (*'low'*) in 2030. Near-shore wind could become nearly as competitive as onshore wind by virtue of its relatively high capacity factor compared to onshore wind. The capacity factor of a near-shore windfarm could be approximately 36% vis-à-vis ~ 24% for onshore wind. This capacity factor not only includes the number of full-load hours dictated by the wind climate, but also corrections for non-availability and park effects.

The cumulative capacity of 'real' offshore wind is assumed to increase from 0.16 GW in 2002 to approximately 205 GW in 2030 (~ 10 doublings). The specific investment costs of offshore constructions and cabling & grid connection are higher than for near-shore wind. Also, the turbines may be larger and probably more costly in terms of €/kW installed. The progress ratios of the components 'offshore constructions' and 'cabling & grid connection' are deemed to be equal to those of near-shore windfarms. Based on these assumptions, the specific investment cost of an offshore windfarm could be reduced from € 1,700/kW in 2002 to € 1,140/kW (*reference*) or possibly € 970/kW (*'low'*) in 2030. This is roughly twice the level of investment cost of onshore wind. The capacity factor of large offshore windfarms on the North Sea and the Baltic Sea is much higher than for onshore wind, viz. 40% vis-à-vis ~ 24%. Nevertheless, offshore wind will remain more costly in terms of €/kWh than onshore wind.

The principle of photovoltaic power (PV) is straightforward, and it offers a vast potential for small- and large-scale application by virtue of its modular character. The challenge is to make PV an economically viable option. The efficiency of solar cells may be increased substantially. Also, the lifetime may be prolonged by prevention of significant degradation. Furthermore, consumption of materials – high-grade silicon, precious metals – may be reduced to low and 'sustainable' levels. Finally, advanced large-scale production processes will make PV more and more competitive in the long term.

Progress ratios of 0.8 for modules (based on past experience) and more modest ones for inverter & cabling as well as installation are applied to a scenario from the European Photovoltaic Industry Association (EPIA). The EPIA scenario implies more than 10 doublings of the global cumulative installed capacity from 2000 to 2035. Consequently, the specific investment cost of grid-connected PV systems could be reduced by a factor 5 to 7, viz. from € 5,400/kW in 2000 to € 950/kW (*reference*) or possibly € 790/kW (*'low'*) in 2035.

A cost reduction of this order of magnitude (factor 5 to 7) is confirmed by other studies on learning effects for various energy technologies. The scenario presented by the European Photovoltaic Industry Association presumes a co-ordinated policy from governments and industry. The growth of the photovoltaic capacity after 2035 is limited by economic factors and by the intermittent nature of a renewable option like PV, rather than by its technical potential.

1. INTRODUCTION

Several ‘renewables’ are in different stages of commercialisation, e.g. onshore wind, offshore wind, and solar (photovoltaic) power. The database of the specific investment costs (e.g. €/kW or \$/kW) as a function of the cumulative capacities of these technologies is increasing. Therefore, projections of future investment costs may be made with more accuracy than before. However, the patterns of cost reduction in the past may not be simply extrapolated to the future. For instance, the database may be limited in terms of cumulative installed capacity. This is particularly relevant in case of PhotoVoltaic power (PV). For onshore wind the database is much larger, although different units – cost ex-works or installed wind turbine cost, (dollar) exchange rates – may give problems. So, one should be aware of possible pitfalls.

First of all, one needs an analysis of the characteristics of a technology, its costs in several stages of development subdivided for basic components, and engineering judgements about the potential for cost reduction. Secondly, the specific investment cost is related to the cumulative installed capacity of a technology during a certain period. This is what in the literature is called an ‘experience curve’ or ‘learning curve’. The two units that are compared are the price (or cost) of a technology - in some currency, e.g. €/kW of the year 2000¹ - and its cumulative installed capacity. The corresponding change in price is referred to as the *progress ratio*. A progress ratio (PR) of 0.8 is tantamount to a cost reduction of 20% for each doubling of the cumulative capacity. Experience curves and PR’s have been determined for onshore wind and photovoltaic power. A curve with a PR of 0.96 from Neij for Danish turbines of 55 kW and more during the period 1982-1997, quoted in a recent IEA study (IEA, 2000), is shown in Figure 1.1.




Figure 1.1 *Experience curve for wind turbines from Danish manufacturers*
Source: IEA: Experience curves for energy technology policy, IEA, Paris, 2000.

¹ Cost figures in this study are in € of 2000, unless otherwise stated.

Although this curve is often referred to and shows a nice fit for the period considered, the progress ratio of ~ 0.96 is not so ‘firm’ as one might expect. For various reasons one has to be careful in simply adopting a progress ratio of such an order of magnitude:

- The PR of 0.96 is based on Danish turbines produced from 1982 with a capacity of 55 kW and more, exclusive of smaller turbines from other manufacturers than the Danish ‘big five’.
- The first few years of the 1980s were characterised by large shipments of Danish turbines to the US in the period of the Californian ‘wind boom’. The average selling price might have been lower without Californian subsidies.
- In the 1990s, Germany and Spain showed steeply increasing wind turbine capacities that are generally not reflected by the learning curve, except for turbines originating from Denmark. Therefore, limitation of the scope to Danish wind turbines may underscore the learning effects in later periods.

The learning curve shown in Figure 1.1 may prove to be not exactly the right yardstick for learning in case of wind turbines in the past decades. A more pronounced learning effect, a PR of say 0.9, as reported by others could be just as probable.

A much more encompassing view of ‘technological learning’ is provided in (Grübler, 1998) for numerous technologies in different periods of time and different world regions. This study is based on a long-term commitment to in-depth analysis of technological development and technological learning within IIASA and other institutes and organisations around the world. Therefore, the view on technological learning has deepened during the last few decades.

The process at the root of cost reductions for wind power and PV is driven by two main factors, viz. the amalgam of technological development and increasing sales on the market. In case of wind energy the development of the market has not been steady in terms of a constant percentage growth of installed capacity per year. Also, sales of PV systems do not show a constant percentage growth, particularly if the focus is on specific countries. The learning process is a complex result of e.g. ongoing R&D in industry and laboratories (e.g. Risø, Denmark, in case of wind energy), demonstration projects, financial incentives, etc. Commercialisation of technologies is intimately linked with RD&D. Wene says in the aforementioned IEA study (IEA, 2000): ‘The cycle reinforces itself; it is a ‘virtuous cycle’. There is a double boost from the sales on the market and from the improvement of knowledge through R&D’.

This study focuses on learning and diffusion for onshore wind, offshore wind, and PV. In Chapter 2 the development of onshore wind in Western Europe and the world at large is addressed, as well as the current state-of-the-art with respect to technology and cost. It also shows a possible development in the next ten years. Finally, Chapter 2 presents an analysis of the potential of cost reduction through 2030, based on a deployment scenario for onshore wind and learning effects that are deemed achievable from the perspective of learning experienced during the last decades and of engineering judgements about future cost reductions.

Chapter 3 gives a similar view of the development of offshore wind, or more specifically near-shore and offshore wind.

Chapter 4 focuses on photovoltaic power (PV) in OECD countries, the status of PV, and potential cost reductions through 2035 based on a deployment scenario for PV and progress ratios for several components of a PV system, partly based on past experience.

Finally, Chapter 5 contains a number of conclusions from the preceding Chapters.

2. ONSHORE WIND

2.1 Introduction

During the last two decades wind energy has become one of the most important ‘new’ renewables. In the early 1980s, wind turbines were small (55 kW), rather inefficient, prone to mechanical problems, and relatively costly. Today, wind turbines are large (up to 2.5 MW), efficient, reliable, and nearly competitive compared to conventional power generation options.

The wind turbine industry has profited from the favourable RD&D climate and the willingness to pay for the higher cost of wind compared to other power generation options. A growing number of countries have consistent and favourable financial incentives. Also, the process of planning and approval has become accountable. It is no wonder that wind energy has become popular in many countries. Yet, there is still a long way to go before wind will generate 10% of the world’s electricity, the target of Greenpeace, European Wind Energy Association (EWEA), and the Danish Forum for Energy and Development (FED) for 2020 (Greenpeace, 2000).

Although the deployment of wind turbines is still in its infancy compared to for instance hydro-power, wind power is evolving from a regional into a world market. Simultaneously, wind power technology is getting more and more mature. Several wind turbine manufacturers have experience with relatively large numbers of identical turbines, even of Megawatt scale.

An important question is whether wind will capture a large share of the power generation market based on further technological development and cost reduction. In general, it is difficult to estimate the (ultimate) potential of wind energy and the possible cost reduction of wind turbines. Therefore, projections may be based on experience gathered from the last few decades.

A number of issues will be highlighted in this chapter. Sections 2.2 and 2.3 shortly address the development of onshore wind in Western Europe and the world respectively. In Section 2.4 the current state-of-the-art with respect to technology and cost is described briefly. Section 2.5 gives a perspective for the next ten years. Finally, Section 2.6 gives insight in the drivers for further cost reduction, viz. technological development and mass production, and the effect they may have on the production cost of wind energy in a strongly growing world market.

2.2 Development in Western Europe

Wind energy has developed rapidly in Western Europe – the EU-15, Switzerland, and Norway. Table 2.1 shows the installed capacity of onshore wind in the period 1990-2000 according to the Danish BTM Consult (BTM Consult, 2000 and 2001). The main markets in Western Europe are Germany (45% of the installed onshore capacity in 2000), Spain (21%), and Denmark (17%).

In Denmark, wind energy attained a market share in power generation of 15% in 2000. The Danish government intends to treble this percentage by 2030. Therefore, wind energy may indeed capture a substantial share if conditions are favourable.

The consequence of a higher penetration of wind energy is that the limits imposed by integration into the power generation mix become prevailing. Options to deal with system integration vary from raising the power exchanges with neighbouring countries – at some economic loss – to adding power storage systems or (if all other options fail) curtailing the power generated by wind turbines to prevent conditions endangering the stability of the grid.

Table 2.1 *Installed onshore wind capacity Western Europe [MW]*

	1990	1995	1997	1998	1999	2000
Austria	-	-	20	25	34	69
Belgium	5	7	9	10	11	19
Denmark	343	609	1,106	1,410	1,728	2,291
Finland	1	2	12	18	39	39
France	1	2	13	21	25	63
Germany	31	1,133	2,081	2,874	4,442	6,107
Greece	1	28	29	55	158	274
Ireland (Rep.)	-	7	53	64	74	122
Italy	2	23	103	197	277	424
Luxembourg	-	-	3	5	6	6
Netherlands	39	252	310	360	414	454
Norway	1	4	4	9	13	13
Portugal	1	9	38	51	61	111
Spain	4	114	512	880	1,812	2,836
Sweden	6	49	122	176	220	252
Switzerland	-	-	2	3	3	3
UK	7	195	328	338	362	421
Total	453	2,432	4,745	6,496	9,679	13,504

Source: BTM Consult ApS.

To put the most recent development of onshore wind energy into perspective, Figure 2.1 shows the cumulative installed capacity of the five countries on top of the European list in 2000.




Figure 2.1 *Installed onshore wind capacity in countries of Western Europe*

It is noteworthy that Germany, Spain, and Denmark are also front runners on a global scale.

What do these figures mean in terms of annual growth? Is the current growth of the ‘front runners’ sustainable? Could other countries copy the spectacular growth rates? Figure 2.2 shows the growth of installed capacity of the countries on top of the ‘European wind league’.

In Germany, installed capacity grew by 40%/a in 2000. Spain and Italy appear to be in the ‘take off’ stage, with particularly high annual growth rates of 60 to 80%. Denmark, once the cradle of modern wind energy and now a mature onshore wind market, grew by 30%/a in 2000. The Netherlands and the UK show much lower growth rates. Although the Netherlands was once a pioneer of wind energy, it is now lagging behind. Reasons for sluggish growth are planning is-

sues, lengthy approval procedures, and sometimes lack of financial incentives. However, there is scope for improvement. Also, the upcoming offshore wind market offers new perspectives.




Figure 2.2 Growth of installed onshore wind capacity, Western Europe 1996-2000

2.3 Global development

As wind energy has got a very good start in Western Europe and most wind turbines manufactured during the last few decades originate from this region (mainly from Denmark, Germany, and Spain), Europe compares favourably to the rest of the world (Table 2.2).

Table 2.2 Development of worldwide installed wind capacity [MW]

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
America		1,634	2,292	2,667	2,847
Europe		4,787	6,553	9,737	13,630
OECD-Asia		11	37	50	70
Asia		1,077	1,224	1,376	1,728
Other continents		36	37	37	37
Cumulative installed	6,070	7,554	10,153	13,932	18,449
Annual installed	1,292	1,484	2,599	3,779	4,517

Source: BTM Consult ApS.

In order to make a comparison between European countries and the rest of the world, Figure 2.3 shows the cumulative installed capacity of the seven countries on top of the global list in 2000.




Figure 2.3 Total installed wind capacity ‘Global top seven’ 1997-2000

Although Europe has the lead, non-European countries – the USA, China and India – are crucial because of their sheer dimensions, huge population, wind climate, and electricity demand.

2.4 Current technology and cost

BTM Consult (2001) attributes cost reductions to the following main factors:

- A better understanding of how loads affect the turbine and thereby the possibility to calculate closer to the physical limits of materials, resulting in a lower weight.
- Better and new materials e.g. for the blade profiles (Advanced Composites) can reduce the weight of the rotor (a compromise between strength/stiffness and dampening properties).
- Optimisation of drive-train – direct drive by use of multipole Synchronous Generator or traditional drive-train-gearbox, couplings and Asynchronous Generator. Control of blades (pitch/adjustment) and control of rotor revolution speed enables the designer to reduce torque peaks in the transmission; hence, lower component prices may be realised.
- Lower loads on rotor and transmission leave room for weight reduction of support structures: machine-frame and tower.
- Advanced control of ‘vibration cycles’ from the rotor/tower and machinery makes it possible to design advanced and ‘light-weight designs’, including the variable speed feature.

Table 2.3 shows the relation between weight, capacity and swept area of large wind turbines. Today, the class of 600-900 kW shows the lowest level of weight per square meter swept area.

Table 2.3 *Weight, capacity, and swept area of large commercial wind turbines*

	Country of origin	Rated power [kW]	Weight rotor & nacelle [kg]	Weight/capacity ratio [kg/kW]	Weight/swept area ratio [kg/m ²]
Bonus 600 kW Mk IV	DK	600	36,675	61.1	24.1
Bonus 1 MW		1,000	62,000	63.0	27.5
Enercon E-40 ²	D	500	29,000	59.0	23.1
Enercon E-66/1500		1,500	99,590	66.4	29.1
NEG NM-900/52	DK	900	40,000	44.4	18.9
NEG NM-1500C64		1,500	75,000	50.0	23.3
NEG NM-2000-72		2,000	114,000	57.0	28.0
NEG NM-2000-78		2,000	116,000	59.0	23.8
Nordex N-43/600 ²	DK/D	600	35,500	59.2	24.5
Nordex N-54/1000		1,000	69,800	69.8	30.5
Nordex N-60/1300		1,300	68,000	52.3	24.0
Tacke TW 600	US (Enron)	600	38,500	64.2	26.5
Tacke TW 1.5		1,500	74,000	49.3	23.7
Vestas V47-660	DK	660	27,600	41.8	15.9
Vestas V66-1650		1,650	78,000	47.3	22.8
Average sub MW		643	34,545	53.7	21.7
Average MW		1,494	84,043	56.2	26.5

Source: BTM Consult ApS.

Exemplary is the first Spanish 1.5 MW variable speed wind turbine with a multipole generator and without a gearbox developed by the Spanish industrial engineering firm M Torres (Windpower Monthly, 2001a). M Torres also uses its aeronautical experience with a lightweight rotor. The first prototype at the company's Pamplona factory has glass fibre blades. A second machine will be equipped with blades based on carbon fibre. A carbon fibre central beam, or cone, will run the length of the blade, while the blade shells are made of glass fibre. Carbon fibre enables a weight reduction from 5,500 kg for a standard 72m-diameter rotor to 2,500 kg.

A study from Greenpeace and Deutsches Windenergie Institut (Greenpeace/DWI, 2000) provides data of the specific investment cost of wind turbines in Germany from 1990 to 1999. They report a reduction of the specific investment cost in *nominal Euro's* from € 1,400/kW in 1990 to € 1,120/kW in 1999 (bottom line Figure 2.4).




Figure 2.4 *Average specific investment cost of wind turbines in Germany, 1990-1999*

Source: Greenpeace/Deutsches Windenergie Institut: North Sea Offshore wind – A powerhouse for Europe, 2000.

Correction for inflation (upper line) using the EU consumer price index suggests a reduction of the specific investment cost in real terms of 35% for the period 1990-1999.

² Enercon and Nordex terminated production of 500 and 600 kW machines because there is not sufficient demand for such 'small' turbines.

The specific investment cost depends on the capacity of the turbine (Wind power in Denmark, 1999) (Figure 2.5).




Figure 2.5 *Specific investment cost of Danish wind turbines as a function of capacity*

Source: Wind power in Denmark. Technologies, policies and results. September 1999.

The effect of installation of larger wind turbines in Denmark is pronounced. Substitution of relatively small wind turbines (55+ kW) around 1990 by more economic turbines of 600 and 750 kW accounted for 35% reduction of the specific investment cost during the period 1990-1998. The data on which Figure 2.5 is based reflect the optimum size of Danish turbines in 1998 (750 kW). In the meantime the optimum turbine size has shifted to 900 kW and more.

Neij shows that wind energy has mainly benefited from upscaling of turbines and not so much from mass production (Neij, 1999; Neij, 1997). Still, turbines within a specific class, e.g. 600 kW, have been performing better and better due to continuous improvements (e.g. more advanced blades) during the period in which the turbines were produced (Figure 2.6).




Figure 2.6 *Specific investment defined as ex-works Danish turbine price divided by annual production; roughness class 1; list prices of leading manufacturers (DKK₁₉₉₉)*

Source: Wind power in Denmark. Technologies, policies and results. September 1999.

2.5 The next ten years

Technological development is one of the drivers for cost reduction. Simultaneously, the wind turbine market may be quadruplicated in terms of MWs sold within this decade, as will be shown in this section. Both effects may entail a substantial cost reduction of wind turbines.

Wind turbines need to be integrated in the electrical network. With rising penetration, the availability of wind turbines and the influence on the network becomes an issue. Fluctuations in the power output, caused by wind gusts, may affect the power quality of the network (Ackermann, 2000). A reduction of short-term power fluctuations may be achieved using variable-speed operation. Short-term power variations may be absorbed by the immediate storage of energy in the rotating masses of the drivetrain. Hence, a smoother power output is achieved than with strongly grid-coupled turbines. There is a tendency to apply direct drive and multipole Synchronous Generator as well as variable-speed operation for Megawatt turbines. Also limited variable-speed turbines with Induction Generators with variable slip may reduce power fluctuations due to wind gusts and the tower shadow effect.

Wind turbines become more and more cost effective because of ongoing technological development and rising annual sales (mass production). However, the economies of scale in terms of higher capacities are limited. Today, 2.5 MW turbines are available, but this may be about the limit for onshore application. Megawatt turbines are preferred for their economic use of land area in Germany and other countries. Large turbines capture the wind at higher altitudes (tower height 80 m and more). Also, in a number of countries room for additional wind farms at favourable sites is scarce, taking into account demands from conservation of landscape. However, Megawatt turbines may pose specific requirements with respect to transport and installation on site, e.g. cranes.

According to Gamesa, one of the market leaders in wind turbines, a wind farm of 37 660 kW turbines would cost € 22 million, or € 900/kW. This is in agreement with the range of € 800-900/kW for similar Danish turbines (Figure 2.5). Wind farms installed by Spanish utilities were put at € 840-930/kW (Dresdner Kleinwort Wasserstein, 2001). And wind farms planned in the province Guadalajara for 2003 with a combined capacity of 482 MW would cost € 400 million, or € 830/kW (Windpower Monthly, 2001b).

A very important factor for cost reduction is the size of the future wind market (Figure 2.7).




Figure 2.7 Projection of global installed wind turbine capacity, 2000-2010 [GW]

Source: BTM Consult ApS.

BTM Consult (2001) assumes that the global installed capacity will increase from 18.45 GW in 2000 to 58.2 GW in 2005 and 144 GW in 2010, which translates in a growth of 26%/a until 2005 and 20%/a from 2005 to 2010. The growth rates for Europe are 25 and 15% respectively.

2.6 The next thirty years and beyond

What is the potential of cost reduction of wind turbines due to technological development and mass production? The relation between the amalgam of technological development and cost reduction may be characterised by an ‘experience curve’ or ‘learning curve’: the price of a wind turbine declines due to ‘technological learning’ as a function of the installed capacity (Junginger, 2001). This relation is analysed for the period of commercialisation that started in the early 1980s. Commercialisation has been accompanied by ongoing R&D in industry and institutes (e.g. Risø, DK) and demonstration projects, ranging from one-of-a-kind or prototype turbines, twin turbines with different modes of blade control (pitch/adjustment or stall), to complete wind farms. So, commercialisation appears to be intimately linked with RD&D.

The relation between the price and installed capacity of wind turbines has been analysed for Danish wind turbines, based on data of annual sales and output (in MW) of wind turbines (from the Danish Wind Turbine Manufacturers Association’s Internet site) (Seebregts, 1998a). Prices in the currency DKK per kW have been corrected for inflation using the Danish consumer price index. Based on data for 1982, 1987, 1990-1991 (Germany), and 1992-1999, the authors find a progress ratio of 0.87: a price reduction of 13% for each doubling of capacity.

Progress ratios of 0.87-0.93 in similar studies (Ybema, 1999) seem to be useful. However, possible pitfalls are the incompleteness of the database – only data of a single German manufacturer of (small) wind turbines for the year 1990-1991 – and distortion of turbine prices in the early 1980s by the Californian ‘wind rush’ (windfall profits that were used for intensified R&D). At that time US Kenetech installed 100 kW machines at the Altamont Pass at a cost of about \$2,200/kW (CADDET, 1995). When Zond (Enron Wind Corp) completed its first wind project in 1981, the cost to purchase and install a wind turbine was \$4,000/kW (Modern Power Systems, 1997). Junginger (2001) gives a hypothetical example of wind turbines originating from Denmark with a ‘measured’ PR of 0.92 that are exported in declining numbers to the US with a ‘perceived’ PR of 0.88. Finally, outsourcing of components is a source of errors. Towers represent the component that is most difficult to transport. On Vestas’ recent 700-turbine order from Florida Power&Light (FPL), the latter sourced its towers from a local manufacturer.

For these various reasons it seems reasonable to limit the use of PR’s to a range of ~ 0.9 to 0.96.

Table 2.4 presents desegregated costs for a 600 kW turbine, based on data from BTM Consult. The price level of € 900/kW in 2000 is the starting point for projections for the next decades.

Table 2.4 *Breakdown of investment cost of wind turbine (~600 kW)*

	[\$ ₁₉₉₈ /kW]	[€ ₂₀₀₀ /kW]	Total machine cost [%]
Machine frame including ring	52.7	52.7	8.6
Blades	106.3	123.8	17.3
Hub including main shaft	48.3	56.3	7.9
Gear including clutch	134.0	156.0	21.8
Generator/controller	73.0	85.0	11.9
Tower including painting	96.6	112.5	15.7
Hydraulics including hoses	19.3	22.5	3.1
Yaw gear	14.5	16.9	2.4
Nacelle cover	27.7	32.2	3.1
Insulation/cables etc.	22.3	26.0	4.5
Estimated assembly cost	19.3	22.5	3.1
Total machine cost	614	715	
Civil works, infrastr. & grid connection		185	26
Total investment cost		900	

Source: Dresdner Kleinwort Wasserstein, January 2001.

Another important parameter is the development of the global wind turbine market (Figure 2.8).




Figure 2.8 *Capacity of onshore wind based on extrapolation of an Enron estimate*
 Source: Dresdner Kleinwort Wasserstein, January 2001 (based on data from Enron Wind Corp).

The onshore capacity is assumed to rise to more than 400 GW in 2020, based on a market study from Enron Wind Corp (Table 2.5), and possibly to 830 GW in 2030 (extrapolation). The annual installed capacity could be 48 GW/a in 2025, ten times the current level of installation (year 2000). Of course, uncertainty with regard to the future capacity increases with time.

Table 2.5 *Wind turbine capacity according to Enron Wind Corp [MW]*

	1997	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	Total
US							
Installed capacity	1,564	2,841	12,789	31,675	67,234	101,966	
Incremental capacity		1,277	9,948	18,886	35,568	34,722	100,402
Western Europe							
Installed capacity	4,707	11,208	25,557	57,549	95,563	104,216	
Incremental capacity		6,501	14,349	31,992	35,014	11,564	99,509
China							
Installed capacity	200	500	3,705	12,279	26,044	51,789	
Incremental capacity		300	3,205	8,574	13,765	25,744	51,689
Japan							
Installed capacity	15	75	1,211	3,972	7,238	12,661	
Incremental capacity		60	1,136	2,761	3,266	5,423	12,646
India							
Installed capacity	910	1,242	2,710	5,881	10,420	19,384	
Incremental capacity		332	1,468	3,171	4,539	8,964	18,474
Latin America							
Installed capacity	45	244	2,956	8,991	17,503	26,619	
Incremental capacity		199	2,712	6,035	8,512	9,166	26,574
Eastern Europe & CIS							
Installed capacity	57	305	1,141	4,874	13,013	27,799	
Incremental capacity		248	836	3,733	8,139	14,787	27,742
Rest of the world							
Installed capacity	58	613	3,392	8,001	23,650	56,049	
Incremental capacity		555	2,779	4,609	15,648	32,339	55,991
Total world							
Installed capacity	7,556	17,028	53,461	133,223	257,674	400,483	
Incremental capacity		9,472	36,433	79,762	124,451	142,809	392,927

Source: Dresdner Kleinwort Wasserstein, January 2001 (based on data from Enron Wind Corp).

Based on a brief analysis of learning (progress ratios of 0.90-0.96), the figure of € 900/kW as the starting point for projections of the investment cost (Table 2.4), and the assumed growth of the global capacity (Figure 2.8), two ‘learning profiles’ have been determined (Table 2.6).

Table 2.6 ‘Learning profiles’ for investment cost of onshore wind turbines (2000-2030)

	Period	Progress ratio rotor & nacelle	Progress ratio tower	Progress ratio civil work, infrastructure, and grid connection
Reference	2000-2030	0.90	0.96	0.98
Low	2000-2030	0.90	0.93	0.96

The ‘reference’ profile is based on a Progress Ratio (PR) for rotor & nacelle of 0.9. For this main component – € 602.5/kW in 2000 (Table 2.4) – learning is assumed to remain significant. For the tower modest learning is assumed, viz. a PR of 0.96 (starting from € 112.5/kW in 2000). The tower does not provide much cost reduction potential due to ‘regional’ manufacturing. Finally, a really modest progress ratio of 0.98 is assumed for the remaining part of the plant – civil work, infrastructure and grid connection (€ 185/kW in 2000).

The learning profile ‘low’ (low ultimate investment cost in 2030) has the same PR of 0.9 for rotor & nacelle as *reference*. The learning potential for the tower is assumed to be somewhat larger than in case of *reference*, viz. PR is 0.93. Finally, learning for civil work, infrastructure, and grid connection, is assumed to be somewhat more pronounced too, viz. PR is 0.96.

Figure 2.9 gives a comparison between the results of these cases and a cost estimate from Enron Wind Corp. As a matter of fact, Enron reported in US\$, but their cost figures (e.g. \$ 900/kW in 2000) suggest parity between Euro and Dollar. The *reference* learning profile, bottoming out at € 590/kWin 2030, is a good yardstick for long-term modelling. Van de Reepe (2001) suggests a similar price – € 595/kW (€₂₀₀₁) – for 2040. The learning profile ‘low’, ending up at € 560/kWin 2030, is deemed to be useful for sensitivity analysis.




Figure 2.9 Specific investment cost onshore wind vis-à-vis cumulative installed capacity

Figure 2.10 shows the same two learning profiles and Enron’s estimate as a function of time.




Figure 2.10 *Specific investment cost of onshore wind turbines, 2000-2030*

The *reference* learning profile with PRs ranging from 0.9 for rotor & nacelle to 0.96 for the tower and 0.98 for the balance of plant gives a good approximation of Enron’s specific investment cost estimate. Learning effects of this order of magnitude are somewhat higher than reported by Neij (PR is ~ 0.96 for Danish wind turbines ≥ 55 kW ex-works, 1982-1997).

Rather modest progress ratios applied to wind turbine components may be argued by:

- The advanced state of current wind turbines with capacities from 0.6 to 2.5 MW.
- Limited potential for further upscaling, one of the main drivers for cost reduction so far.
- Limited cost reduction potential for towers; towers are often sourced from local suppliers.
- Minor cost reduction potential for civil work, infrastructure, and grid connection.
- A cost reduction potential of 10-34% in case of upscaling of production volumes from 1,000 to 30,000 turbines/a, reported by Princeton Economic Research Inc. (Garrad Hassan and Partners Limited, 2000).

Dresdner Kleinwort Wasserstein (2001) reports operation and maintenance costs of 600 kW turbines, both with respect to replacement costs (Tables 2.7) and annual costs (Table 2.8).

Table 2.7 *Replacement cost for major components on 600 kW turbines*

	[Thousand € ₂₀₀₀]	[€ ₂₀₀₀ /kW]
Entire blade set	~100	~167
Individual blade	~36	~60
Gearbox	>50	>83
Generator	Up to 18	Up to 30

Source: Dresdner Kleinwort Wasserstein, January 2001 (based on data from Allianz).

Table 2.8 *Estimated maintenance cost over 15 years for a 600 kW turbine*

	Cost over 15 years [Thousand € ₂₀₀₀]	Annual costs [€ ₂₀₀₀ /kW/a]
Maintenance including consumables	54	6.0
Oil change	15	1.7
Blade maintenance	33	3.7
Gearbox maintenance	51	5.7
Generator maintenance	10	1.1
Other	23	2.6
Insurance	41	4.6
Total	228	25.0

Source: Dresdner Kleinwort Wasserstein, January 2001 (based on data from Allianz).

The average maintenance cost for new turbines is around 0.6-1.0 €/kWh, rising to 1.5-2.0 €/kWh after the first 10 years of operation. It is assumed that the future maintenance cost will be 0.6 €/kWh for the first 10 years and 0.9 €/kWh after that, or 0.7 €/kWh on average.

Table 2.9 summarises the projections for the global cumulative installed capacity of onshore wind turbines (Figure 2.8), as well as for the specific investment cost and the maintenance cost.

Table 2.9 *Specific investment cost and maintenance cost for onshore wind turbines based on two learning profiles and an estimate from Enron Wind Corp*

	Unit	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
Assumed installed cap.	[GW]	18.36	51	124	245	413	623	830
Investment cost								
Enron Wind Corp	[€ ₂₀₀₀ /kW]	900	750	650	625	600	600	600
<i>Reference</i>	[€ ₂₀₀₀ /kW]	900	801	726	674	637	609	589
<i>Low</i>	[€ ₂₀₀₀ /kW]	900	791	708	650	609	579	557
Maintenance & insurance	[€ ₂₀₀₀ /kW/a]	25	22	20	19	18	17.5	17

The *reference* learning profile and the cost projection from Enron Wind Corp suggest a reduction of the specific investment cost of 35% through 2030 and 2020 respectively. The maintenance cost could fall by the same percentage. Enron's data or the *reference* learning profile could be used for long-term modelling. Whether the costs will decline along these lines remains uncertain. It is noted that the range in PRs reported is still pretty high. Will the cumulative capacity indeed be around 880 GW in 2030? Will onshore wind profit from further technological innovation and mass production to the extent presumed?

With respect to the learning profile '*low*', it is reiterated that this learning profile is very ambitious (perhaps too ambitious). However, considering the range of historical progress ratios reported it has some probability. So, it seems appropriate to use it for sensitivity analysis.

Finally, the anticipated development of onshore wind through 2030 is compared to estimates of the potential of onshore wind in world regions according to Garrad Hassan and Partners Limited (2000). This study on behalf of the IEA Greenhouse Gas R&D Programme contains supply curves for both the capacity and the power generation potential as a function of the generation cost. In order to facilitate comparison, the potentials have been corrected for the anticipated reduction of the specific investment cost, viz. 35% in 2020 compared to 2000 (Table 2.10).

Table 2.10 *Potential dependent on cut-off generation cost for large onshore wind farms from Garrad Hassan's study with correction for investment cost (€ 590/kW)*

Cut-off generation cost	Potential capacity [GW]			Potential generation [TWh]		
	[4 ¢/kWh]	[6 ¢/kWh]	[8 ¢/kWh]	[4 ¢/kWh]	[6 ¢/kWh]	[8 ¢/kWh]
US	100	740	985	350	1,600	2,070
European Union	230	385	465	800	1,170	1,280
China	375	980	1,160	1,000	2,750	3,070
India	20	60	175	60	150	300
Latin America	655	1,230	1,780	2,150	3,100	4,000
Eastern Europe & FSU	2750	5,300	6,100	9,000	13,400	13,700
Africa	365	1,585	4,000	1,200	4,000	9,000
Middle East	670	1,105	1,425	2,200	2,800	3,200
Australia	10	80	270	30	200	600
Rest of Asia	275	535	640	900	1,350	1,430
Total world	5,500	12,000	17,000	17,690	30,520	38,650

Garrad Hassan and Partners use a division in world regions that differs from Enron's projection (Table 2.5). Therefore, only corresponding regions are compared. Figure 2.11 compares the onshore wind potential from Figure 2.8 (based on extrapolation of Enron data) to the corresponding data from Garrad Hassan (Table 2.10) with a cut-off level of 6 ¢/kWh.




Figure 2.11 *Percentage utilisation in 2030 of onshore wind potential with cut-off at 6 ¢/kWh (based on an assessment by Garrad Hassan and Partners)*

The utilisation of the economic potential at a cut-off level of 6 ¢/kWh is modest, except for India. In case of Western Europe, roughly 30% of the economic potential could be utilised by 2030. The development of onshore wind shown in Figure 2.8 is not curtailed by the economic potential of wind, presumed that the anticipated cost reduction will materialise. However, an increasing share of wind power in the power generation mix might necessitate measures to prevent conditions endangering the stability of the grid (power exchanges with neighbouring countries, adding power storage systems, or limiting the power generated by the turbines).

3. NEAR-SHORE AND OFFSHORE WIND

3.1 Introduction

In addition to onshore wind, offshore wind got much attention recently. A distinction is made between near-shore and offshore wind (Section 3.3). The application of offshore wind depends on several factors, among which the remaining onshore potential. This remaining potential is more determined by economic and other criteria (preservation of landscape) than by availability of wind. An important factor is cost. Going offshore, the generation cost tends to go up.

Section 3.2 gives an introduction to the onshore and offshore wind potential. Section 3.3 gives a very brief overview of recent developments in offshore wind in Denmark, as well as a definition of near-shore and offshore wind. Section 3.4 presents a view on near-shore wind, and Section 3.5 gives a view on offshore wind. At last, results are compared and summarised in Section 3.6.

3.2 Onshore and offshore wind potential

‘Wind force 10’ (Greenpeace, 2000) from Greenpeace, European Wind Energy Association (EWEA), and (FED), presents an ambitious target of 10% of the world’s electricity originating from wind in 2020. This may be achieved by a fast growth of wind power of 23%/a culminating in 1,200 GW in 2020, equivalent to about 3,000 TWh/a. The onshore potential in Europe is based on 1993 data from Utrecht University. Greenpeace defines a 20% share of onshore wind in European power generation, presuming a growth of electricity consumption of 3%/a through 2020. A 20% share would be equal to 366 TWh generated onshore (Table 3.1).

Table 3.1 *Potential of onshore wind power in Western Europe*

	Technical wind potential		20% share	Beyond 20%
	[GW]	[TWh]	[TWh]	[TWh]
Austria	1.5	3	3	-
Belgium	2.5	5	5	-
Denmark	4.5	10	6.2	3.8
Finland	3.5	7	7	-
France	42.5	85	85	-
Germany	12	24	24	-
Greece	22	44	8.2	?
Ireland	22	44	3.4	40.6
Italy	34.5	69	41.4	27.6
Luxembourg	0	0	-	-
Netherlands	3.5	7	7	-
Norway	38	76	23.2	52.8
Portugal	43	15	6.4	8.6
Spain	20.5	86	35.6	50.4
Sweden	20.5	41	35.2	5.8
UK	57	114	75.8	38.2
Total	315	630	366.4	227.8

Source: Greenpeace, European Wind Energy Association, Forum on Energy and Development: Wind force 10, 2000.

‘Wind force 10’ also gives an estimate of the ‘realistic mid-term potential’ for offshore wind on the North Sea, based on the technical potential in Table 3.2. It should be noted that this technical potential is rather hypothetical, particularly for water depths beyond 30 m (Table 3.2).

Table 3.2 *Offshore wind resources in Europe (exclusive of Finland, Norway and Sweden)*

Water depth	Up to 10 km offshore [TWh]	Up to 20 km offshore [TWh]	Up to 30 km offshore [TWh]
10 m	551	587	596
20 m	1,121	1,402	1,523
30 m	1,597	2,191	2,463
40 m	<i>1,852</i>	<i>2,615</i>	<i>3,028</i>

Note: The technical potential for a water depth beyond 30 m is more or less hypothetical (denoted by italics).

Source: Wind force 10 ('Study of offshore wind energy in the EC', Garrad Hassan & Germanischer Lloyd, 1995).

Greenpeace reduced this potential to a more realistic level, based on the following assumptions:

- All water depths over 20 m are excluded (reduction to 1,523 TWh, see Table 3.2).
- Sites up to 10 km from the shore are reduced by 90%, mainly for reasons of visual obtrusion (reduction from 1,523 to 514 TWh).
- Sites from 10 to 20 km off the shore are reduced by 50%, mainly for the same reasons (reduction from 514 to 374 TWh).
- Sites from 20 to 30 km off the shore are reduced by 50%, taking into account claims from fishery, shipping lanes, etc. (reduction from 374 to 313 TWh).

Greenpeace compares the on- and offshore potential with the electricity demand in 2020, based on extrapolation of data for world regions from IEA's World Energy Outlook 1998 (Table 3.3).

Table 3.3 *Wind energy potential and electricity demand in world regions*

	Electricity demand 2020 [TWh/a]	20% share [TWh/a]	Technical wind potential [TWh/a]	Wind potential beyond 20% share [X 20% share]
OECD Europe	4,492	898	Onshore: 630 Offshore: 313	1.05
OECD N-America	6,363	1,273	14,000	11
OECD Pacific	1,865	373	3,600	10
Latin America	2,073	415	5,400	13
East Asia	2,030	406	} 4,600	} 3
South Asia	1,657	331		
China	3,857	771		
Middle East	839	167	n.a.	
Transition economies	3,298	660	10,600	16
Africa	851	170	10,600	62
World total	27,325	5,465	49,740	9

Source: Greenpeace, European Wind Energy Association, Forum on Energy and Development: Wind force 10, 2000.

Greenpeace presents a mid-term potential of wind in Europe of 940 TWh (technical potential onshore wind 630 TWh; offshore wind 313 TWh). This is equal to 20% of Europe's electricity demand, presuming that IEA's business-as-usual scenario may be extrapolated to 2020.

3.3 Recent developments

Denmark has an official target of 5,500 MW wind power in 2030. Considering the development of onshore capacity, it is reasonable to expect that between 2,500 and 3,000 MW offshore would be needed to comply with that target. The Danish North Sea and Baltic Sea offer a theoretical potential of 28 GW and a realistic potential of 12 GW. Promising offshore areas are:

- West of Horns Rev in the North Sea.

- South of the island Laesoe in the Kattegat.
- South of Omoe in Smaalands Huvet.
- South of Lolland.

In 2000, the Middelgrunden windfarm (3 km offshore from Copenhagen) was commissioned:

- 20 Turbines of 2 MW each.
- Water depth 3-6 meter.
- Concrete gravity foundations with provision to withstand drifting ice.
- Annual mean wind speed at hub height (64 m) 7.1 m/s.
- Anticipated electricity production 89 GWh/year.

Table 3.4 shows cost data of the Middelgrunden windfarm (Sørensen, 2001) (Vølund, 2001).

Table 3.4 *Investment cost of Middelgrunden windfarm*

Component	[million € ₂₀₀₀]	[€ ₂₀₀₀ /kW]	Total windfarm cost [%]
Turbines	26.1	653	53
Foundations	9.9	248	20
Internal grid	4.56	114	9
External grid	4.1	102	8
Others	4.34	108	9
Total	49.0	1,225	100

Sources: EWEC 2001, Copenhagen, and CADDET Renewable Energy Newsletter, March 2001.

The specific investment cost is approximately 35% higher than for onshore wind (€ 1,225 compared to € 900/kW). The investment cost of large windfarms in the German coastal waters and offshore – outside the 12 nautical miles zone – is put at DM 3,600/kW \approx €1,840/kW (Knight, 2001), or twice the level of onshore wind. According to an ECN study on large offshore windfarms (outside the 12 miles zone, up to 5,000 MW), the share of turbines and foundations in the total investment cost would be 32% and 44% respectively (de Noord, 1999). Possible trends in the specific investment cost of near-shore and offshore windfarms are elaborated in the next sections.

In 1997, the Danish Ministry of Energy closed an agreement with the Danish utilities to develop five offshore wind farms totalling 750 MW from 2001 to 2008, that would generate enough electricity to cover 8% of the Danish electricity demand. The utility Elsam A/S is building the first 160 MW (80 * 2 MW) offshore windfarm in the Danish North Sea at Horns Rev. The windfarm is sited 14-20 km off the coast, west of Blavands Huk (near Esbjerg). A 150 kV high voltage line connects the windfarm to the existing grid. As will be shown later on, the specific investment cost amounts to € 1,675/kW, or about 35% more than in case of ‘Middelgrunden’.

Apart from potential issues such as shipping lanes, building large-scale windfarms is a major intervention in the ‘landscape’. Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) and public inquiries are required, before the Danish Energy Agency can give permission to build an offshore windfarm (CADDET, 2001). An EIA takes account of physical and biological aspects as well as the impact of human activities. Visualisations show the appearance of the wind farm from various positions onshore. The noise of the turbines will be audible at a distance of no more than 1 km. Changes in the physical conditions at the site are expected to be limited. No direct adverse impact on the fauna in the areas is predicted. Migratory birds are at risk of colliding with the turbine blades, and their feeding area may be reduced. More research is needed into the disturbance of bird species resting in an area by the mere presence of wind turbines offshore.

The following more or less practical distinction is made between near-shore and offshore wind:

- Near-shore windfarms are assumed to be built in sheltered offshore areas with relatively shallow waters, and at moderate distance from the coast, particularly in the Baltic Sea;
- Offshore windfarms are assumed to be in 'real' offshore areas, with higher wind speeds, deeper waters, higher waves, etc. Those areas are to be found on the Continental Shelf of the North Sea and in parts of the Baltic Sea that are far (20 km or more) from the coast.

Table 3.5 *Characteristics of near-shore windfarms*

Project	Country	Location	Start of operation [year]	Average wind speed [m/s]	Distance to shore [km]	Water depth [m]	Capacity [MW]	Investment cost [million €]	Investment cost [€/kW]	Capacity factor [%]
Lely	NL	IJsselmeer	1994	7.7	0.8	4-5	2	5.3	2600	21.7
Vindeby	DK	Baltic Sea	1991	7.5	1.5-3	2.5-5	4.95	13.2	2660	24.4
Tunø Knob	DK	Baltic Sea	1995	7.4	3-6	3-5	5	11.6	2326	28.5
Middelgrunden	DK	Baltic Sea	2000	7.2	2	3-6	40	48.96	1224	25.4
Rødsand	DK	Lolland	2003		9-10		150	210.8	1406	38.1
Omø Stålgårde	DK	Baltic Sea	2005?		10		150	210.8	1406	32.7
Gedser Rev	DK	Baltic Sea	2008?		6-20		150	210.8	1406	38.1
Bockstigen	S	Gotland	1998		4	6	2.5	4.2	1681	24.7
Utgrunden	S	Kalmar Sound	2000	8.5	12.5	7-10	10	18.3	1833	43.3
Yttre Stengrund	S	Blekinge	2001				7.5	13.0	1730	44.6
	S	Landskrona	2003?		5	10-15	70	105.1	1501	43.3

3.4 Near-shore wind

3.4.1 Characteristics of near-shore windfarms

In 1991, the world's first 'offshore' windfarm was put into operation, consisting of 11×450 kW turbines, 1.5-3 km off the coast at *Vindeby* in Denmark in 2.5-5 m deep water. The average wind speed is 7.5 m/s. The specific investment cost is put at € 2,600/kW ([Http://www.seas.dk](http://www.seas.dk)).

The first near-shore windfarm in the Netherlands is the 4×500 kW (2 MW) windfarm *Lely* near Medemblik. This tiny windfarm, 1 km off the coast in the shallow water of the IJsselmeer, started operation in 1994. The wind speed is 7.7 m/s. The specific investment cost of this small first-of-a-kind windfarm is high: € 2,600/kW (Delft University Wind Energy Institute, 2001).

The second near-shore windfarm in Denmark is the 10×500 kW (5 MW) windfarm *Tunø Knob*, commissioned in 1995. The distance to the shore is 3-6 km, and the water depth is 3-5 m. The average wind speed is 7.4 m/s. The specific investment cost is € 2,300/kW (Madsen, 1996).

The third Danish project of this kind is the 20×2 MW (40 MW) windfarm *Middelgrunden*, commissioned in 2000-2001. This windfarm is situated 3 km off the coast of Copenhagen. The water depth is 3-6 m. The average wind speed is approximately 7.2 m/s. The specific investment cost is € 1,225/kW (Sørensen, 2001) (Vølund, 2001) ([Http://www.middelgrund.dk](http://www.middelgrund.dk)).

In 1998, the first 'offshore' windfarm in Sweden, the 5×500 kW (2.5 MW) windfarm *Bockstigen*, 4 km from Gotland in 6 m deep water was commissioned. The specific investment cost amounts to approximately € 1,700/kW (Ronsten, 2001) ([Http://www.vindkompaniet.se](http://www.vindkompaniet.se)).

The second near-shore windfarm in Sweden - commissioned in 2000 - is the 7×1.43 MW (~ 10 MW) windfarm *Utgrunden*, 12.5 km from Kalmar Sound in 7-10 m deep water. The wind speed is 8.5 m/s. The specific investment cost is € 1,700/kW (Kühn, 2001) ([Http://www.vindkraft.nu](http://www.vindkraft.nu)).

In 2001, a third 5×1.5 MW (7.5 MW) near-shore windfarm called *Yttre Stengrund* was commissioned. *Yttre Stengrund* has roughly the same specific investment cost as *Utgrunden* (approximately € 1,700/kW) ([Http://www.stem.se](http://www.stem.se)).

Another nearshore windfarm in Sweden is in the planning stage. The location is a few km north of Malmö and 5 km off the coast of *Landskrona*. The 70 MW windfarm (probably 20×3.5 MW) would cost approximately € 105 million, or € 1,500/kW (New Energy, 2001a).

At last, three almost identical near-shore windfarms in the Danish Baltic Sea are in the planning stage, viz. *Rødsand* (2003), *Omø Stålgrunde* (postponed), and *Gedser Rev* (postponed). The distance to the shore is some 10 km, and the size of the wind farm is 72×2.1 MW (~ 150 MW). The specific investment cost is estimated at € 1,400/kW.

With regard to the capacity factor of near-shore windfarms the following is observed:

- Five existing windfarms - Lely, Vindeby, Tunø Knob, Middelgrunden, and Bockstigen - show relatively modest capacity factors of 22-28%.
- For Utgrunden and Yttre Stengrund as well as the planned nearshore windfarms in the Swedish and Danish Baltic Sea the capacity factor ranges from 33 to 45%.

The capacity factor not only includes the number of full-load hours dictated by the wind climate, but also corrections for non-availability and park effects.

Figure 3.1 shows the relationship between the specific investment cost and the size of a near-shore windfarm in MW.




Figure 3.1 Specific investment cost of nearshore wind as a function of installed capacity

The specific investment is € 1,375/kW for relatively large nearshore windfarms not too distant from the coast. The Middelgrunden windfarm in close proximity to Copenhagen is an exception.

3.4.2 Perspectives for the next thirty years

The development of nearshore windfarms depends on a number of factors, among which the scarcity of favourable onshore sites, the availability of near-shore sites, and possible cost reductions for near-shore windfarms. Today, the specific investment cost of near-shore wind (e.g. *Middelgrunden*) is at least 35% higher than for onshore wind.

It is assumed that the capacity will grow by 25%/a on average for the period 2000-2030. Initially, the growth rate is higher than that (a trebling of capacity from 2000 to 2002), later on the growth comes down to 12.5%/a. Taking into account the decommissioning of windfarms after 25 years, the cumulative installed capacity in 2030 amounts to 68.55 GW (Figure 3.2).




Figure 3.2 Projection of global cumulative capacity of near-shore wind

3.4.3 Learning effects

Near-shore windfarms may show learning effects that are comparable to onshore wind. Cost reductions for rotor, nacelle, and tower may be quite similar. The following ‘components’ of near-shore windfarms have been distinguished (Table 3.6).

Table 3.6 *Breakdown of investment cost of state-of-the-art 160 MW near-shore windfarm*

	[million € ₂₀₀₀]	[€ ₂₀₀₀ /kW]	Total windfarm cost [%]
Rotor & nacelle & tower	104.48	653	47
Offshore constructions	39.68	248	18
Cabling & grid connection	76.16	476	35
Total	220.00	1,375	100

The specific investment costs of ‘rotor & nacelle & tower’ and ‘offshore constructions’ are equal to those of the Middelgrunden windfarm (Table 3.4). However, it has been assumed that the distance to the shore is larger. Therefore, the cost of grid connection – a high voltage cable to the mainland’s grid – is higher than in case of ‘Middelgrunden’, which is reflected by the component ‘cabling & grid connection’ (also including preparation costs).

The following progress ratios are assumed for the *reference* and *low* cases with regard to ‘rotor & nacelle & tower’, ‘offshore constructions’, and ‘cabling & grid connection’ (Table 3.7).

Table 3.7 *‘Learning profiles’ for investment cost of a near-shore windfarm (2000-2030)*

	Period	Progress ratio rotor & nacelle & tower	Progress ratio offshore constructions	Progress ratio cabling & grid connection
Reference	2000-2030	Parallel to ‘onshore wind’	0.95	0.975
Low	2000-2030	Parallel to ‘onshore wind’	0.925	0.95

The turbine cost (rotor & nacelle & tower) may differ from the cost of an onshore turbine, as special precautions are required for the aggressive environment (marinisation) and the operational costs have to be scrutinised. This is because repairs and maintenance are more costly at near-shore windfarms. However, relatively high numbers of identical turbines might roughly outweigh the additional cost of marinisation, minimisation of maintenance, etc.

The learning profile *reference* is based on the assumption that the specific investment cost of the ‘turbine’ will decline as a function of time parallel to the cost of an onshore turbine, more specifically to the cost of ‘rotor & nacelle & tower’ of an onshore turbine (Chapter 2). For offshore constructions, including installation, a progress ratio of 0.95 is assumed. For internal cables and grid connection (including ‘other’ cost) a modest progress ratio of 0.975 is assumed.

The learning profile *‘low’* (low ultimate investment cost in 2030) also presumes that the specific investment cost of the turbine will decline parallel to the cost of an onshore turbine (viz. rotor & nacelle & tower). For offshore constructions on the one hand and cabling & grid connection on the other hand progress ratios of 0.925 and 0.95 respectively have been assumed.

Figure 3.3 shows the results of learning in case of a near-shore windfarm. The initial specific investment cost is assumed to be € 1,375/kW. This figure is higher than the corresponding cost figure for ‘Middelgrunden’, as the latter is in close proximity to the mainland (Copenhagen).




Figure 3.3 Specific investment cost near-shore wind vis-à-vis cumulative installed capacity

The *reference* learning profile shows a decline of the specific investment cost from € 1,375/kW in 2000 to € 885/kW in 2030. This is tantamount to a cost reduction of 35% in 30 years (comparable to onshore wind). The *reference* case is a good yardstick for long-term modelling. The case '*low*', with an ultimate level of € 755/kW in 2030, may be used for sensitivity analysis.

Figure 3.4 presents the *reference* and *low* learning profiles as a function of time.




Figure 3.4 Specific investment cost of a near-shore windfarm, 2000-2030

Compared to onshore wind, the uncertainties with respect to the long-term potential, learning effects and the ultimate cost level in 2030 are even larger. The gap between *reference* and *low* is larger in case of near-shore wind than for onshore wind. Under *reference* conditions, the specific investment cost of nearshore wind is 50% higher than for onshore wind in 2030 (€ 885 and € 590/kW respectively). In the *low* case, however, the specific investment cost is only 35% higher (€ 755 and € 560/kW for nearshore and onshore wind respectively).

In 2030, near-shore wind could be nearly as competitive as onshore wind. The higher capacity factor of near-shore wind (approximately 36% vis-à-vis ~ 24%) might nearly outweigh the higher specific investment cost compared to onshore wind.

Table 3.8 *Characteristics of offshore windfarms*

Project	Country	Location	Start of operation [year]	Average wind speed [m/s]	Distance to shore [km]	Water depth [m]	Capacity [MW]	Investment cost [million €]	Investment cost [€/kW]	Capacity factor [%]
Blyth Offshore Windfarm	UK	North Sea	2000	7.2	1	6	4	6.44	1,610	35.0
Pilot Phase 'Borkum West' (Borkum III)	D	North Sea	2003		40-45	30	60	132.5	2,208	45.7
Scroby Sands Offshore Windfarm	UK	North Sea	2003		>2.3		76	112.7	1,483	31.9
Near-Shore Windfarm (NSW)	NL	North Sea	2003	8.5	23	15-20	100	185.7	1,857	34.2
Offshore Windfarm Wenduinebank	B	North Sea	2003	8.3	8.4	5-10	115	214.2	1,862	36.2
Offshore Windfarm Horns Rev	DK	North Sea	2002	9.7	14-20	6-14	160	268	1,675	41.0
Bürger-Windpark Butendiek	D	North Sea	2006		30		240	400	1,667	38.1
Phase One 'Sandbank 24'	D	North Sea	2004			30	360	511	1,419	45.7
Arkona Bay South-East	D	Baltic Sea	2007?				860	1,278	1,486	41.1
Nördliche Pommersche Bucht	D	Baltic Sea	2007?		42	12-20	1,000	1,530	1,530	41.1
Borkum West (Borkum III)	D	North Sea	2007?		45	30	1,040	1,500	1,442	45.7

Table 3.9 summarises the specific investment cost and the maintenance cost of near-shore wind.

Table 3.9 *Specific investment cost and maintenance cost for a near-shore windfarm*

	Unit	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
Assumed installed cap.	[GW]	0.09	0.75	2.50	6.76	16.42	35.77	67.80
Investment cost								
<i>Reference</i>	[€ ₂₀₀₀ /kW]	1375	1209	1101	1024	965	919	885
<i>Low</i>	[€ ₂₀₀₀ /kW]	1375	1153	1020	925	852	796	754
Maintenance & insurance	[€ ₂₀₀₀ /kW/a]	45	40	37	34	32	31	30

3.5 Offshore wind

3.5.1 Characteristics of offshore windfarms

The first offshore windfarm in the North Sea is the 2×2 MW (4 MW) windfarm off the coast of *Blyth* (east coast UK, Table 3.8). The water depth is 6 m. The wind speed is 7.2 m/s. The specific investment cost is €1,600/kW (New Energy, 2001b) ([Http://www.blyth-offshore.co.uk](http://www.blyth-offshore.co.uk)). A second offshore windfarm, the 38×2 MW (76 MW) *Scroby Sands* windfarm, 3 km off the east coast of the UK, is due for 2003. The specific investment cost is € 2,200/kW ([Http://www.huginonline.com](http://www.huginonline.com)) ([Http://www.offshorewindfarms.co.uk](http://www.offshorewindfarms.co.uk)).

Elsam A/S is building the first Danish offshore windfarm at *Horns Rev*, 14-20 km from the coast near Esbjerg in 6-14 m deep water. The capacity of the windfarm is 160 MW (80×2 MW). The wind speed is 9.7 m/s. The specific investment cost is € 1,675/kW, including a high voltage cable of € 250/kW (Bonefeld, 2001) (Windkraft Journal, 2001) (www.hornsrev.dk).

In the Netherlands, the 100 MW offshore windfarm ('*Near-Shore Windfarm*', NSW), 11-23 km off the coast of Egmond aan Zee, is due for 2003. The water depth is 15-20 m. The wind speed is 8.5 m/s. The specific investment cost is € 1,860/kW (www.pde.nl).

In Belgium, a 50×2.3 MW (115 MW) windfarm is planned 8.4 km off the coast of *Wenduine*, in 5-10 m deep water. The average wind speed is 8.3 m/s. The *Wenduinebank* windfarm is due for 2003. The specific investment is € 1,860/kW (Stromen, 2000) (www.c-power.de) (www.mumm.ac.be).

The first offshore windfarm in Germany (2003) could be the *Pilot Phase* of '*Borkum West*' in the North Sea, consisting of 12 turbines of 5 MW (60 MW). The distance to the shore of Borkum is 40-45 km, and the water depth is 30 m. The specific investment cost is € 2,200/kW.

Phase One of '*Sandbank 24*', 120 km west of Sylt in the North Sea, will probably be commissioned in 2004. Its capacity is 120×3 MW (360 MW). The water depth is about 30 m. The specific investment cost is approximately € 1,420/kW (New Energy, 2001c).

Another project in the planning stage is the 80×3 MW (240 MW) windfarm *Bürger-Windpark Butendiek*, due for 2006. '*Butendiek*' will be built 30 km west of Sylt and 50 km south of '*Horns Rev*'. The specific investment cost is about € 1,670/kW (Windpower Monthly, 2000).

Among the offshore windfarms planned in Germany is the 172×5 MW (860 MW) windfarm *Arkona Bay East*, 25 km northeast of Cape Arkona in the Baltic Sea, due for 2007. The specific investment cost is estimated at € 1,280/kW (www.ge-ag.com) (Press report IWR, 2001).

Also due for 2007 is the 200×5 MW (1,000 MW) offshore windfarm 42 km east of Rügen , in the Baltic Sea, called 'Nördliche Pommersche Bucht'. The water depth is 12-20 m. The specific investment cost is put at € 1,530/kW (www.nordex-online.com).

Borkum West – 208×5 MW (1,040 MW) – will be completed in 2007. 30% of the specific investment cost (€ 1,440/kW) is for cabling and grid connection (www.wind-energie.de).

With respect to the capacity factor of offshore windfarms the following is observed:

- Two UK windfarms - Blyth and Scroby Sands - show modest capacity factors of 32-35%.
- The other nine offshore windfarms show projected capacity factors from 35% to 45%.

The development of offshore wind depends *inter alia* on the cost difference between offshore and onshore wind. The specific investment cost of *Horns Rev* is about 85% higher than for onshore wind. Figure 3.5 shows the specific investment cost of offshore windfarms. The specific investment cost of offshore windfarms ranges from € 1,400/kW to € 2,200/kW. A representative figure for a 100-200 MW offshore windfarm in the year 2002 is € 1,700/kW.




Figure 3.5 Specific investment cost of offshore wind as a function of installed capacity

3.5.2 Perspectives for the next thirty years

Figure 3.6 shows an ambitious scenario for offshore wind.




Figure 3.6 *Projection of global cumulative capacity of offshore wind*

Offshore wind energy is assumed to take off at a very fast speed in the first few years, dropping to nearly 40%/a in 2007, and eventually 11%/a in 2030. The installed capacity in 2030 is estimated at 200 GW. Taking into account the decommissioning of offshore windfarms after some 25 years, the cumulative installed capacity in 2030 would be approximately 205 GW.

The combined installed capacity of near-shore and offshore wind in 2030 is estimated at some 268 GW. This is more than ten times the global installed onshore wind capacity in 2001.

3.5.3 Learning effects

Offshore wind farms could show learning effects comparable to those of near-shore wind, particularly with regard to the ‘wind turbine’ (rotor, nacelle, and tower). The following costs have been attributed to the components ‘turbines’, ‘offshore constructions’, and ‘cabling & grid connection’ (including ‘other’ costs) of a state-of-the-art offshore windfarm (Table 3.10).

Table 3.10 *Breakdown of investment cost of state-of-the-art 160 MW offshore windfarm*

	[million € ₂₀₀₀]	[€ ₂₀₀₀ /kW]	Total wind farm cost [%]
Rotor & nacelle & tower	116	725	43
Offshore constructions	72	450	26
Cabling & grid connection	84	525	31
Total	272	1,700	100

For the two cases similar learning effects are assumed as for near-shore wind (Table 3.11).

Table 3.11 'Learning profiles' for investment cost of an offshore windfarm (2000-2030)

	Period	Progress ratio rotor & nacelle & tower	Progress ratio offshore constructions	Progress ratio cabling & grid connection
<i>Reference</i>	2000-2030	Parallel to 'onshore wind'	0.95	0.975
<i>Low</i>	2000-2030	Parallel to 'onshore wind'	0.925	0.95

Wind turbines for offshore application may be larger than those applied onshore (today, the maximum rated power of onshore turbines is 2.5 MW). However, the manufacturing industry for offshore turbines may profit to a large extent from the onshore market, in terms of technical learning as well as market development. Profits generated from turbines sold at the onshore market may be diverted to R&D on dedicated offshore turbines with special attention for:

- Marinisation, in order to prevent undue non-availability.
- Minimisation of repairs and maintenance.
- Accessibility of turbines for boats and/or helicopters.
- Design optimised for offshore operation, e.g. higher rotational and tip speeds, presuming that noise is not a big issue far from the coast.

It is assumed that offshore turbines are generally larger and more costly in terms of €/kW than 'comparable' onshore turbines, as the optimum size is determined to a large extent by the economies of scale of other components, notably the offshore construction.

The learning profile *reference* is based on a progress ratio of 0.95 for offshore constructions and a PR of 0.975 for cabling and grid connection (including 'other' cost). For the case '*low*' (low ultimate investment cost in 2030) the corresponding progress ratios are 0.925 and 0.95 respectively, reflecting a relatively high level of optimism with regard to learning effects.

Figure 3.7 shows the results of learning in case of offshore wind. The initial specific investment cost is put at € 1,700/kW, only slightly higher than the corresponding figure for '*Horns Rev*'.




Figure 3.7 Specific investment cost offshore wind vis-à-vis cumulative installed capacity

The *reference* learning profile shows a decline of the specific investment cost from € 1,700/kW in 2002 to € 1,140/kW in 2030. This is tantamount to a cost reduction by one-third in 28 years (comparable to nearshore wind). The *reference* value of € 1,140/kW is deemed to be a good yardstick for long-term modelling. A considerably lower price of € 860/kW for 2050 has been calculated by Van de Reepe (2001). However, he assumed a 'gross' progress ratio of 0.9. This is almost certainly too optimistic for the total investment cost of an offshore windfarm. The case '*low*', bottoming out at € 970/kW in 2030, seems to be appropriate for sensitivity analysis.

Figure 3.8 presents the *reference* and *low* learning profiles as a function of time.




Figure 3.8 *Specific investment cost of offshore windfarms, 2000-2030*

Compared to onshore wind, the uncertainties with respect to the deployment potential, the learning effects, and the ultimate cost level in 2030 are significantly larger. Offshore wind shows a wider gap between the *reference* and *low* cases than onshore wind. In the *reference* case, the specific investment cost of offshore wind in 2030 (€ 1,140/kW) is 95% higher than that of onshore wind (€ 590/kW). In the *low* case, the specific investment cost of offshore wind is 75% higher (€ 970/kW compared to € 560/kW).

Taking into account the higher capacity factor for offshore wind - approximately 40% vis-à-vis ~ 24% - offshore wind would remain somewhat more costly than onshore wind in the long run.

Table 3.12 summarises the projections for the global cumulative installed capacity of offshore wind (Figure 3.6), as well as for the specific investment cost and the maintenance cost.

Table 3.12 *Specific investment cost and maintenance cost for an offshore windfarm*

	Unit	2002	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
Assumed inst. cap.	[GW]	0.16	2.41	11.36	30.42	64.15	136.05	200.00
Investment cost								
<i>Reference</i>	[€ ₂₀₀₀ /kW]	1,700	1,515	1,379	1,291	1,229	1,180	1,143
<i>Low</i>	[€ ₂₀₀₀ /kW]	1,700	1,300	1,256	1,149	1,074	1,016	972
Maintenance & ins.	[€ ₂₀₀₀ /kW/a]	52	50	47	45	43	41	40

3.6 Near-shore and offshore compared to onshore wind

Figure 3.9 shows the anticipated onshore, near-shore, and offshore wind capacity. In 2030, the total installed capacity could amount to 1,100 GW. Onshore wind could account for about 75% of the total installed capacity, near-shore wind for 6%, and offshore wind for 18%.




Figure 3.9 Projection of global capacity of onshore, near-shore, and offshore wind

The number of doublings of the installed capacity until 2030 is:

- About 6 for onshore wind.
- Less than 10 for near-shore wind.
- More than 10 for offshore wind.

Figure 3.10 shows the cost curves of onshore, near-shore, and offshore wind as a function of time. The cost curves shown correspond to the *reference cases*.




Figure 3.10 Specific investment cost of onshore, near-shore, and offshore wind turbines

The cost of offshore wind is assumed to decline relatively fast in the first few years. This is because offshore wind could show a spectacular growth in the ‘take-off’ stage (starting from 160 MW in 2002). After that, the growth rate will come to down to moderate levels. Therefore, the specific investment cost of offshore wind declines correspondingly slower towards 2030.

The specific cost of near-shore and onshore wind declines roughly perpendicularly as a function of time. However, it is noted that the assumptions with regard to progress ratios of components (except rotor & nacelle & tower) and numbers of doublings until 2030 are quite different.

4. PHOTOVOLTAIC POWER

4.1 Introduction

PhotoVoltaic (PV) power is a renewable option based on direct conversion of solar energy into electricity. Compared to 'solar thermal power' - based on e.g. steam generated by concentrating solar energy with mirrors or 'solar troughs' - PV power is rather straightforward. It offers much potential for small-scale as well as large-scale application because of its modular character.

The challenge is to make PV an economically viable option. The cost of PV has to be reduced substantially: roughly by a factor five to ten depending on the application or the region (latitude) considered. This may be achieved by continuing R&D and increasing production levels. The efficiency of solar cells - typically 7-15 percent for commercially available solar cells - may be raised. The lifetime may be prolonged by prevention of significant degradation. Consumption of materials - high-grade silicon, precious metals - may be reduced to 'sustainable' levels. In the long term, PV may become competitive compared to other power generation options. Whether current power generation options - coal- and gas-fired power, nuclear power - will remain 'cheap', remains to be seen, as they have persistent problems: greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in case of coal- or gas-fired power, and long-living nuclear waste in case of nuclear power.

Photovoltaic power - global installed capacity 1.43 GW in 2000 - is in an early commercial stage compared to wind power - 18.45 GW in 2000. Electricity from a 3 kW grid-connected system (single-family house) is priced at about 40-70 €/kWh (Western Europe), which is ten times more than onshore wind today. Thus, a more or less dramatic cost reduction is needed.

Section 4.2 gives an overview of PV in OECD countries. The status of PV is briefly described in Section 4.3. Section 4.4 provides a short introduction into learning for PV. Finally, Section 4.5 addresses the possible cost reduction because of learning in the next 35 years.

4.2 Photovoltaic power in the OECD

In 1999, OECD countries accounted for 45% of the global installed PV capacity (Figure 4.1).




Figure 4.1 *Installed photovoltaic power (grid-connected and off-grid) in OECD countries*
Source: Dresdner Kleinwort Wasserstein, January 2001 (based on IEA data).

PV is characterised by relatively low numbers of full-load hours (compared to wind power), viz. 800-1,700 hours/a in Western Europe. At lower latitudes solar thermal power plants – based on concentrating mirrors or ‘solar troughs’ – may give higher efficiencies and better economies than PV. Also, solar thermal power plants may be operated at relatively high capacity factors by means of thermal energy storage, albeit at a cost. Thermal energy storage may be provided by e.g. fluids (specific oils) with a relatively high heat capacity. Therefore, thermal solar power is a serious competitor to PV at lower latitudes characterised by mostly unclouded skies.

Figure 4.1 shows that PV has grown rapidly and steadily during the last decade. The growth rates of PV in selected OECD countries and the OECD at large are shown in Figure 4.2.




Figure 4.2 *Growth of photovoltaic power (grid-connected and off-grid) in OECD countries*
Source: Dresdner Kleinwort Wasserstein, January 2001 (based on IEA data).

The installed capacity of OECD countries, shown in the Figures 4.1 and 4.2 and Table 4.1, includes off-grid PV systems. In some countries (e.g. the United States) photovoltaic power may be used for large-scale solar power generation (desert areas). Regions/countries with above-average growth rates, viz. higher than 30%/a, are OECD Pacific and Germany. The US shows relatively low growth rates. The average annual growth in the OECD is about 30%.

Growth rates may be explained by geographical conditions but foremost by government policies in place. Countries ranking high in terms of installed capacity per capita are Switzerland, Austria, and Japan. These countries pioneered in introduction of financial incentives for PV.

More than half of the installed PV capacity in OECD countries is in grid-connected systems, most of which is distributed PV. In the US and Italy, large-scale PV power plants are in operation. Most of the power generators and distribution companies in OECD countries, however, are interested in distributed generation and few centralised plants have been built since 1996. An exception is the 13 MW solar power plant firmly planned in *Murcia* (Spain) at a total cost of approximately \$65 million ([Http://www.crest.org](http://www.crest.org)).

In the OECD, the focus is mainly on grid-connected PV, because most of its residents are connected to the grid. Also, grid-connected systems are approximately two times less costly than off-grid systems. For instance, in the US the specific investment cost of grid connected systems in a specific area was \$5,700/kW in 2000, whereas the corresponding figure for off-grid systems was \$13,900/kW (Mortensen, 2001). Off-grid (autonomous) systems need a battery and a power regulator and are commonly smaller in capacity than grid-connected systems.

Table 4.1 shows the distribution of several categories of PV among OECD countries.

Table 4.1 *Cumulative installed PV power in OECD countries (end of 1999)*

Country	Off-grid [kWp]	On-grid distributed [kWp]	On-grid centralised [kWp]	Cumulative installed [kWp]	Cum. installed per capita [Wp/capita]	Installed in 1999 [kWp/a]
Australia	1,413	2,119	140	3,672	0.45	811
Austria	23,180	1,490	650	25,320	1.34	2,800
Canada	5,529	287	10	5,826	0.19	1,356
Denmark	190	880	0	1,070	0.2	565
Finland	2,255	17	30	2,302	0.45	132
France	8,772	349	0	9,121	0.16	1,490
Germany	11,500	49,100	8,900	69,500	0.85	15,600
Israel	381	6	14	401	0.07	93
Italy	10,860	905	6,710	18,475	0.32	795
Japan	56,900	145,500	2,900	205,300	1.63	71,900
Korea	3,171	288	0	3,459	0.07	477
Mexico	12,920	2	0	12,922	0.13	900
Netherlands	3,886	5,309	0	9,195	0.59	2,715
Norway	5,670	0	0	5,670	1.28	320
Portugal	2,460	124	0	2,584	0.29	0
Spain	7,000	600	1,480	9,080	0.23	1,080
Sweden	2,460	124	0	2,548	0.29	214
Switzerland	2,500	9,420	1,480	13,400	1.89	1,900
UK	395	736	0	1,131	0.02	441
US	84,200	21,100	12,000	117,300	0.43	17,200
Total OECD	243,670	238,250	34,310	516,230	0.54	120,790

Source: Dresdner Kleinwort Wasserstein, January 2001 (based on IEA data).

There is a huge potential for both off-grid and grid-connected PV in developing countries:

- In rural areas that are not connected to the electrical grid.
- In areas with lack of sufficient or reliable generation and/or transmission capacity.

In those countries PV may serve to make electricity affordable to the rural population. Some areas are scarcely populated and far from industrial centres. Generally, a diesel power plant requires the scale of a small town for economic operation. Even then, the operational costs may be high (fuel costs). Besides, many developing countries enjoy favourable solar characteristics.

4.3 Status of PV

PV systems consist of modules (panels) that are assemblies of solar cells, and inverters to convert DC power to AC power (in case of grid-connected systems). Modules are mounted on roofs of single- or multi-family dwellings, garages, office buildings, or own support structures.

Currently, the majority of PV modules is based on wavered cells sawn from crystalline ingots of high-grade silicon or specially grown silicon ribbons, applied in three forms:

- Monocrystalline silicon (black). This is the purest and most expensive of the three.
- Multi-crystalline silicon (blue).
- Amorphous silicon (black/reddish). Amorphous silicon is the cheapest (per square meter).

Crystalline cells are brittle wafers usually cut from a large silicon block, whereas amorphous silicon cells consist of a layer of uncrystallised silicon deposited on a substrate (mostly glass). 'Cells' are formed by scribing through the layers with a laser. The films are produced as large complete modules, not as individual cells that have to be mounted in frames and wired together.

Crystalline cells have longer lifetimes and higher efficiencies than amorphous silicon cells. New ways of growing the silicon gain importance, such as silicon sheets and ribbons, produced directly from the melt without slicing. This reduces material consumption, which is crucial in silicon technology. Currently, around 60% of the module cost is silicon related (Dresdner Kleinwort Wasserstein, 2001).

About 65% of the solar researchers worldwide are working on thin film technology. Amorphous silicon is the most common thin film material at present, but other technologies are approaching commercialisation, notably Cadmium Telluride (CdTe), and Copper Indium Diselenide (CIS, originally developed for space applications). These promise similar cost reduction potential to amorphous silicon but with higher stable conversion efficiencies. Several manufacturers have production plants for cadmium telluride cells of 10 MW in the stage of start-up or under construction. Some companies (Siemens Solar) started commercialisation of CIS technology.

Table 4.2 shows the state-of-the-art with respect to module and cell efficiencies. Although laboratory efficiencies of around 20% have been reported for multicrystalline silicon cells, the efficiencies of modules based on multicrystalline silicon are more somewhat lower (11-14%).

Table 4.2 *Module and cell efficiencies [%]*

	Typical module efficiency	Maximum recorded module efficiency	Maximum recorded laboratory efficiency
Single crystalline cell	12-15	22.7	24.7
Multicrystalline silicon	11-14	15.3	19.8
Amorphous silicon	5-7	-	12.7
Cadmium telluride	-	10.5	16
CIS	-	12.1	18.2

Source: Dresdner Kleinwort Wasserstein, January 2001.

PV cells/modules mainly originate from OECD: Japan, the US, and the EU. However, PV production plants are also found in India and China (Greenpeace/EPIA, 2001) (Table 4.3).

Table 4.3 *PV cell/module manufacturing - leading producers by region (2000)*

Country/ Region	Leading producers	Shipments in 2000 [MWp]	Total shipments in 2000 by region [MWp]	Growth compared to 1999 [%]
Europe	Photowatt (F)	14.0	58.5	46
	ASE (D)	10.0		
	Isofoton (S)	9.5		
	BP Solar (S)	7.0		
	Shell (D/NL)	6.5		
	Solar-Fabrik (D)	4.6		
US	Siemens Solar US	28.0	78.5	29
	Solarex	20.0		
	Astropower	18.0		
	ASE Americas	6.0		
Japan	Sharp	50.4	116.6	46
	Kyocera	42.0		
	Sanyo	17.0		
Rest of world	BP Solar (AUS)	6.0	24.2	18
	BP Solar (India)	5.0		
	Sinonar (Taiwan)	3.0		
	China	2.5		

Source: Greenpeace/EPIA: Solar Generation, 2001 (based on PV News, 2001).

Table 4.4 shows the distribution among the various types of solar cells and modules in 1999.

Table 4.4 *PV cell and module production in 1999 by region*

Region/ Country	Cells Production [MWp]	Modules Production based on different cell types			Total [MWp]	Production capacity [MWp]
		Crystalline [MWp]	Amorphous [MWp]	Other [MWp]		
Europe	29.32	34.40	5.00	4.20	43.60	94.10
US	60.80	69.97	15.01	0	84.98	145.20
Japan	79.60	29.32	2.40	0	31.72	73.33
Other	7.50	7.50	0.00	0	7.50	12.50
Total	177.20	141.20	22.40	4.20	167.80	325.10

Source: Dresdner Kleinwort Wasserstein, January 2001.

As PV generating systems do not have moving parts, their maintenance costs are low. The modules are expected to operate for 20 years. The majority of the other components - inverters, controllers - are usually serviceable for ten years or more. Batteries for off-grid applications are currently the weak link in those systems, needing replacement at least every five years.

The competitiveness of PV systems is highly dependent on factors like the solar characteristics of the region (latitude), the availability of an electricity grid, electricity tariffs, etc.

4.4 Learning in the past decades

Photovoltaic cells, modules, other components, and systems are generally produced on a relatively small scale. This is because R&D is still going on strongly. Also, the PV market is not sufficiently large at this time to make large-scale production (say 500 MW/a) economically viable. Therefore, the market has to be developed and in the meantime the costs have to be reduced by further R&D. Today, plants for solar cells and modules have capacities of 10 to 25 MW/a. Production capacities of 100 to 250 MW appear to be achievable within this decade.

C. Harmon made an in-depth analysis of the price of PV modules. The price has come down steadily over the past two decades (Harmon, 2000) (Figure 4.3).




Figure 4.3 *Average selling price of PV modules 1976-1998*

Source: Experience curves of photovoltaic technologies, IASA, 2000.

Figure 4.4 shows the resulting progress ratio (PR) for the period 1968-1998.




Figure 4.4 *Experience curve of PV modules 1968-1998*

Source: Experience curves of photovoltaic technologies, IIASA, 2000.

The observed progress ratio of 0.8 for PV modules refers to a cumulative capacity of 1000 MW. With increasing experience in the next years, the slope of the curve may change. Patterns of cost reduction in the past may not be representative of future cost reductions. The PR may become higher or lower than 0.8, the figure that gives the best fit up to 1998. A progress ratio of 0.8 for modules may be applied to long-term cost projections, albeit with awareness of the uncertainty.

A similar progress ratio for the so-called 'Balance of system' (BOS) - inverter, cabling, installation - has not been found. This is because there is so much divergence in solar systems:

- Grid-connected and off-grid applications.
- From tens of Watts up to 13 MW (e.g. in case of the 'Murcia' PV plant, Section 4.2).
- Integrated in roofs (dwellings, offices) or installed in frames (e.g. in the case of 'Murcia').

Because of the unique features of PV systems, it is virtually impossible to make a systemic analysis of the cost of the BOS in the way the cost of modules has been analysed. Probably, the cost of the BOS has decreased as rapidly as modules for some time. Such a phenomenon may be related to efficiency improvement of solar panels and foremost to economies of scale from increasing dimensions of panels and PV systems. However, impressive cost reductions of the 'BOS cost' cannot be expected for the next few decades. Solar cells and modules are the 'high tech' part of the PV system, with their ongoing technical breakthroughs, economies of scale, and related progressive cost reduction. Inverter, cabling, and installation are governed by different learning processes. Therefore, the cost of the BOS will decline more gradually.

4.5 The next thirty-five years

Recently, Greenpeace and the European Photovoltaic Industry Association (EPIA) published a study on the potential of PV power from a global point of view (Greenpeace/EPIA, 2001). Their projection towards 2040 has been used for an analysis of the possible cost reduction of PV in the next few decades.

The scenario for the global development PV in Figure 4.5 is based on data from EPIA published on Internet ([Http://www.jxj.com](http://www.jxj.com)). The data show some differences with the Greenpeace/EPIA study. Both projections (EPIA and Greenpeace/EPIA) are ambitious. The Figure shows that the Greenpeace/EPIA curve is even more ambitious than the EPIA curve (particularly from 2020).




Figure 4.5 Global cumulative PV capacity based on EPIA and Greenpeace/EPIA data

Sources: Greenpeace/EPIA: Solar Generation, 2001; EPIA ([Http://www.jxj.com](http://www.jxj.com)).

The EU's target, part of a broader strategy for renewable energy, is to reach at least 3 GWp of PV power in the 15 EU states by the year 2010. The 'EPIA curve' indicates a global installed capacity of more than 14 GW in 2010, which is nearly five times the present target for the EU.

The Greenpeace/EPIA projection is the most ambitious of the two:

- In 2020 the difference is small: 195 GW and 207 GW for the EPIA and the Greenpeace/EPIA projections respectively.
- After 2020, the gap becomes wider due to larger differences in growth rates assumed.
- EPIA gives a projection of 7,368 TWh solar generation in 2040, 23% of the global demand. The Greenpeace/EPIA study projects 9,113 TWh in 2040, 26% of global demand.

Part of the difference seems to be related to different estimates of the future electricity demand. Scenarios for 2040 are scarce. Even figures for electricity demand in 2020 from IEA's World Energy Outlook may be questioned on good grounds. Their 'business-as-usual' scenario does not consider the issue of GHG emissions as a constraint to economic and energy developments.

The projection for global PV in this study is defined as the EPIA projection (www.jxj.com) (Figure 4.5). Besides, two 'learning profiles' for PV are introduced (Table 4.5).

Table 4.5 'Learning profiles' for investment cost of grid-connected PV (starting in 2000)

Specific investment cost	[€ ₂₀₀₀ /kW]	Module	Inverter, cabling	Installation
		4,000	750	650
Progress Ratio	Period	PR	PR	PR
<i>Reference</i>	2000-2035	0.80	0.87	0.94
<i>Low</i>	2000-2035	0.80	0.85	0.90

Although the uncertainties with regard to modules remain substantial, the PR of 0.8 from the past is used. The uncertainty with respect to learning for the BOS seems to be even larger. The learning profile *reference* is based on replication of the learning rate for modules - approximately € 4,000/kW in 2000 - from the past: a progress ratio for the modules of 0.8. For the inverter, cabling, etc., a more modest learning rate is assumed, viz. a PR of 0.87 starting from €

750/kW in 2000. These components are already manufactured on a relatively large scale. For installation - € 650/kW in 2000 - a modest learning rate is assumed, viz. a PR of 0.94.

The learning profile 'low' (low ultimate investment cost in 2035) is based on a PR of 0.8 for PV modules, just like in the case *reference*. The learning potential for materials (inverter, cabling, etc.) is assumed to be higher than in case of *reference*, viz. PR is 0.85. Finally, the learning rate for installation is also assumed to be more pronounced than for *reference*, viz. PR is 0.90.

Figure 4.6 shows the results in terms of specific investment cost of grid-connected PV systems (typically 3 kW for single-family houses) as a function of the cumulative installed capacity.




Figure 4.6 *Specific investment cost PV as a function of cumulative installed capacity*

Figure 4.7 presents the results of the same two 'learning profiles' as a function of time.




Figure 4.7 *Specific investment cost of PV as a function of time*

The assumptions made and the results of the analysis may be described as follows:

1. The EPIA curve indicate a cumulative capacity of 1,590 GW in 2035, based on a growth of:
 - 21%/a from 2000 to 2005,
 - 31%/a from 2005 to 2009,
 - 30%/a from 2009 to 2020,
 - 15%/a after 2020.
2. The 'EPIA scenario' could imply more than 10 doublings of the cumulative installed capacity in 2035 compared to the level of 2000.

3. The investment cost of € 5,400/kW for grid-connected ‘single-family’ systems in 2000 is based on the aforementioned US experience, viz. US\$ 5,600/kW for grid-connected systems in 2000, and the projected cost of the 13 MW ‘Murcia’ PV plant, viz. \$ 5,000/kW.
4. The distribution of the cost in 2000 between modules, inverter & cabling, and installation (74%, 14%, and 12% respectively) is based on a Dutch estimate, viz. 75% for modules, 10% for the inverter (multicrystalline modules) (W/E Adviseurs duurzaam bouwen, 2000). This source also gives a projection of the system cost of € 4,95/Wp, which is the average *reference* cost for the years 2001 and 2002.
5. This analysis suggests an ultimate specific investment cost of grid-connected PV in 2035 of:
 - € 950/kW in case of the learning profile *reference*,
 - € 790/kW in case of the learning profile ‘low’.

In case of long-term models, the *reference* figure of € 950/kW may be useful as a cost level for the timeframe 2030-2035 (dependent on the scenario used, see Figure 4.5). Van de Reepe (2001) presents an estimate of € 720/kW for the year 2050. These figures are rather uncertain, taking into account the technical breakthroughs that are needed. The level of €790/kW (learning profile ‘low’), based on more ambitious PRs for components other than modules, may be useful for sensitivity analysis.

Finally, Figure 4.8 shows how the projections from EPIA and Greenpeace/EPIA (2001) compare to potentials of PV calculated by IIASA for world regions in the year 2100 (Christiansson, 1995).




Figure 4.8 PV potential according to EPIA, Greenpeace/EPIA (2001), and IIASA (1995)

It turns out that both the estimates of EPIA and Greenpeace/EPIA are ambitious, if one assumes an S-curve from 2000 towards 2100. IIASA’s figure of 20,880 TWh is based on the following estimates by world region (Table 4.6).

Table 4.6 *Potential of PV in world regions in 2040 and 2100*

Region Source	2000 EPIA		2020 EPIA		2040 EPIA		2100 IIASA
	[GW]	[TWh]	[GW]	[TWh]	[GW]	[TWh]	[TWh]
North America							1,800
Latin America							1,564
Western Europe							1,293
Eastern Europe							880
FSU							2,104
Middle East							1,484
Africa							1,548
China							3,775
Southern Asia							1,420
Pacific Asia							4,675
Pacific OECD							337
Total world	1.4	2	195	275	3,190	7,370	20,880

IIASA's figure of 1,548 TWh for Africa in 2100 is a very rough estimate, taking account of the sheer surface of the Sahara. The same holds for other world regions near the equator. Evidently, IIASA does not presume any large-scale PV systems in the Sahara for power export to Europe.

Much caution is needed with regard to the prospects of PV. The scenarios shown presume a considerable effort, not only in OECD countries but also in other parts of the world. The growth rates assumed could be realised, but not without a strong and ongoing commitment from the industry (R&D, market development), governments (financial investments) and consumers (willingness to pay for more expensive PV power).

Another aspect is the intermittent nature of PV. An advantage of PV is the predictability of day/night variations. Also advantageous is the similarity between the daily supply curve of PV and the corresponding electricity demand pattern, particularly in case of a climate that requires air conditioning. However, in Europe and other regions of the world at higher latitudes the strongly seasonal pattern of supply from PV does not fit with the electricity demand pattern. Therefore, with increasing capacities of PV provisions have to be made such as load management. Alternatively, inequalities between supply and demand for electricity may be matched by short- and long-term electricity storage systems that are available today (pumped hydro storage) or are in the stage of RD&D.

5. CONCLUSIONS

This study gives an analysis of the potential of cost reduction for onshore wind, offshore wind, and photovoltaic power. The process of cost reduction is driven by the amalgam of technological development and increasing sales.

Wind energy has developed rapidly in Western Europe (the EU-15, Switzerland, and Norway). Sluggish growth experienced in some countries may be caused by planning issues, lengthy approval procedures, and sometimes lack of financial incentives taking into account the difference in production cost between wind power and conventional power production. However, there is scope for improvement. Also, the upcoming offshore wind market offers new perspectives. Although Europe has the lead, non-European countries – the USA, China, and India – are crucial as well, because of their sheer dimensions, the magnitude of their population, the prevailing wind climate, and the size of their electricity demand. It is evident that the wind turbine market is no longer a regional but a true world market.

The future development of the cost of onshore wind may be derived from several data:

- Evidence of learning effects in a number of literature sources, based on analysis of the cost or price of turbines (e.g. in €/kW) as a function of the cumulative installed capacity.
- Projections of the installed onshore wind capacity for the next 20 to 30 years.
- Engineering judgements on the extent to which the specific investment cost (e.g. in €/kW) of onshore windfarms may be reduced.

Enron Wind Corp published estimates of the global market potential of wind until 2020 as well as wind turbine prices for the next two decades. These estimates are used as a yardstick for future cost reductions of onshore wind until 2030. According to Enron Wind Corp, the capacity of onshore wind may increase from 18,36 GW in 2000 to 400 GW in 2020. Possibly, the capacity may increase further to 860 GW in 2030, with an annual addition of 48 GW in 2025.

From literature sources a progress ratio of 0.9 for rotor & nacelle has been derived. A progress ratio of 0.9 for rotor & nacelle (the main components of an onshore windfarm) implies a cost reduction of 10% for each doubling of the cumulative capacity. More modest progress ratios are assumed for the tower and the balance of plant (civil work, infrastructure, and grid connection).

The specific investment cost of a state-of-the-art wind farm is estimated at € 900/kW in 2000 (€ of the year 2000). The above mentioned scenario for onshore wind is combined with specific progress ratios for the wind turbine components and the starting level of € 900/kW in 2000. The result is a gradually decreasing level of the specific investment cost. In 2030 the specific investment cost could be as low as € 590/kW (*reference*) or possibly € 560/kW (*low*). The terms *reference* and *low* refer to different learning effects assumed for the tower and the balance of plant, with *low* as the most ambitious variant. The level of € 590/kW in case of *reference* is in accordance with an estimate from Enron (\$ 600/kW in 2020).

Rather modest progress ratios applied to wind turbine components may be argued by:

- The advanced state of current wind turbines with capacities from 0.6 to 2.5 MW.
- Limited potential for further upscaling, one of the main drivers for cost reduction so far.
- Limited cost reduction potential for towers; towers are often sourced from local suppliers.
- Minor cost reduction potential for civil work, infrastructure, and grid connection. This part of a windfarm is more or less 'conventional technology'.
- An estimated cost reduction potential of 10-34% in case of upscaling of production volumes from 1,000 to 30,000 turbines per year.

The utilisation of the economic potential of onshore wind from a study by Garrad Hassan and Partners for a cut-off level of 6 ¢/kWh is fairly modest, e.g. around 30% for Europe. Further growth towards 2100 is generally not limited by wind potential, but by economic and other considerations, such as the intermittent nature of wind and conservation of landscape.

Data have been collected for offshore wind farms that have been realised or are in preparation. A distinction is made between *near-shore* and *offshore* windfarms. Generally, offshore windfarms are characterised by more or less harsh wind and wave conditions prevailing at the North Sea and parts of the Baltic Sea. Near-shore windfarms are assumed to be built in more sheltered and shallow waters like the Baltic Sea coast near Denmark and Sweden.

The cumulative capacity of near-shore wind could increase from 0.09 GW in 2000 to 69 GW in 2030 (nearly 10 doublings). Based on progress ratios for components of near-shore windfarms that are comparable to those of onshore wind, and an initial cost of € 1,375/kW in 2000, the specific investment cost could come down to € 885/kW (*reference*) or possibly € 755/kW (*'low'*) in 2030. Near-shore wind could become nearly as competitive as onshore wind. The higher capacity factor of near-shore wind compared to onshore wind (about 36% and ~ 24% respectively) might nearly outweigh the higher specific investment cost.

The cumulative offshore capacity could increase by more than 10 doublings, from 0.16 GW in 2002 to about 205 GW in 2030. Taking account progress ratios for turbine components, and initial costs of € 1,700/kW in 2002, the specific investment cost could decrease to € 1,140/kW (*reference*) or possibly € 970/kW (*'low'*) in 2030. Offshore wind will remain more costly than onshore wind. The higher capacity factor of offshore wind compared to onshore wind (about 40% and ~ 24% respectively) is not sufficient to outweigh the higher specific investment cost.

The principle of photovoltaic power (PV) is rather straightforward, and it offers a very large potential for small- and large-scale application because of its modular character. The challenge is to make PV an economically viable option. The efficiency of solar cells may be increased, and the lifetime may be prolonged by prevention of significant degradation. Also, consumption of materials – high-grade silicon, precious metals – may be reduced to low and ‘sustainable’ levels. Last but not least, continued research and development as well as advanced large-scale production processes may well make PV more and more competitive in the long term.

The initial investment cost of € 5,400/kW for grid-connected roof-mounted PV systems in 2000 is based on US experience, viz. \$ 5,600/kW for grid-connected systems, and the projected cost of a 13 MW PV plant in Murcia, Spain (\$ 5,000/kW). The distribution of the cost in 2000 between modules, inverter & cabling, and installation (74%, 14%, and 12% respectively) is based on literature sources. A progress ratio (PR) of 0.8 for modules (based on past experience) and more modest PRs for inverter & cabling and installation are applied to a scenario from the European Photovoltaic Industry Association (EPIA). The specific investment cost may come down by a factor 5 to 7, viz. to € 950/kW (*reference*) or € 790/kW (*'low'*) in 2035.

Such an ambitious PV scenario presumes a co-ordinated policy from governments and industry. The scenario implies more than 10 doublings of the cumulative installed capacity compared to 2000. The growth of PV capacity after 2035 is limited by economic factors and by the intermittent nature of a renewable option like PV, rather than by its technical potential.

REFERENCES

- Ackermann, T. et. al. (2000): *Wind energy technology and current status: a review*. Renewable and sustainable energy reviews, 4 (2000), pp 315-374.
- Bonefeld, J.W. et. al. (2001): *Status of the Horns Rev offshore project*. EWEC 2001, Copenhagen, pp 32-34.
- BTM Consult (2000): *International Wind Energy Development, World Market Update 1999*. March 2000.
- BTM Consult (2001): *International Wind Energy Development, World Market Update 2000*. March 2001.
- CADDET (1995): *Wind energy developments at Altamont Pass, USA*. CADDET renewable energy, Technical Brochure no. 14, 1995.
- CADDET (2001): *Environmental impact assessment of offshore wind farms under way*. CADDET Renewable Energy Newsletter, June 2001, pp 7-9.
- Christiansson, L. (1995): *Diffusion and learning curves of renewable energy technologies*. IIASA, WP-95-126, December 1995, Appendix A.
- De Noord, M. (1999): *Large-scale offshore wind energy*. ECN, Petten, ECN-I--99-003.
- Delft University Wind Energy Institute (2001): *Offshore wind energy ready to power a sustainable Europe*. December 2001, p. 6-11 – 6-12.
- Dresdner Kleinwort Wasserstein (2001): *Power generation in the 21st century, part II: renewables gaining ground*. 18 January 2001.
- Garrad Hassan and Partners Limited (2000): *The potential of wind energy to reduce carbon dioxide emissions*. IEA Greenhouse Gas R&D Programme. Report Number PH3/24, October 2000.
- Greenpeace (2000): *Wind force 10, a blueprint to achieve 10% of the world's electricity from wind power by 2020*. Edition 2000.
- Greenpeace/DWI (2000): *North Sea offshore wind – A power house for Europe*. October 2000, pp 80-81.
- Greenpeace/EPIA (2001): *Solar Generation*. September 2001.
- Grübler, A. (1998): *Technology and global change*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Harmon, C. (2000): *Experience curves of photovoltaic technology*. IIASA, IR-00-014, March 2000.
- IEA (2000): *Experience curves for energy technology policy*, IEA, Paris, 2000.
- Junginger, M. (2000): *Experience curves in the wind energy sector*. NWS-I-2000-29. Department of Science, Technology and Society, Utrecht University, November 2000.
- Knight, S. (2001): *German offshore plans in costs trap*. Windpower Monthly, September 2001, pp 44-47.
- Kühn, M. et. al. (2001): *Utgrunden offshore wind farm – first results of design certification by measurements*. EWEC 2001, Copenhagen, pp 545-548.
- Madsen, P.S. (1996): *Tunø Knob offshore wind farm*. EWEC 1996, Göteborg, 20-24 May 1996, pp 4-7.

- Modern Power Systems (1997): *100 MW of wind power for Minnesota's clean future*. October 1997, pp 49-53.
- Mortensen, J. (2001): *Factors associated with photovoltaic system costs*. NREL/TP.620.29649, June 2001.
- Neij, L. (1997): *Use of experience curves to analyse the prospects for diffusion and adoption of renewable energy technology*. Energy Policy, November 1997, pp 1099-1107.
- Neij, L. (1999): *Cost dynamics of wind power*. Energy, May 1999, pp 375-389.
- New Energy (2001a), 5/2001, p. 51.
- New Energy (2001b), 1/2001, p. 50.
- New Energy (2001c), October 2001.
- Press report IWR (2001), 30 January 2001. [Http://www.iwr.de](http://www.iwr.de).
- Ronsten, G. et. al. (2001): *Evaluation of loads, power quality, grid interaction, meteorological conditions and power performance of the first Swedish offshore wind farm at Bockstigen*. [Http://www.windenergy.foi.se/main.htm](http://www.windenergy.foi.se/main.htm).
- Seebregts, A.J. et. al. (1998): *Endogenous technological learning: experiments with MARKAL*. ECN, Petten, ECN-C--98-064.
- Sørensen, H.C. et. al. (2001): *Experience from the establishment of Middelgrunden 40 MW offshore wind farm*. EWEC 2001, Copenhagen, pp 541-544.
- Stromen (2002), 8 February 2002.
- Van de Reepe, D. (2001): *Inzet door Inzicht*. Natuurwetenschappen en Bedrijf & Bestuur, Universiteit Utrecht, November 2001.
- Vølund, P. (2001): *World's largest wind farm built in Denmark*. CADDET Renewable Newsletter, March 2001, pp 18-19.
- W/E adviseurs duurzaam bouwen (2000): *Corporaties en het dilemma van zonnestroom*. Oktober 2000, p. 43.
- Wind power in Denmark (1999). *Technologies, policies and results*. September 1999.
- Windkraft Journal (2001), 4/2001, pp 42-43.
- Windpower Monthly (2001a), July 2001, p. 38.
- Windpower Monthly (2001b), July 2001, p. 10.
- Windpower Monthly (2002), January 2002, p. 38.
- Ybema, J.R. et al. (1999): *De bijdrage van duurzame energie in Nederland tot 2020*. ECN, Petten, ECN-C--99-053.

INTERNET

[Http://www.seas.dk](http://www.seas.dk).

[Http://www.middelgrund.dk](http://www.middelgrund.dk).

[Http://www.vindkompaniet.se](http://www.vindkompaniet.se).

[Http://www.vindkraft.nu](http://www.vindkraft.nu).

[Http://www.stem.se](http://www.stem.se).

[Http://www.blyth-offshore.co.uk](http://www.blyth-offshore.co.uk).

[Http://www.cws.huginonline.com](http://www.cws.huginonline.com).

[Http://www.offshorewindfarms.co.uk](http://www.offshorewindfarms.co.uk).

[Http://www.hornsrev.dk](http://www.hornsrev.dk).

[Http://www.pde.nl](http://www.pde.nl).

[Http://www.c-power.be](http://www.c-power.be).

[Http://www.mumm.ac.be](http://www.mumm.ac.be).

[Http://www.fe-ag.com](http://www.fe-ag.com).

[Http://www.nordex-online.com](http://www.nordex-online.com).

[Http://www.wind-energie.de/zeitschrift/new-energy/jahr-2001/inhalte/ny.../december2.htm](http://www.wind-energie.de/zeitschrift/new-energy/jahr-2001/inhalte/ny.../december2.htm).

[Http://www.crest.org/articles/static/html](http://www.crest.org/articles/static/html).

[Http://www.jxj.com/magsandj/rew/2001_05/solar_generation_two.html](http://www.jxj.com/magsandj/rew/2001_05/solar_generation_two.html).