

UNIVERSITEIT·STELLENBOSCH·UNIVERSITY jou kennisvennoot · your knowledge partner

Recent developments in wave energy along the coast of southern African

James Joubert Stellenbosch University

Ocean Energy workshop 18 September 2009





Contents



- Introduction
- Industry opportunities & barriers
- Global & local wave energy resource
- Commercial projects in SA
- SWEC
- ShoreSWEC
- Way forward
- Conclusions
- Recommendations





Introduction





 \bullet

• Highest energy density of all RE sources

• Free source of non-polluting energy

· Osesses al veriale ilitera energina energinal 8 selan energina

Seasonal variability corresponds to demand (in SA)



3



Opportunities for wave energy development in SA





- SA renewable energy target of 10 000 GWh by 2013
- Abundant resource (30 50 kW/m)
- Energy security & strengthen weak coastal grid
- Strong research base dating back to the seventies
- Competent community of coastal engineers, naval architects and ship manufacturers
- Job creation





Industry barriers



- Immature, unproven technology
- Lack of collaboration between various role-players
- "Low" cost of electricity in SA
- No financial incentives
- No clear guidelines for licensing and permit requirements
- Difficult to quantify environmental impacts



Global wave power resource







World Waves data/OCEANOR/ECMWF





SA meteorology





CENTRE FOR RENEWABLE AND SUSTAINABLE ENERGY STUDIES

7



Measured wave data analysis





CENTRE FOR RENEWABLE AND SUSTAINABLE ENERGY STUDIES

8







Model output

- •
- •
- •







Comparison of model hindcast- to measured data



% Difference between hindcast- and measured wave data												
Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	Мау	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Mean annual
4%	-6%	3%	4%	-1%	9%	9%	6%	8%	7%	-2%	1%	5%



CENTRE FOR RENEWABLE AND SUSTAINABLE ENERGY STUDIES

10





11







Commercial developments in southern Africa







Oceanlinx: Namibia





Pelamis: Southern Cape coast



Finavera's Aquabuoy: Southwest coast

12



Stellenbosch Wave Energy Converter(SWEC)







SWEC (cont)



Barriers for full scale deployment

- Oil price stabilised
- High capital cost
- Complex licensing & permit requirements

Incorporate SWEC principle into breakwater structure for existing/new port development

- Cost sharing between breakwater & WEC
- Reduced loadings on breakwater
- Simplifies EIA
- Supply clean, free energy to development

14



ShoreSWEC





15



Site selection



Criteria

- Existing and/or new breakwater structure with suitable orientation
- Wave energy resource characteristics
- Impact on the surrounding environment and regulatory requirements
- Potential power purchaser
- Service vessels and waterfront infrastructure for system deployment, retrieval and servicing
- Proximity to device fabrication, assembly facilities and expertise
- Proximity to onshore grid interconnection points





Site selection (cont)



17

Granger Bay





Table Bay wave energy resource







Table Bay wave energy resource (cont)

19

Mean annual average wave power distribution of Table Bay based on 10 years of hindcast wave data





Table Bay wave energy resource (cont)

20

Mean annual average wave power distribution of Table Bay based on 10 years of hindcast wave data





21

Table Bay wave energy resource (cont) RENEWABLE & SUSTAINABLE ENERGY STUDIES











- Develop numerical model
- Physical model tests









Way forward (cont)



Upgrading wavemaker facilities in US hydraulic









23





Conclusions





24

- Great opportunities for wave energy development in SA, but also barriers
- SA has a world class wave energy resource
- SA has an indigenous WEC designed for local conditions
- Opportunity to demonstrate SWEC conversion principle in port development
- Wave power focal zone exist in Table Bay



Recommendations







- Support technology conceived locally instead of international developers exploiting our abundant resource
- Promote ideal of wave energy conversion in new port developments
- Increased government support





26

Mutriku





Thank you for your attention















29







Sensitivity analysis of SWAN methodology

Simulate dominant wave conditions

% Difference between values obtained through model methodology and direct method Hs = 2.6mDeep Inter Shallow Shelter SW-Tp10 5%8% 9% 5%SW-Tp12 1% 2%2%1% SW-Tp14 0% 0% 1% 1% WSW-Tp10 4%7%9% 6% WSW-Tp12 1% 2%2%2%WSW-Tp14 0% 0% 0% 1%

CONCLUSION: Model output sufficiently accurate in nearshore applications





Global wave height distribution







Literature review





Wave energy conversion (WEC) technology

Point absorber

Attenuator

Perpendicular to wave front

Terminator

• Parallel to wave front



32



SWAN computational theory

Spectral action balance equation





$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}N + \frac{\partial}{\partial x}c_{x}N + \frac{\partial}{\partial y}c_{y}N + \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma}c_{\sigma}N + \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta}c_{\theta}N = \frac{S}{\sigma}$

Generation and dissipation source term (S) Generation

• Wind input

Dissipation

- White-capping
- Depth induced-wave breaking
- Bottom friction

Non linear wave-wave interaction

Quadruplets and triads